

Agenda

Cabinet

This meeting will be held on:

Date: **Wednesday 19 November 2025**

Time: **6.00 pm**

Place: **Long Room - Oxford Town Hall**

For further information please contact:

Dr Brenda McCollum, Committee and Member Services Officer,
Committee Services Officer

📞 01865 252784

✉ DemocraticServices@oxford.gov.uk

Members of the public can attend to observe this meeting and.

- may submit a question about any item for decision at the meeting in accordance with the [Cabinet's rules](#)
- may record all or part of the meeting in accordance with the Council's [protocol](#)

Details of how City Councillors and members of the public may engage with this meeting are set out later in the agenda. Information about recording is set out later in the agenda and on the [website](#)

Please contact the Committee Services Officer to submit a question; to discuss recording the meeting; or with any other queries.

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

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

Cabinet Membership

Councillors: Membership 10: Quorum 3: No substitutes are permitted.

Leader/ Chair

Cabinet Members

Councillor Susan Brown	Leader, Partnership Working
Councillor Ed Turner	Deputy Leader (Statutory) - Finance and Asset Management
Councillor Lubna Arshad	Cabinet Member for a Safer Oxford
Councillor Nigel Chapman	Cabinet Member for Citizen Focused Services and Council Companies
Councillor Alex Hollingsworth	Cabinet Member for Planning and Culture
Councillor Chewe Munkonge	Cabinet Member for a Healthy, Fairer Oxford and Small Business Champion
Councillor Anna Railton	Cabinet Member for a Zero Carbon Oxford
Councillor Linda Smith	Cabinet Member for Housing and Communities

Apologies received before the publication are shown under *Apologies for absence* in the agenda. Those sent after publication will be reported at the meeting.

Decisions come into effect after the latest of the expiry of the post-meeting councillor call in period; reconsideration of a called-in decision; or Council's agreement of recommendations.

Oxford City Council, Town Hall, St Aldate's Oxford OX1 1BX

Agenda

Items to be considered at this meeting in open session (part 1) and in confidential session (part 2).

Future items to be discussed by the Cabinet can be found on the Forward Plan which is available on the Council's [website](#)

	Pages
1 Apologies for Absence	
2 Declarations of Interest	
3 Minutes of the previous meeting Recommendation: That Cabinet resolves to approve the minutes of the meetings held on 22 October 2025 and 10 November 2025 as a true and accurate record. <i>The minutes from the meeting held on 10 November 2025 will be circulated as a supplement to the agenda.</i>	9 - 24
4 Addresses by members of the public Public addresses relating to matters of business for this agenda, up to five minutes is available for each public address. The request to speak accompanied by the full text of the address must be received by the Director of Law, Governance and Strategy by 5.00 pm on Thursday the 13th of November.	
5 Councillor addresses on any item for decision on the Cabinet agenda Councillor addresses relating to matters of business for this agenda, up to five minutes is available for each address. The request should be received by the Director of Law, Governance and Strategy by 5.00 pm on Thursday the 13th of November.	

Decisions come into effect after the latest of the expiry of the post-meeting councillor call in period; reconsideration of a called-in decision; or Council's agreement of recommendations.

Oxford City Council, Town Hall, St Aldate's Oxford OX1 1BX

6 **Councillor addresses on Neighbourhood Issues**

7 **Items raised by Cabinet Members**

8 **Reports from the Scrutiny Committee**

The Scrutiny Committee will meet on 11 November 2025 to consider the following items. Report and recommendations, including those from its working groups, from the meeting will be published as a late supplement.

- Hackney Carriage Vehicle Emission Standards Amendment

9 **Deferral of the commencement of the Hackney Carriage Vehicle Emission Standards**

25 - 70

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

Cabinet is recommended to:

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

10 **Dates of future meetings**

Meetings are scheduled for the following dates:

- 10 December 2025
- 21 January 2026
- 11 February 2026
- 18 March 2026

All meetings start at 6.00 pm.

Decisions come into effect after the latest of the expiry of the post-meeting councillor call in period; reconsideration of a called-in decision; or Council's agreement of recommendations.

Oxford City Council, Town Hall, St Aldate's Oxford OX1 1BX

Matters Exempt from Publication

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

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

Decisions come into effect after the latest of the expiry of the post-meeting councillor call in period; reconsideration of a called-in decision; or Council's agreement of recommendations.

Oxford City Council, Town Hall, St Aldate's Oxford OX1 1BX

Information for those attending

Recording and reporting on meetings held in public

Members of public and press can record, or report in other ways, the parts of the meeting open to the public. You are not required to indicate in advance but it helps if you notify the Committee Services Officer prior to the meeting so that they can inform the Chair and direct you to the best place to record.

The Council asks those recording the meeting:

- To follow the protocol which can be found on the Council's [website](#)
- Not to disturb or disrupt the meeting
- Not to edit the recording in a way that could lead to misinterpretation of the proceedings. This includes not editing an image or views expressed in a way that may ridicule or show a lack of respect towards those being recorded.
- To avoid recording members of the public present, even inadvertently, unless they are addressing the meeting.

Please be aware that you may be recorded during your speech and any follow-up. If you are attending please be aware that recording may take place and that you may be inadvertently included in these.

The Chair of the meeting has absolute discretion to suspend or terminate any activities that in his or her opinion are disruptive.

Councillors declaring interests

General duty

You must declare any disclosable pecuniary interests when the meeting reaches the item on the agenda headed "Declarations of Interest" or as soon as it becomes apparent to you.

What is a disclosable pecuniary interest?

Disclosable pecuniary interests relate to your* employment; sponsorship (ie payment for expenses incurred by you in carrying out your duties as a councillor or towards your election expenses); contracts; land in the Council's area; licenses for land in the Council's area; corporate tenancies; and securities. These declarations must be recorded in each councillor's Register of Interests which is publicly available on the Council's website.

Declaring an interest

Where any matter disclosed in your Register of Interests is being considered at a meeting, you must declare that you have an interest. You should also disclose the nature as well as the existence of the interest. If you have a disclosable pecuniary interest, after having declared it at the meeting you must not participate in discussion or voting on the item and must withdraw from the meeting whilst the matter is discussed.

Members' Code of Conduct and public perception

Even if you do not have a disclosable pecuniary interest in a matter, the Members' Code of Conduct says that a member "must serve only the public interest and must never improperly confer an advantage or disadvantage on any person including yourself" and that "you must not place yourself in situations where your honesty and integrity may be questioned". The matter of interests must be viewed within the context of the Code as a whole and regard should continue to be paid to the perception of the public.

Members' Code – Other Registrable Interests

Where a matter arises at a meeting which directly relates to the financial interest or wellbeing** of one of your Other Registrable Interests*** then you must declare an

interest. You must not participate in discussion or voting on the item and you must withdraw from the meeting whilst the matter is discussed.

Members' Code – Non Registrable Interests

Where a matter arises at a meeting which ***directly relates*** to your financial interest or wellbeing (and does not fall under disclosable pecuniary interests), or the financial interest or wellbeing of a relative or close associate, you must declare the interest.

Where a matter arises at a meeting which affects your own financial interest or wellbeing, a financial interest or wellbeing of a relative or close associate or a financial interest or wellbeing of a body included under Other Registrable Interests, then you must declare the interest.

You must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room, if you answer in the affirmative to this test:

“Where a matter affects the financial interest or well-being:

- a. to a greater extent than it affects the financial interests of the majority of inhabitants of the ward affected by the decision and;
- b. a reasonable member of the public knowing all the facts would believe that it would affect your view of the wider public interest You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting.”

Otherwise, you may stay in the room, take part in the discussion and vote.

*Disclosable pecuniary interests that must be declared are not only those of the member her or himself but also those member's spouse, civil partner or person they are living with as husband or wife or as if they were civil partners.

** Wellbeing can be described as a condition of contentedness, healthiness and happiness; anything that could be said to affect a person's quality of life, either positively or negatively, is likely to affect their wellbeing.

*** Other Registrable Interests: a) any unpaid directorships b) any Body of which you are a member or are in a position of general control or management and to which you are nominated or appointed by your authority c) any Body (i) exercising functions of a public nature (ii) directed to charitable purposes or (iii) one of whose principal purposes includes the influence of public opinion or policy (including any political party or trade union) of which you are a member or in a position of general control or management.

How Oxford City Councillors and members of the public can engage at Cabinet

Addresses and questions by members of the public (15 minutes in total)

Members of the public can submit questions in writing about any item for decision at the meeting. Questions, stating the relevant agenda item, must be received by the Head of Law and Governance by 9.30am two working days before the meeting (eg for a Tuesday meeting, the deadline would be 9.30am on the Friday before). Questions can be submitted either by letter or by email (to cabinet@oxford.gov.uk).

Answers to the questions will be provided in writing at the meeting; supplementary questions will not be allowed. If it is not possible to provide an answer at the meeting it will be included in the minutes that are published on the Council's website within 2 working days of the meeting.

The Chair has discretion in exceptional circumstances to agree that a submitted question or related statement (dealing with matters that appear on the agenda) can be asked verbally at the meeting. In these cases, the question and/or address is limited to 3 minutes, and will be answered verbally by the Chair or another Cabinet member or an officer of the Council. The text of any proposed address must be submitted within the same timescale as questions.

For this agenda item the Chair's decision is final.

Councillors speaking at meetings

Oxford City councillors may, when the chair agrees, address the Cabinet on an item for decision on the agenda (other than on the minutes). The member seeking to make an address must notify the Head of Law and Governance by 9.30am at least one working day before the meeting, stating the relevant agenda items. An address may last for no more than three minutes. If an address is made, the Cabinet member who has political responsibility for the item for decision may respond or the Cabinet will have regard to the points raised in reaching its decision.

Councillors speaking on Neighbourhood issues (10 minutes in total)

Any City Councillor can raise local issues on behalf of communities directly with the Cabinet. The member seeking to make an address must notify the Head of Law and Governance by 9.30am at least one working day before the meeting, giving outline details of the issue. Priority will be given to those members who have not already addressed the Cabinet within the year and in the order received. Issues can only be raised once unless otherwise agreed by the Cabinet. The Cabinet's responsibility will be to hear the issue and respond at the meeting, if possible, or arrange a written response within 10 working days.

Items raised by Cabinet members

Such items must be submitted within the same timescale as questions and will be for discussion only and not for a Cabinet decision. Any item which requires a decision of the Cabinet will be the subject of a report to a future meeting of the Cabinet.

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



Committee members present:

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

Officers present for all or part of the meeting:

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

Also present:

Councillor Alex Powell, Chair of Scrutiny

Apologies:

Councillor Railton sent apologies for a late arrival.

63. Declarations of Interest

None.

64. Minutes of the previous meeting

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

65. Addresses by members of the public

Cabinet received two addresses from members of the public.

Address from Marta Lomza, former City Council employee.

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

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

1) LACK OF COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

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

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

2) LACK OF EVIDENCE IN THE PROPOSAL

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

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

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

4) NOT INCLUDING A PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENT

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

IN CONCLUSION

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

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

- The decision you're facing tonight is this:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

It is not.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

None received.

67. Councillor addresses on Neighbourhood Issues

None received.

68. Items raised by Cabinet Members

None.

69. Reports from the Scrutiny Committee

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

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

- Annual Safeguarding Report

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

70. Museum of Oxford entry fee

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

With the change in the final recommendation:

Cabinet resolved to:

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

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

71. Anti-Social Behaviour Policy

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

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

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

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

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

Cabinet resolved to:

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

72. Draft Air Quality Action Plan

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Cabinet resolved to:

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

73. HRA Policies

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Cabinet resolved to:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Cabinet resolved to:

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

75. Local Nature Recovery Strategy

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

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

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

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

With this slight alteration:

Cabinet resolved to:

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

76. Domestic Abuse Policy for Council Staff

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Cabinet resolved to:

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

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

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

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

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

Cabinet resolved to:

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

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

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

78. Contract for Annual Real Estate Asset Valuations

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

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

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

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

Cabinet resolved to:

1. **Give Project Approval** to approve the procurement of a suitably qualified firm of real estate valuers to undertake valuations of council-owned properties recorded within the General Fund and Housing Revenue Accounts
2. **Delegate** authority to the Deputy Chief Executive – Place in consultation with the Group Director of Finance, the Director of Law, Governance and Strategy (Monitoring Officer), and the Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Assets to determine the form of the procurement, contract, and award and enter into the final contract with the preferred supplier

79. Dates of future meetings

Cabinet noted the dates of future meetings.

Matters Exempt from Publication

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

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

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

Chair

Date: Monday 10 November 2025

When decisions take effect:

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

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

All other committees: immediately.

Details are in the Council's Constitution.

To: Cabinet

Date: 19 November 2025

Report of: Deputy Chief Executive, Citizen and City Services

Title of Report: Deferral of the commencement of the Hackney Carriage Vehicle Emission Standards

Summary and recommendations	
Decision being taken:	To consider a delay to the final phase of emission standards for Hackney Carriage Vehicles licensed by this Authority.
Key decision:	Yes Issue details - Hackney Carriage Vehicle Emission Standards Oxford City Council
Cabinet Member:	Councillor Anna Railton. Deputy Leader, and Cabinet Member for a Zero Carbon Oxford
Corporate Priority:	Strong, Fair Economy; Thriving Communities; Zero Carbon Oxford.
Policy Framework:	No

Recommendation(s): That Cabinet resolves to:
1. Approve the delay to the implementation on the 1 January 2026 of the Ultra-Low Emissions Vehicle Standards for hackney carriage vehicles, to be revisited by such successor organisation that results from Local Government Reorganisation

Information Exempt From Publication	
Appendix 1 – Advice from Counsel	<p>This information is exempted from publication under Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972:</p> <p>This is Information that could be considered legally privileged Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings</p>

Appendix No.	Appendix Title	Exempt from Publication
Appendix 1	Advice from Counsel	Yes This information is exempted from publication under Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 on the following basis: Information that could be considered legally privileged Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings
Appendix 2	Report to the GLPC on 22 September 2025	No
Appendix 3	COLTA delay request	No
Appendix 4	2025 Affordability and Emissions Report	No
Appendix 5	Equality Impact Assessment	No

Introduction and background

1. This report is before Cabinet because of external Counsel advice that was sought in relation to the proper decision-making path for the Ultra-Low Vehicle Emissions Standards for hackney carriage vehicles (“Emissions Standards”). A copy of the advice summary can be found at confidential Appendix 1 to this report.
2. Historically such policies have been recommended by the General Purposes Licensing Committee (“GPLC”) to Full Council for approval in line with Part 5.6 of the Constitution.
3. Under the Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000 (“the Regulations”) it lists in Schedule 1, paragraph b the matters which should not be a decision of an authority’s executive (Cabinet). These are:
 - a. Licensing hackney carriages and Private Hire Vehicles (“PHVs”)
 - b. Licensing drivers of hackney carriages and PHVs
 - c. Licensing operators of hackney carriages and PHVs
4. All other decisions concerning taxi licensing can either be a Cabinet function or a function of Full Council, however the default position is that they fall to Cabinet unless Full Council make a positive and explicit decision to keep the decision making with Full Council.

5. Historically, since its first adoption, Oxford City Council has approved in its Constitution at Part 5.6 that decisions on taxi licensing (including hackney carriage vehicles are for Full Council. This has been consistently adopted by Council with each amendment to the Constitution.
6. Officers have therefore dealt with decision making on policies such as the Emissions Standards since by ensuring their referral from GPLC to Full Council in line with the Constitution.
7. Owing to confusion on the part of officers at the recent GPLC on the 22 September 2025 advice was sought from Counsel on Councils provision for decision making in the Constitution.
8. That advice has confirmed that, owing to there being no explicit recommendation of Full Council which can be located in historic minutes that the function remain with Full Council, under the operation of the Regulations the function properly rests in default with Cabinet.
9. The intention is that at the next meeting of Full Council an explicit ratification of the approval by Full Council of all Taxi licensing policies. In the meantime however time constraints require this report to come to Cabinet to ask it to take a decision as to the delay of the commencement of the Emissions Standards, due to take effect in January 2026.
10. Whilst it would be possible to take the matter to Full Council at the same time as the Constitutional changes it will lead to further uncertainty for the hackney carriage sector who will, if not approved, need to be taking steps to comply. As such it is considered appropriate to bring this to Cabinet for consideration as the proper identified decision maker following the Counsel's advice provided.
11. Officers apologise to both Cabinet and Members of the GLPC for the issues this has caused. The advice raises very technical points of law and, in good faith, officers had considered that the power was properly reserved to Full Council.

Ultra Low Vehicle Emissions Standards for Hackney Carriages

12. On the 22 July 2019 the Emissions Standards for hackney carriage vehicles was formally adopted by the Council following recommendation for approval by the General Purposes Licensing (GPL) Committee on 23 January 2019. The purpose of the standard was to reduce emissions in the taxi fleet and improve air quality in the City.
13. On 18 March 2024 Full Council approved an amendment to the Emission Standards for HCVs, by extending the final phase for compliance from 1 January 2025 to 1 January 2026. This was based on a recommendation from the GPLC on the 5 February 2024. The 2024 GPLC report can be found at Appendix Two.
14. The current HCV emission standards, as adopted by the Council are:

Date From	Renewal HCV Applications	New HCV Applications

Renewal – 1st January 2020 New – Immediately	All HCV must meet EURO 4 emission standard	All HCV must meet EURO4, EURO 6 or ULEV emission standard.(EURO 5 vehicles will not be considered to meet this standard)
1st January 2022	All HCV must meet EURO 4 emission standard	All HCV must meet ULEV standard, *or at least Euro 4 if replacing an existing Euro 4, Euro 5 or Euro 6 due to the vehicle being written off by an insurance company or is a temporary courtesy vehicle due to repairs
1st January 2026	All HCV must meet ULEV standard	All HCV must meet ULEV standard

15. As of September 2025, 40 out of 107 licensed hackney carriage vehicles have transitioned to meet the ULEV standard, along with 3 out of 4 currently licenced temporary vehicles. This means 67 licensed HCVs and 1 temporary vehicle still need to upgrade to meet the ULEV standard from the 1st January 2026.
16. On 11th April and 22nd July 2025, the City of Oxford Licensed Taxicab Association (COLTA) formally requested that the Council postpone the final phase of the Hackney Carriage Vehicle (HCV) emission standards, currently set for implementation on 1st January 2026, by an additional two years, extending the deadline to 2028. This can be found at Appendix 3. In that COLTA cited the following reasons in support of their request:
 - Financial hardship.
 - Impact of the evolving private hire trade.
 - Uncertainty regarding hackney carriage quantity control.
 - Local infrastructure challenges, including road closures and delays to the Zero Emission Zone.
 - Uncertainty regarding local government reorganisation.
17. On 22nd September 2025, GLPC agreed to recommend to Council a postponement of the final phase until the establishment of a new unitary council under the Local Government Review, aligning the policy with wider structural changes and enabling consistent standards across the new licensing authority.
18. To support making an informed decision, the Environmental Sustainability Team produced an updated report examining key factors affecting the hackney carriage market. The report explores:

- The affordability of electric hackney carriages, including ownership and running costs.
- The impact of reduced government grants, rising energy, and borrowing costs.
- Comparative cost scenarios between electric and diesel vehicles.
- Emissions reductions achieved since the introduction of licensing standards.
- Implications of Zero Emission Zone (ZEZ) charges and delays to its expansion.

A copy of this report can be found at **Appendix Four**.

19. By comparison to neighbouring authorities Oxford City Council is leading the way for low emission hackney carriage vehicles, with the current requirement of ULEV standard from 2026:
 - South Oxfordshire District Council & Vale of White Horse District Council aim for zero-carbon by 2030 but currently only require Euro 6 by 2026.
 - Cherwell District Council sets a later ULEV deadline of 2030 for new applications, and 2033 for renewals.
 - West Oxfordshire District Council has no formal ULEV requirement at present.
20. Since the adoption and amendment of the Emissions Standards, government have launched a national Local Government Reorganisation programme (“LGR”). Implementation is expected by 2028 and will result in a reshaping of Oxfordshire’s council structure. In all three proposals put forward there will be a significant increase in the hackney carriage from that which is currently in each authority, as they will be combined across either one, two or three new authorities, as opposed to the 5 current constituent licensing authorities (including West Berkshire who are involved in the reorganisation as set out in two of the three proposals).
21. Based on March 2025 County wide data, a single Oxfordshire-wide authority would license approximately 1,068 hackney carriages, an increase of 898% compared to Oxford City alone. A two-unitary model would create one authority with around 332 vehicles (Oxford City, Cherwell, West Oxfordshire), an increase of 210%. A three-unitary model is less precise due to the boundary proposal, but estimates suggest a Greater Oxford fleet of 300–350 vehicles, an increase of 180–227%.

Conclusion

22. Cabinet is asked to consider deferring the 1 January 2026 implementation of the final phase of the Hackney Carriage Vehicle (HCV) emission standards in light of several key factors:
 - a. The City of Oxford Licensed Taxicab Association (COLTA) request for a two-year extension to the current policy deadline as outlined above.
 - b. The Environmental Sustainability Team’s updated assessment of the hackney carriage market, confirming that significant progress has been made in reducing emissions, but also highlighting the increasing financial

pressures faced by vehicle owners, particularly those without access to home charging.

- c. The further complexity brought about as a result of the ongoing Local Government Reorganisation, which will result in a significant increase in the number of vehicles within the new licensing areas that do not currently and will not meet Oxford City's ULEV standard. Aligning these standards will be a priority for the shadow authority, and any decision taken now will have implications for the future policy alignment.

- 23. Any future decision on an emissions policy for hackney carriages would be a matter for the newly formed authorities resulting from LGR.

Alternative Options Considered

A. Maintain the current policy

Retain the existing implementation date of 1st January 2026, requiring all new and renewal HCV applications to meet the Ultra-Low Emissions Vehicle standard. This is not proposed due to the complexities as set out in the report.

B. Extend the deadline by one year

Amend the policy to defer the final phase by 12 months, setting a new implementation date of 1st January 2027, allowing additional time for transition while maintaining momentum towards the Council's environmental objectives. This will not remove the complexities of LGR.

Other implications

Financial implications

- 24. The updated financial implications on the hackney carriage trade are outlined in the affordability and emissions report found at **Appendix Four**.

Legal issues

- 25. Though the decision is still stated as a matter for Full Council in the Constitution Part 2.1 states that the Council will follow the Constitution unless it conflicts with the law. As set out in the report that is currently the case as advised by Counsel. As such it is considered that in this case the Constitution does not apply and Cabinet is able to take the decision in line with the Regulations.
- 26. All other legal implications are contained within the report.

Level of risk

- 27. This decision presents several key risks: potential emissions impacts as detailed in the 'Affordability and Emissions Report', which may conflict with the Council's environmental objectives; financial implications for existing hackney carriage proprietors, potentially affecting their viability and competitiveness; and misalignment with the Local Government Reorganisation policy timetable, where acting prematurely could necessitate future reversal or adjustment of decisions,

undermining policy coherence. Additionally, this decision may create a perception of unfairness among proprietors who have already invested in ULEV standard hackney carriage vehicles.

Equalities impact

28. This is considered in the attached Equalities Impact Assessment at Appendix 5 of this report.

Carbon and Environmental Considerations

29. These are set out in the report and appendices.

Conclusion

30. In conclusion Cabinet is asked to consider delaying the implementation of the Emissions Standards as set out in the recommendations. Based on advice this is to be taken by Cabinet to provide a decision and certainty sooner, before the governance and decision making issues are resolved by Full Council later this month.

Report author	Emma Jackman
Job title	Director of Law, Governance and Strategy
Service area or department	Corporate Services
e-mail	ejackman@oxford.gov.uk

Background Papers:	
1	Council Approval July 2019
2	Council Approval March 2024
3	Agenda for General Purposes Licensing Committee on Wednesday 23 January 2019, 6.15 pm Oxford City Council

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

To: General Purposes Licensing Committee

Date: 22 September 2025

Report of: Deputy Chief Executive for Citizens and City Services

Title of Report: Hackney Carriage Vehicle Emission Standards Amendment

Summary and recommendations	
Decision being taken:	To consider a delay to the final phase of emission standards for Hackney Carriage Vehicles licensed by this Authority.
Key decision:	No.
Cabinet Member:	Councillor Anna Railton, Taxi Licensing.
Corporate Priority:	Strong, Fair Economy; Thriving Communities; Zero Carbon Oxford.
Policy Framework:	Vehicle emission standards and age limits for all hackney carriage and private hire vehicles.

Recommendation(s): That the General Purposes Licensing Committee resolves to:

1. **Consider**
 - the request made by City of Oxford Licenced Taxicab Association to delay the final phase of the hackney carriage emission standards
 - the Environmental Sustainability Teams Affordability and Emissions Report
 - the full contents of this report including the options presented:
 - A. Maintain the current policy
 - B. Extend the deadline by one year
 - C. Align with Local Government Reorganisation
2. **Agree** any amendments to the current emission standards for hackney carriage vehicles licenced by this authority;
3. **Agree** that any such amendments be recommended to Council for adoption.

Appendix No.	Appendix Title	Exempt from Publication
Appendix One	2019 GPL Committee Report	No
Appendix Two	2024 GPL Committee Report	No
Appendix Three	COLTA request for policy delay	No
Appendix Four	2025 Affordability and Emissions Report	No
Appendix Five	Equality Impact Assessment	No

Introduction and background

1. On 23rd January 2019 the General Purposes Licensing (GPL) Committee approved the recommendation to introduce new emission standards for hackney carriage vehicles (HCV) licenced by this Authority, to reduce emissions in the taxi fleet and improve air quality in the City.
2. It was acknowledged that Oxford City centre has high levels of toxic nitrogen dioxide, which contributes to diseases including cancer, asthma, stroke and heart disease; and, to around 40,000 deaths in the UK every year.

The 2019 GPL Committee report can be found at **Appendix One**.

3. On 5th February 2024 the GPL Committee approved an amendment to the emission standards for HCVs, by extending the final phase of the standards, requiring all new and renewal HCV applications to meet ultra-low emission vehicle (ULEV) standards from 1st January 2026 (previously 1st January 2025). This report included a public consultation.
4. On 18th March 2025, the recommended extension was further debated at full Council, who subsequently voted to approve it.

The 2024 GPL Committee report can be found at **Appendix Two**.

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

Date From	Renewal HCV Applications	New HCV Applications
Renewal – 1st January 2020 New – Immediately	All HCV must meet EURO 4 emission standard	All HCV must meet EURO4, EURO 6 or ULEV emission standard.(EURO 5 vehicles will not be considered to meet this standard)

1st January 2022	All HCV must meet EURO 4 emission standard	All HCV must meet ULEV standard, *or at least Euro 4 if replacing an existing Euro 4, Euro 5 or Euro 6 due to the vehicle being written off by an insurance company or is a temporary courtesy vehicle due to repairs
1st January 2026	All HCV must meet ULEV standard	All HCV must meet ULEV standard

6. As of September 2025, 40 out of 107 licensed hackney carriage vehicles have transitioned to meet the ULEV standard, along with 3 out of 4 currently licenced temporary vehicles. This means 67 licensed HCVs and 1 temporary vehicle still need to upgrade to meet the ULEV standard from the 1st January 2026.

City of Oxford Licensed Taxicab Association (COLTA) request

7. On 11th April and 22nd July 2025, the City of Oxford Licensed Taxicab Association (COLTA) formally requested that the Council postpone the final phase of the Hackney Carriage Vehicle (HCV) emission standards, currently set for implementation on 1st January 2026, by an additional two years, extending the deadline to 2028. COLTA cited the following reasons in support of their request:

- Financial hardship.
- Impact of the evolving private hire trade.
- Uncertainty regarding hackney carriage quantity control.
- Local infrastructure challenges, including road closures and delays to the Zero Emission Zone.
- Uncertainty regarding local government reorganisation.

A copy of this request can be found at **Appendix Three**.

Affordability and Emissions

8. To support the Committee in making an informed decision, the Environmental Sustainability Team at Oxford City Council has produced an updated report examining key factors affecting the hackney carriage market. The report explores:
- The affordability of electric hackney carriages, including ownership and running costs.
 - The impact of reduced government grants, rising energy, and borrowing costs.

- Comparative cost scenarios between electric and diesel vehicles.
- Emissions reductions achieved since the introduction of licensing standards.
- Implications of Zero Emission Zone (ZEZ) charges and delays to its expansion.

A copy of this report can be found at **Appendix Four**.

Oxfordshire policy comparison

9. Oxford City Council is leading the way for low emission hackney carriage vehicles, with the current requirement of ULEV standard from 2026.

South Oxfordshire District Council & Vale of White Horse District Council aim for zero-carbon by 2030 but currently only require Euro 6 by 2026.

Cherwell District Council sets a later ULEV deadline of 2030 for new applications, and 2033 for renewals.

West Oxfordshire District Council has no formal ULEV requirement at present.

Local Government Reorganisation

10. The Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) will reshape Oxfordshire's council structure, with implementation expected in 2028 following a shadow authority period, with three unitary models proposed.
11. Based on March 2025 County wide data, a single Oxfordshire-wide authority would license approximately 1,068 hackney carriages, an increase of 898% compared to Oxford City alone. A two-unitary model would create one authority with around 332 vehicles (Oxford City, Cherwell, West Oxfordshire), an increase of 210%. A three-unitary model is less precise due to the boundary proposal, but estimates suggest a Greater Oxford fleet of 300–350 vehicles, an increase of 180–227%.

Conclusion

12. The Committee is asked to consider the future implementation of the final phase of the Hackney Carriage Vehicle (HCV) emission standards in light of several key factors.
13. The City of Oxford Licensed Taxicab Association (COLTA) has formally requested a two-year extension to the current policy deadline, citing financial hardship, market change from the private hire trade, infrastructure challenges, and uncertainty surrounding future regulation. COLTA emphasises that while many vehicle owners have already transitioned, further time is needed to ensure a fair and sustainable shift for the remaining fleet.
14. The Environmental Sustainability Team has provided an updated assessment of the hackney carriage market, exploring affordability, emissions reductions, and the impact of government grants and energy costs. Their findings confirm that significant progress has been made in reducing emissions, but also highlight the increasing financial pressures faced by vehicle owners, particularly those without access to home charging.

15. The Local Government Reorganisation adds further complexity. Regardless of which unitary model is adopted, there will be a significant increase in the number of vehicles within the new licensing areas that do not currently and will not meet Oxford City's ULEV standard. Aligning these standards will be a priority for the shadow authority, and any decision taken now will have implications for the future policy alignment.

16. The Committee is invited to consider the following options:

A. Maintain the current policy

Retain the existing implementation date of 1st January 2026, requiring all new and renewal HCV applications to meet the Ultra-Low Emissions Vehicle standard.

B. Extend the deadline by one year

Amend the policy to defer the final phase by 12 months, setting a new implementation date of 1st January 2027, allowing additional time for transition while maintaining momentum towards the Council's environmental objectives.

C. Align with Local Government Reorganisation

Postpone the final phase until the establishment of the new unitary council in 2028, aligning the policy with wider structural changes and enabling consistent standards across the new licensing authority.

Financial implications

17. The updated financial implications on the hackney carriage trade are outlined in the affordability and emissions report found at **Appendix Four**.

Legal issues

18. The Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 at sections 47, 48 and 51 allows the Licensing Authority to attach to vehicle licences such conditions as it considers 'reasonably necessary'. Improving standards in vehicle safety, and air quality are relevant factors in this respect.

Equalities impact

19. The equality impact assessment identifies that the current Hackney Carriage Vehicle (HCV) emissions policy will primarily affect vehicle owners and licence holders. Any extension to the implementation date would provide financial relief to those who have not yet upgraded their vehicles to meet the Ultra-Low Emissions Vehicle (ULEV) standard, currently 67 vehicles. However, such an extension may result in a financial disadvantage for early adopters of ULEV vehicles, currently 40 vehicles, who have already made significant investment in compliance.

A copy of the equality impact assessment can be found at **Appendix Five**.

Report author	Joshua Curnow
Job title	General Licensing Team Manager
Service area or department	Community Safety
Telephone	01865 252565
e-mail	jcurnow@oxford.gov.uk



City of Oxford Licensed Taxicab Association *(Est. 1952)*

15 Belvedere Road,
Oxford, OX4 2AZ
coltaoxford@outlook.com
Tel: 07702031372

11th April 2025

To Oxford City Taxi Licensing,

RE: Emmisions Standards policy for Hackney Carriages

I am writing to formally request an extension to the Emission Standards policy that is scheduled to be implemented from January 2026.

As you are aware our taxi trade has been navigating through an exceptionally challenging period since Covid. The cumulative impact of challenges (further explained) has strained our resources and capabilities, making it incredibly tough for us to comply with the impending emissions standards within the given timeframe.

The taxi trade of Oxford has faced unprecedented challenges, from significant drops in passenger numbers particularly at the train station due to people working from home and the lack of a daytime taxi rank in the heart of the city centre (Queen street). The permanent shutdown of nightclubs is another major blow, including the continued closure of Botley Road. The uncertainty about a Unitary Council and how that would impact our taxi trade. Also, the introduction of Uber in Oxford and how that's significantly impacted our operations with Uber's unfair pricing structure which no locally licensed operators can match.

These issues have created financial hardships that has left our drivers struggling to stay afloat including those who are currently struggling to pay monthly instalments on their electric taxi.

An attempt to deregulate our trade

This issue is connected to all the difficulties we are currently experiencing, it is important that I explain how this development has sent shockwaves to the trade.

A cloud of uncertainty had been forced upon us by our licensing department where in their recent report which was scheduled to be presented to the GPLC on 10th February

2025 but withdrawn prior to the meeting, the licensing officer responsible recommended to deregulate the Hackney Carriage trade. This recommendation was very alarming and our drivers were in a state of shock, especially given the significant investment we have been asked to make in purchasing the electric taxi which costs above £102,000 for a new one to purchase.

Our trade requires assurances. On one hand we are being pushed to invest heavily in electric taxis, which is a considerable financial commitment, on the other hand, there are ongoing discussions about deregulating the trade, which are contradictory and nonsensical. We need clarity and assurance that our investments will be protected and that the trade regulation will remain.

It is crucial for the readers to understand the full implications of deregulation and how it will impact our business and future investments. As has been the case in previous years, an independent met/unmet demand survey ought to be carried out which in previous years has provided the licensing office with valuable data.

Uber granted a licence

The trade was astonished to learn that Uber were granted a license towards the end of 2024 to operate in Oxford. There was no prior discussions with any licensing officer informing us that Uber had applied and this development seemed obscure. We were informed by a telephone conversation by taxi licensing the day Uber was granted the license to operate.

Uber's introduction to Oxford is already having an impact on our trade. They are a billions of pounds multinational entity currently offering up to 50% discount to passengers during a promotional period. Uber then pay extra to their drivers (top up) during the surcharge period throughout the day. As one example, the passenger may pay £5 (discounted) from the train station to the John Radcliffe Hospital. The driver will get paid £25 by Uber because it's a surcharge period. No taxi operator can compete with this pricing structure and it's unfair competition with unregulated practices.

Uber have a lot of money and they can pump millions of pounds into their business model in any particular city like Oxford and in the process, put the local taxi trade and the private hire operators out of business.

Another concern is Uber drivers licensed outside of Oxford but coming and operating in Oxford. We have seen licensed vehicles arriving from Reading, Portsmouth and Wolverhampton operating in our city. If the floodgates are allowed to be left open like this, we will see an unbearable level of vehicles operating for Uber and flooding our city.

We have no idea what discussions had taken place between Uber and our licensing department and whether concerns were raised about the increased levels of vehicles

licensed to work in Oxford. We believe that the committee needs clarification including the full details of the discussions had between Uber and the licensing department.

On a final point here, up until the licensing of Uber in November 2024, in Oxford there were 772 private hires plus 400 out of town taxis making it a total of 1172 vehicles operating in Oxford. In light of Uber's introduction to Oxford, it is most likely that this number will increase significantly as more drivers gain a license in Oxford (who may not live in the city) and others travelling from outside of Oxford but operating within the city. This will prove problematic in the very near future as the plans to reduce the number of vehicles in the city centre will be difficult to keep in check and it will have a negative impact on the level of emissions when it is this very issue we are forced to invest even though the level of emissions we are seen to be responsible for is insignificant. The report on this is available.

Botley Road closure

The prolonged closure of Botley Road is continuing to have a huge impact on our operations. The road has been closed since March 2023. The proposed reopening date in October 2026 is uncertain in light of the previous deadlines that have been missed. This continued closure is significantly impacting our movements and livelihoods. We have lost all of our work going and returning from the west of the city centre.

Delay to ZEZ

The introduction of the expanded Zero Emissions Zone (ZEZ) is also delayed. As you are aware, the introduction of the expanded ZEZ was initially planned to begin in 2025 but due to setbacks because of other issues including the Botley Road closure, this planned zone is now facing further delays and we are told it will be introduced in late 2027 or beginning of 2028. This is uncertain as the introduction of the ZEZ is dependent on the opening of the Botley Road.

The whole reason for the push to change our diesel taxi to electric ones was tied in with the plans for a zero emission zone. As we know, the introduction of an expanded ZEZ is not happening until at least 2028. Therefore, our trade cannot be forced into complying to an expanded ZEZ which will not be introduced for another 2 to 3 years from now. In fact, this now gives all of us the opportunity to work towards an expanded ZEZ and allowing the trade up until 2028 to gradually change our remaining diesel vehicles to electric cabs. A gradual change is a positive move and has worked over the previous five years where drivers have been able to change their cabs during this whole process.

Unitary council

The discussions based around the plans for a unitary council is another major development which has created anxiety within the trade. There are many unanswered questions at the moment and no one is sure how the plans for a unitary council will impact Oxford businesses as a whole but more importantly, the impact on our taxi trade.

If a single licensing authority was to be introduced incorporating a larger area for Oxford, undoubtedly those vehicles licensed outside of Oxford will then be operating freely within the current boundary lines of Oxford and this will have a significant impact on many aspects not only impacting our trade, but the whole of Oxford city.

In light of the above difficulties described and the potential introduction of a unitary council, currently we strongly feel that it would be highly unreasonable and unjust that we are forced in to making a huge investment in purchasing the electric taxi so soon from January 2026 onwards. We are seeking your understanding and support in granting us additional time to make the switch to meet the emission standards. This extension would not only provide much-needed relief but also ensure that we can transition more smoothly and sustainably towards the new regulations. This would also enable our Licensing department to consider how best to deal with other factors which are upon us and described in this letter and then make a balanced decision.

Given the above circumstances, we request additional time to transition our remaining diesel taxis to electric taxis. Out of a fleet of 107 Hackney carriages, thirty eight (38) owners have already transitioned to electric cabs. License holders have always been committed to the emission standards policy and other requirements that our licensing department have instructed us to do.

The above issues described are certainly valid and undoubtedly impacted the timeline for transitioning to electric taxis in 2026. We believe that with extra time to switch, the remaining license holders can ensure a smooth and successful transition to electric taxis, aligning with the goals of the ZEZ in 2028.

We are committed to adhering to the environmental goals outlined in the policy and believe that with more time, we can effectively align our operations to meet the required standards. Your support in this matter would be much appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several overlapping loops and a final downward stroke.

Sajad Khan
Secretary of C. O. L. T. A.

This page is intentionally left blank

HC Fleet Affordability and Emissions Update 2025

There are a few key differences between 2019, 2024 and 2025, both regarding, the affordability of electric Hackney Carriages (HC) and regarding the Emissions benefit from the investment in such vehicles that should be considered in the context of this paper.

In summary, in 2018/19, over 50% of HC's licenced in Oxford had Euro 3 or lower standard engines, emitting up to 8.7tonnes of NOx pa. The Zero-Emission Capable Licensing Standards brought in, in 2019, required at the time a minimum of Euro 4 standard engines, with all HC's to be zero-emission capable by 2025, (now 2026). These standards have been very effective, reducing real world emissions from the HC trade by almost 60%. This is a significant achievement and shows the commitment by the trade to reducing emissions.

The Plug-in Taxi Grant was introduced in 2017 offering £7500 off the price of new E-Taxis. In quarter 1 of 2024, the grant was reduced to £6,000 and in April 2025 it was further reduced to a maximum of £4000.

As reported in 2024, the affordability of new electric HC vehicles has significantly worsened since 2019, with the cost for power and interest rates more than tripling from 2018/19 to 2023/24. In the last 12 months this has worsened, by the reduction of the Plug-in Taxi Grant (PiTG) from £7500 in 2017 to £4000 in April 2025.

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

It should also be noted that this report is based on average data and comparators.

1. Financial Implications

In 2019, investment in a new electric LEVC eTX showed a small return on investment at 6 years (see GPLC Paper 23/01/2019, Emissions Standards, §21). GULO funding and low electricity pricing supported an electricity price of 18p/kWh for home and public charging. The business case for the trade at that time, based on a Feasibility study conducted by Cenex, was aligned with the Council's ambition to reduce emissions.

Today energy and cost of living crisis have had a significant impact on electricity cost (public charging is now 3 to 4 times higher) and borrowing costs (3 times higher). In 2025 the average cost of UK public rapid charging has increased by 7p/kWh to 76p/kWh.

Oxford City Council has worked to support the hackney trade by securing reduced charging at 46p/kWh for Taxi drivers at Blink Rapid charge points within the city until at least January 2026. Fastned at Redbridge also offer 0.52p/kWh using a £120 pa gold card subscription. Newish smart electric vehicle home charging tariffs, via Octopus and EON energy amongst others, offer exceptional rates for overnight charging (@8p/kWh).

A new electric London Taxi (LEVC e-TX) as in 2024, remains more expensive to own and run than a second-diesel London Taxi. However, a second-hand (assumed average £42.5k) electric London Taxi, if majority charged at home (average 21p/kWh), can be more economical than a second-hand diesel Euro 4. Costs of operation become less viable compared to diesel equivalents, if Hackney Cab Owners do not have access to home charging and rely on public charging as the main source of electricity.

Costs used in calculations by Cenex in 2018 are shown in the table below versus the costs in 2023/24, 2024/25 and % increases.

Table 1 - Fuel & Electricity Costs Comparator (2018 vs 2023/24 vs 2024/25)

Fuel	2018	2023/24	2024/25	% Increase 2018 to 2023/24	% Increase 2018 to 2024/25
Diesel p/l	121	145	143	20%	18%
Petrol p/l	119	135	135	13%	13%
Electricity Home Charging p/kWh	10.7	34	21	219%	97%
Electricity Public Rapid Charging p/kWh	18	69	76	283%	322%
Electricity Taxi Blink Rapid Charging p/kWh	18	69	46	283%	156%
Electricity Taxi Fastned Rapid Charging p/kWh	18	49	52	172%	189%

Table 2 – Costs of Ownership in 2025

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Vehicle	New LEVC-TX Leased	New LEVC-TX Bought	2019 LEVC-TX Bought (home charge)	2013 Euro 4 Bought
Net purchase price (after grants)		£ 68,342	£ 42,500	£ 3,000
Purchase/lease	Lease	Purchase	Purchase	Purchase
TCO 100% home charging	£16,386	£13,130	£9,941	£10,708
TCO pa 70% home, 30% fuel	£17,015	£13,759	£10,570	£10,708
TCO pa - Fully electric 100% electric - 70% home , 30% rapid	£17,309	£14,053	£10,864	£10,708
TCO pa Public charging only + 30% petrol	£19,168	£15,912	£12,724	£10,708
Cost per mile	£0.68	£0.55	£0.42	£0.43
NOx Emissions g/per mile	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.62
PM Emisions g/per mile	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.096

A more detailed estimate of costs of ownership between an LEVC eTX and Diesel (Euro 4) TX4 is shown in Annex 1, including all assumptions.

2. Expanding ZEZ Implications & Charges

The original Emissions Pathway anticipated ZEZ cost implications for HCVs and PHVs fuelled conventionally:

Fees for ZEZ access (as of August 2025) will be £10 per day for Euro 4 Diesel Hackney cabs. Assuming 250 journeys into the ZEZ per annum, there is an additional £2.5k pa cost to running a Diesel TX4. This additional £2.5k, gives zero emission taxi's a competitive advantage over conventionally fuelled vehicles, hugely supporting the overall business case and supporting alignment with purchase of even a new electric hackney (assuming borrowing at 7%).

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

It should be noted that any expansion to the ZEZ will not happen until earliest autumn 2027 and currently ZEZ charges only apply to a few roads in the city centre, therefore this price differential has not currently been included in the calculations. If charges remain as currently set out then the business case for electrification will significantly improve.

3. Emissions

The difference between HCV fleet emissions in 2018/19 and 2023/24 and 2024/25 is shown in Annex 2 below. In 24/25 nearly 40% of the fleet are ULEV compliant, real world emissions from the HC fleet have reduced by almost 60%. The majority remainder of the fleet are operating Euro 4 Diesel Cabs (London Cab -TX4).

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

1. EU Euro standard calculations show that NOx, HCNOx and PM have reduced by 76%, 75% and 76% respectively of original emissions. LEVC eTX are range extended vehicles and it is more cost effective for Operators to run on or top up petrol for longer journeys, if they cannot charge at home. Public charging is 25% more expensive than using petrol via the range extender. Assumptions, therefore include 30% of mileage in these vehicles as petrol fuelled.
2. Real World data (used for calculations in 2018/19). The comparison between 2018/19 and today, shows NOx emissions have reduced to 59% of the original total. Note – we do not have accurate data for Real World petrol extended emissions, so an estimate for real world petrol emissions has been used.

The 2025 Air Quality Source Apportionment report for road transport emissions (based on 2022 data), provided more detail on the differences in emissions between Private Hire (PHV) and Hackney Cabs (HC). It's modelling includes the recent 69% electrification of bus fleet in Oxford, which has resulted in almost 30% reduction in bus emissions and thereby a rebalanced transport emissions sector.

Overall emissions from Taxis, in relation to all transport emissions, have increased in proportion to overall vehicle emissions by just over 1%, albeit Taxi emissions remain generally low, @2% on a city-wide basis. Private Hire vehicles contribute more emissions than HCV's and diesel taxi's (HCV and PHV) contribute more than petrol. The same report identified that in areas of higher taxi density, Hackney taxis have comparable NOx emissions to PHV and considerably lower particle emissions. Overall, Hackney NOx and PM emissions have reduced by over 59% and up to 74%.

Table 3 - Apportionment of Taxis as part of overall Transport emissions in Oxford (Report 2025, Data 2022) in key city locations.

	Hackney				Private Hire				Other Taxi		
	NOx %	PM2.5 %	PM10 %		NOx %	PM2.5 %	PM10 %		NOx %	PM2.5 %	PM10 %
St Clements/ The Plain	1.1	1	0.9		1.2	3	3.2		0.2	0.2	0.2
Headington	0.8	0.9	0.7		0.9	2.6	2.7		0.1	0.2	0.1
Botley road	1.0	0.9	0.8		1	2.8	3.0		0.2	0.1	0.2
Worcester Street	0.9	0.8	0.9		1.0	2.7	2.9		0.1	0.2	0.1

ANNEX1: Comparative Costs of Hackney Ownership.

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
<i>Vehicle</i>	New LEVC-TX Leased	New LEVC-TX Bought	2019 LEVC-TX Bought (home charge)	2013 Euro 4 Bought
Net purchase price (after grants)		£ 68,342	£ 42,500	£ 3,000
Purchase/lease	Lease	Purchase	Purchase	Purchase
Running Costs (annual)				
Fuel/Charging 70% home, 30% fuel	£2,713	£2,713	£ 2,713	£4,898
Servicing & Maintenance	£620	£620	£920	£3,425
Insurance	£1,200	£1,200	£ 1,200	£1,200
Road Tax (annual)	£0	£0	£ -	£555
Congestion/ULEZ charges	£0			£0
Lease cost (annual)/Interest	£12,482	£4,579	£2,848	£180
Depreciation		£4,647	£2,890	£450
Total Cost	£14,302	£11,046	£7,858	£10,708
TCO 100% home charging	£16,386	£13,130	£9,941	£10,708
TCO pa 70% home, 30% fuel	£17,015	£13,759	£10,570	£10,708
TCO pa - Fully electric 100% electric - 70% home , 30% rapid	£17,309	£14,053	£10,864	£10,708
TCO pa Public charging only + 30% petrol	£19,168	£15,912	£12,724	£10,708
Cost per mile	£0.68	£0.55	£0.42	£0.43
NOx Emissions g/per mile	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.62
PM Emisisions g/per mile	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.096

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

																	Average km Per Annum		Average km using fuel (if electric)					
																	40000		12000					
2018/19 Data for Hackney Cabs Licenced in Oxford																	g/ km per annum Standards classification Euro engines			Total kg/km per annum			Real World	
Age of Vehicle (First registration)	<2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Grand Total	NOx Commercial Vehicle	HCNOx	PM	NOx Commercial Vehicle	HCNOx	PM	Nox g/km	NOx Total Total per annum kg/km
Engine Type																								
E0	19	1														20	1.8	2	0.25	1440	1600	200	2.7	2160
E1	23	4	2													29	1.5	1.7	0.25	1740	1972	290	2.4	2784
E3	6		5	1	3											15	0.78	0.86	0.1	468	516	60	1.5	900
E4						1	7	9	9	6	8					40	0.39	0.46	0.06	624	736	96	1.3	2080
E5												3	2	3		8	0.28	0.35	0.05	90	112	16	2.4	768
Grand Total	48	5	7	1	3	1	7	9	9	6	8	3	2	3	0	112				4362	4936	662		8692 kg

2023/24 Data for Hackney Cabs Licenced in Oxford																	g/ km per annum Standards classification Euro engines			Total kg/km per annum			Real World		No real world data - this is estimated
Age of Vehicle (First registration)	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2014	2015	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Grand Total	NOx Commercial Vehicle	HCNOx	PM	NOx	HCNOx	PM	Nox g/km	Total NOx kg/km per annum	
Engine Type																									
Euro 4 - TX4 (Diesel)	1	10	11	22	12	13	3	1								73	0.39	0.46	0.06	1138.80	1343.20	175.20	1.30	3796.00	
Euro 6 (Diesel)									1	1						2	0.125	0.215	0.005	10.00	17.20	0.40	1.00	80.00	
ULEV compliant - LEVC-TX - Euro 6 (petrol)										4	4	7	5	13	1	34	0.082	0.082	0.005	33.46	33.46	2.04	0.25	100.37	
Grand Total	1	10	11	22	12	13	3	2	1	4	4	7	5	13	1	109				1182.3	1393.9	177.6		3976.4	
Emissions Reduction %																									
100% ULEV COMPLIANT - EURO 6																	0.082	0.082	0.005	107.256	107.256	6.54	0.25	0	
Emission Saved through 100% electrification																				1075	1286.6	171.1		3976.4	

2024/25 Data for Hackney Cabs Licenced in Oxford																	g/ km per annum Standards classification Euro engines			Total kg/km per annum			Real World		No real world data - this is estimated
Age of Vehicle (First registration)	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2014	2015	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	Grand Total	NOx Commercial Vehicle	HCNOx	PM	NOx	HCNOx	PM	Nox g/km	Total NOx kg/km per annum	
Engine Type																									
Euro 4 - TX4 (Diesel)	9	8	22	9	11	4	1									64	0.39	0.46	0.06	998.40	1177.60	153.60	1.30	332	

Why do an Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA)?

1. Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) is part of Oxford City Council's **Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) (Equality Act 2010)**.

The General PSED enables Oxford City Council to:

- a. **identify and remove discrimination,**
 - b. **identify ways to advance equality of opportunity,**
 - c. **foster good relations.**
2. **An EqIA must be done before making any decision(s)** that may have an impact on people and/or services that people use and depend on.
 3. An **EqIA form is one of many tools** that can simplify and structure your equalities assessment.
 4. We are passionate about equalities, and we highly recommend that **Corporate Management Team (CMT) reports and all projects must attach an EqIA.**

For questions, queries, and a chat about how to do your EqIA, please email your EDI officers:

1. Sobia Afridi- safриди@oxford.gov.uk

Please do refer to our [SharePoint Page](#) for support such as FAQs and Examples, etc.

A good EqIA has the following attributes:

1. **Comprehensively considers the 9 protected characteristics.**

1. Age	6. Race & Ethnicity
2. Disability	7. Religion or Belief
3. Gender Reassignment	8. Sex
4. Marriage & Civil Partnership	9. Sexual Orientation
5. Pregnancy & Maternity	NEW- Socio-economic inequalities (voluntary adoption)

2. It has **considered equality of treatment** towards service users, residents, employees, partners, council suppliers & contractors, and Council Members
3. Sufficiently considered **potential and real impact** of proposal or policy on service users, residents, employees, partners, council suppliers & contractors, and Council Members.
4. **Systematically recorded and reported** any potential and real impact of your proposal or policy on service users, residents, employees, partners, council suppliers & contractors, and Council Members
5. **Collected, recorded, & reported sufficient information and data** on how your policy or proposal will have an impact.
6. Offers **mitigations or adjustments** if a PSED has been impacted.
7. Provides clear **justifications** for your decisions.
8. It is written in **plain English** with simple short sentence structures.

Section 1: General overview of the activity under consideration

1.	Name of activity being assessed. For example: -New policy, -Review of existing policy, -Changes in service(s), -New project(s), etc.	Review of Hackney Carriage Emission standards, and consideration of delays to final phase.	2.	The implementation date of the activity under consideration:	22 nd September 2025
3.	Directorate/Department(s):	General Licensing	4.	Service Area(s):	Community Safety
5.	Who is (are) the assessment lead(s): Please provide: -Name -Email address	Joshua Curnow jcurnow@oxford.gov.uk	6.	Contact details, in case there are queries: Please provide: -Name -Email address	Joshua Curnow jcurnow@oxford.gov.uk
7.	Is this a new or ongoing EqlA?	New <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Extension to existing EqlA <input type="checkbox"/>	8.	If this is an extension of a previous EqlA, please indicate where the previous EqlA is located and share the link to the said EqlA.	
9.	Date this EqlA started:	1 st September 2025			
10.	Will this EqlA be attached to Corporate Management Team (CMT) reports/updates, which will be published online?	This EqlA will be attached to a report for the General Purposes Licensing Committee and then attached for full Council.	11.	Give a date (tentative or otherwise) when this assessment will be taken to the CMT.	22 nd September 2025

Section 2: About the activity, change, or policy that is being assessed.

12.	Type of activity being considered: Check the most appropriate.	<input type="checkbox"/> Budget	<input type="checkbox"/> Decommissioning	<input type="checkbox"/> Commissioning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change to an existing activity.	
		<input type="checkbox"/> New Activity	<input type="checkbox"/> Others. Please specify:			
13.	Which priority area(s) <u>within Oxford City Council's Corporate strategy (2024-2028)</u> does this activity fulfil? Please check as needed.	<input type="checkbox"/> Good, affordable homes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, fair economy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Thriving Communities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Zero Carbon Oxford	<input type="checkbox"/> Well run council
14.	Which priority area(s) within <u>Oxford City Council's Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Strategy (2022)</u> does this activity fulfil? Please check as needed.	<input type="checkbox"/> Responsive services and customer care.	<input type="checkbox"/> Diverse and engaged workforce.	<input type="checkbox"/> Leadership & organisational commitment.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Understanding and working with our communities.	
15.	Outline the aims, objectives, & priorities of the activity being considered. Consideration of a request to delay the final phase of the hackney carriage vehicle (HCV) emission standards, requiring all new and renewal HCV applications to meet Ultra-low emission standards (ULEV): The aim is for members of the General Purposes Licensing Committee to make an informed decision regarding the request and any amendment to the Policy.					

<p>16. Please outline the consequences of not implementing this activity.</p> <p>For example,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Existing activity does not fulfill Corporate Objectives, -existing activity is discriminatory and not fulfilling Council's PSED, ... to name a few. 	<p>It could be seen as unreasonable for the local authority to provide no additional consideration to the policy in light of the formal request for extension and additional report regarding affordability and emissions produced by the environmental sustainability team.</p>
---	--

Section 3: Understanding service users, residents, staff and any other impacted parties.

<p>17. Have you undertaken any consultations in the form of surveys, interviews, and/or focus groups?</p> <p>Please provide details—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -when, -how many, and -the approach taken. 	<p>Public Consultation took place for the February 2024 report that also considered a request to delay the emission standards for hackney carriage vehicles. Additional consultation has not taken place, as the options available to the committee have not changed.</p>
<p>18. List information and data used to understand who your residents or staff are and how they will be impacted.</p> <p>These could be-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -third-party research, -census data, -legislation, -articles, -reports, -briefs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation results • Licensing data • Guidance from the Equality and Human Rights Commission • 2021 ONS Census Data • Equality Act 2010 • 'Justfair' Guidance regarding Socio-Economic Duty

19.	<p>If you have not done any consultations or collected data & information, are you planning to do so in the future?</p> <p>Please list the details – -when, -with whom, and -how long will you collect the relevant data.</p>	N/A
-----	--	-----

Section 4: Impact analysis.

20.	Who does the activity impact?	Service Users	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Don't Know <input type="checkbox"/>
	Check as needed. The impact may be positive, negative or unknown.	Members of staff	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Don't Know <input type="checkbox"/>
		General public	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Don't Know <input type="checkbox"/>
		Partner / Community Organisation	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Don't Know <input type="checkbox"/>
		City Councillors	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Don't Know <input type="checkbox"/>
		Council suppliers and contractors	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Don't Know <input type="checkbox"/>

21.

Does the activity impact positively or negatively on any protected characteristics as stated within Equality (Act 2010)?

Check as needed and provide evidence-driven conclusions.

Good Practice is to keep it simple and list your, evidence, insights, and mitigations.

Protected Characteristic	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Don't know	Data/information/evidence supporting your assessment	Analysis & insight Mitigations
Age	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recorded age of proprietors. Equality and Human Rights Commission: Age Discrimination Equality and Human Rights Commission: Direct and Indirect Discrimination 	<p>The majority of current Hackney Carriage Vehicle proprietors fall evenly into the three age brackets 40-49, 50-59, and 60-69.</p> <p>Therefore, the emissions policy (requiring the transition to an ultra-low emission vehicle), and any amendments to it, may impact those aged 40 – 69 disproportionately.</p>
Disability (Visible and invisible)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equality and Human Rights Commission: Direct and Indirect Discrimination 	Any amendment to this policy has no direct or indirect impact on this protected characteristic.
Gender re-assignment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equality and Human Rights Commission: Gender Reassignment discrimination 2021 Gender Identity Census Data 	Any amendment to this policy has no direct or indirect impact on this protected characteristic.

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equality and Human Rights Commission: Direct and Indirect Discrimination 	
Marriage & Civil Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equality and Human Rights Commission: Marriage and civil partnership Equality and Human Rights Commission: Direct and Indirect Discrimination 	Any amendment to this policy has no direct or indirect impact on this protected characteristic.
Race, Ethnicity and/or Citizenship	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vehicle owner and Driver data. Equality and Human Rights Commission: Direct and Indirect Discrimination Equality and Human Rights Commission: Race Discrimination ONS Census data 2021 	<p>Nearly all the hackney carriage vehicles licensed by Oxford City Council are owned by people of Pakistani heritage. Those from a Pakistani heritage represent 1.5% of the Oxfordshire population.</p> <p>Therefore, the emissions policy (requiring the transition to an ultra-low emission vehicle), and any amendments to it, may impact those of a Pakistani heritage disproportionately.</p>
Pregnancy & Maternity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equality and Human Rights Commission: Pregnancy and maternity Discrimination Equality and Human Rights Commission: Direct and Indirect Discrimination 	Any amendment to this policy has no direct or indirect impact on this protected characteristic.
Religion or Belief	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equality and Human Rights Commission: 	Any amendment to this policy has no direct or indirect impact on this protected characteristic.

					Religion or belief Discrimination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equality and Human Rights Commission: Direct and Indirect Discrimination 	
Sex	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equality and Human Rights Commission: Sex Discrimination Equality and Human Rights Commission: Direct and Indirect Discrimination 	Any amendment to this policy has no direct or indirect impact on this protected characteristic.
Sexual Orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equality and Human Rights Commission: Sexual Orientation Discrimination Equality and Human Rights Commission: Direct and Indirect Discrimination 	Any amendment to this policy has no direct or indirect impact on this protected characteristic.

Socio-economic inequalities such as: - income and factors that impact income. -access to jobs This was voluntarily adopted by Oxford City Council on the 13th of March 2024.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Justfair' Guidance: Socio-Economic Duty • Licensing Data 	<p>The hackney carriage emission policy requires those with lower emission vehicles to upgrade to ultra-low emission vehicles from 1st January 2026.</p> <p>This is a significant investment for vehicle owners, of the 107 vehicles licenced, there are 67 that will require upgrading from 2026.</p> <p>Any extension to the policy will positively impact vehicle owners who have not upgraded but may negatively impact those that transitioned their vehicles before the deadline.</p>
Other (voluntary consideration) For example: Migrant, refugee, or asylum seekers.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	N/A
Other For example: - Unpaid carers - Prison population - Homeless population -Council suppliers & contractors -Cabinet Members	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	N/A

Section 5: Conclusion(s) of your Full Impact Assessment

22.	Conclusions. Check as needed.			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Stop and reconsider the activity.	<input type="checkbox"/> Adjust activity before beginning the activity and continue to monitor.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No major change(s) or adjustments and continue with activity but continue to monitor.	<input type="checkbox"/> No major change(s) or adjustments and continue with the activity. No need to monitor in the future.
23.	<p>Please explain how you have reached your conclusions above.</p> <p>This assessment identifies that the current Hackney Carriage Vehicle (HCV) emissions policy will primarily affect vehicle owners and licence holders. Any extension to the implementation date would provide financial relief to those who have not yet upgraded their vehicles to meet the Ultra-Low Emissions Vehicle (ULEV) standard, currently 67 vehicles. However, such an extension may result in a financial disadvantage for early adopters of ULEV vehicles, currently 40 vehicles, who have already made significant investment in compliance.</p>			

Section 6: Monitoring and review plan.

The responsibility for maintaining a monitoring arrangement of the EqIA action plan lies with the service/team completing the EqIA. These arrangements must be built into the performance management framework such as KPIs or Risk Registers.

24.	<p>Who or which team or service area will be responsible for monitoring equalities impact?</p> <p>For example-</p>	<p>General Licensing Team, Community Safety</p>
-----	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - team, -directorate, -service area, -Equalities Steering Group,etc. 				
25.	Who (individual, team, or service area) will be responsible for carrying out the EqIA review?	General Licensing Team			
26.	How often will the equality impact be reviewed for this activity? For example- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -quarterly, -yearly, etc. 	<table> <tr> <td data-bbox="647 507 1193 727">This policy will form part of the wider policy alignment for Local Government Reorganisation, review of the equality impact of the policy will take place as part of that process.</td><td data-bbox="1193 507 1695 727"> 27. Date when the EqIA will be reviewed again. </td><td data-bbox="1695 507 2168 727">~2028</td></tr> </table>	This policy will form part of the wider policy alignment for Local Government Reorganisation, review of the equality impact of the policy will take place as part of that process.	27. Date when the EqIA will be reviewed again.	~2028
This policy will form part of the wider policy alignment for Local Government Reorganisation, review of the equality impact of the policy will take place as part of that process.	27. Date when the EqIA will be reviewed again.	~2028			

Section 7: Sign-off

Name: Joshua Curnow

Job Title: Licensing Team Manager

Signature:



Name: Tom Hook

Job Title: Deputy Chief Executive

Signature:



Name: Full Name

Job Title: Type here

Signature:

Name: Abby Abrahams

Job Title: Solicitor

Signature: Abby Abrahams

Name: Full Name

Job Title: Type here

Signature:

Name: Full Name

Job Title: Type here

Signature:

Name:

Job Title:

Signature:

Name: Full Name

Job Title: Type here

Signature:

Name: Full Name

Job Title: Type here

Signature:

Suggested list of people to include are:

- 1) Project lead/manager.
- 2) Head of service area or team.
- 3) Person who completed the EqIA.
- 4) EDI Lead.
- 5) EDI Specialist.
- 6) For joint projects, please consider the following:
 1. Other project leads
 2. Other service area and/or team lead/managers.

This is not an exhaustive list.

You have now reached the end of the assessment.

 Please appended this to any reports and project files for reference.

This page is intentionally left blank