

Minutes of a meeting of the Scrutiny Committee on Tuesday 1 July 2025

www.oxford.gov.uk



Committee members present:

Councillor Powell (Chair)

Councillor Azad

Councillor Miles

Councillor Ottino

Councillor Fry (Substitute)

Councillor Rowley (Vice-Chair)

Councillor Jarvis

Councillor Mundy

Councillor Qayyum

Councillor Henwood (Substitute)

Also present:

Councillor Lubna Arshad, Cabinet Member for A Safer Oxford

Councillor Alex Hollingsworth, Cabinet Member for Planning and Culture

Officers present for all or part of the meeting:

Celeste Reyeslao, Scrutiny and Governance Advisor

Hannah Carmody-Brown, Committee and Member Services Officer

Richard Adams, Community Safety Service Manager

Helen Bishop, Director of Communities & Citizens

Vicki Galvin, Citizen Experience Manager

Liz Jones, ASBIT Manager & Domestic Abuse Lead

Diana Fawcett, City Centre Manager

Apologies:

Councillor(s) Corais, Latif and Stares sent apologies.

Substitutes are shown above.

13. Declarations of interest

None.

14. Chair's Announcements

The Chair reordered the agenda.

Items were considered in the following order: 8, 7, 9, 4, 5, 6, 10.

Councillor Fry joined the meeting.

15. Domestic Abuse Policy for Service Users

Cabinet, at its meeting on 9 July 2025, will consider a report to approve the Domestic Abuse Policy for Service Users.

The Committee was asked to consider the report and agree any recommendations.

Councillor Lubna Arshad, Cabinet Member for A Safer Oxford, Richard Adams, Community Safety Service Manager, and Liz Jones, ASBIT Manager & Domestic Abuse Lead, were present to respond to questions.

Councillor Arshad introduced the report, noting that Oxford City Council is currently working to achieve the Domestic Abuse Housing Accreditation (DAHA) which will offer housing providers a framework and benchmark to operate by to ensure delivery of effective responses to domestic abuse. The Committee heard that the Council will be assessed for the required standards in respect of supporting survivors of domestic abuse, children of domestic abuse, and holding perpetrators to account. Councillor Arshad explained that the policy will guide the Council in this effort. Members were also notified of an edit to the report, as highlighted in yellow.

The Chair invited the Committee to ask questions.

Councillor Ottino requested some illustrative examples of how staff would be expected to respond.

Councillor Qayum joined the meeting.

Councillor Jarvis asked firstly, in relation to the wider context of temporary accommodation provision pressures, what confidence there is that the current capabilities are adequate for dealing with instances of domestic abuse and how much confidence is there that the Council can move people on from temporary accommodation into more stable environments. Secondly, information regarding prevention of domestic abuse was requested.

Councillor Henwood sought clarification around the process for recording and managing domestic abuse against those under 16 years of age.

The ASBIT Manager & Domestic Abuse Lead responded. In response to Councillor Ottino's request, an increase in the number of people coming forward and reporting domestic abuse was noted. For these scenarios it was explained that contact centres report to Safer Oxford and the Community Safety Team who then consider the report and contact the person as required. The Committee heard that contact could take the form of a text, and risk assessments are used to determine risk levels and next steps. The ASBIT Manager & Domestic Abuse Lead explained that referrals are made to MARAC (Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference) for high-risk cases and referrals to Oxfordshire Domestic Abuse Service are used for medium-risk cases. It was emphasised that each case is individual, and needs are assessed upon this understanding, however Oxford City Council is not a support service but does hold responsibility for identifying and sourcing the correct support for victims. In respect of children, it was explained that referrals are made to MASH as necessary.

In response to Councillor Jarvis, the ASBIT Manager & Domestic Abuse Lead explained that anyone who approaches the Council through the housing team to report lack of accommodation due to domestic abuse would be immediately triaged and risk assessed. This can lead to the assignment of emergency accommodation with consideration of the location and context of the placement based on the risk assessment. The Committee heard how this work crosses over with the Sanctuary Scheme to ensure that victims are supported and connected with support services and necessary resources. Furthermore, in line with the Domestic Abuse Act 2021, persons are then moved on under the consideration of further risk assessments to more permanent accommodation which suits their individual needs.

Councillor Mundy joined the meeting.

Councillor Qayyum asked on average how long the process of triaging reports takes for those with children facing domestic violence to receive emergency housing. The ASBIT Manager & Domestic Abuse Lead reassured the Committee that this would take place on the same day generally but emphasised that this depends on the ability to successfully contact and communicate with the person in question.

The Chair asked, in relation to pages 55 and 56 of the report, what protections are in place for those of vulnerable immigration status to reassure them that their information will not be passed on to the Home Office, for example, as means of encouraging them to come forwards. Secondly, it was asked whether there has been any consideration of explicitly recognising how immigration controls can be a barrier to people coming forward, and as a result increasing vulnerability.

The ASBIT Manager & Domestic Abuse Lead assured the Committee that a process is currently being drafted to ensure that housing teams can access support for those who come forward with no recourse to public funds whilst fleeing domestic abuse. Language barriers were also recognised as a necessary factor for consideration. If the person is fleeing domestic abuse and has no children, they can be housed with Sanctuary Hosting until they are awarded the Migrant Victims of Domestic Abuse Concession (MVDAC) which provides temporary immigration status and access to public funds. They can then be housed in a refuge and can apply for indefinite leave to remain.

In response to an earlier question regarding prevention measures for domestic abuse, the ASBIT Manager & Domestic Abuse Lead informed the Committee that she sits on the Oxfordshire Domestic Abuse Strategy Board which is focused on raising awareness, working with schools and community groups, and changing misogynistic attitudes.

Councillor Qayyum requested clarification on how legal fees to support leave to remain applications are sourced. The ASBIT Manager & Domestic Abuse Lead explained that people are signposted to the Home Office who provide the domestic abuse concession which allows immigration lawyers to access legal aid to help them apply for indefinite leave to remain.

The Chair invited the Committee to discuss possible recommendations.

The Committee resolved to make the following recommendation(s) on the report to Cabinet:

1. That there is explicit recognition under section 3, Diversity Implications, of the way in which national immigration policy makes people less likely to disclose domestic violence, given Oxford's status as a Council of Sanctuary, it is especially important to acknowledge how national policy can harm the efforts of local authorities to build inclusive and safe communities.

The Chair thanked Councillor Arshad, the Community Safety Service Manager, and the ASBIT Manager & Domestic Abuse Lead.

Councillor Arshad, the Community Safety Service Manager, and the ASBIT Manager & Domestic Abuse Lead left the meeting and did not return.

16. Tourism

Scrutiny Committee had commissioned a report to consider an update on tourism work across the city, alongside work being undertaken to explore the implementation of a tourist tax for the city.

The Committee was asked to consider the report and agree any recommendations.

Councillor Alex Hollingsworth, Cabinet Member for Planning and Culture, and Diana Fawcett, Oxford City Centre Manager, were present to respond to questions.

Councillor Hollingsworth introduced the report, explaining that it provides a broad summary of ongoing actions relating to tourism in Oxford City centre which are subject to high tourist levels from visitors across the world and the associated benefits and challenges. The Committee were informed that positive change in recent years has ensured that on average, tourists often now stay longer overnight and attend more events and facilities within Oxford and the surrounding areas.

The City Centre Manager provided a summary of the impacts of tourism and potential funding routes in line with the presentation enclosed within the agenda. The Committee were informed that the statistics enclosed relate to 2023 and demonstrate the popularity of Oxford as a global city with international reputation. Following the pandemic, it has been noted that countries within Asia and North America have started to return to Oxford in larger numbers and have contributed to the boom observed in 2024 which is a shared trend across other regions such as Europe. The City Centre Manager recognised the impacts that accompany increased tourism and assured Committee members that funding options are being explored to manage this considering that the City Centre Action Plan has no funding available for tourism related issues. The Committee were assured that the matter is being considered with importance as tourism affects anyone living and working in the city, and not just those visiting. As such, focus is being paid to supporting overnight stays and hotels to ensure more stable employment levels in the hospitality industry.

In relation to the proposed Accommodation Business Improvement District (ABID), the City Centre Manager emphasised that the Council is a facilitator and not the levy payers as the ABID would be set up and managed by an independent company. As such, the Council cannot decide if the bid goes ahead but can support facilitation of the process. The Committee heard details relating to similar examples in Manchester and Liverpool and understood that the project is a positive opportunity to generate funds for the city. The City Centre Manager explained however that any funds resulting from the ABID could not be used on Council services under existing legislation. There is no legislation currently in England that allows a 'tourist tax' but such has been discussed in locations such as Edinburgh. An ABID is the only legislation in England that allows a levy charge.

The City Centre Manager summarised other funding options which had been considered and explained the rationale for supporting the ABID which would involve around 29 hotels. On a presumed hotel occupancy rate of 75%, and a presumed charge of £2 per room per night, the project could generate around £1.3m per annum over a 5-year period. It was noted that these parameters would be set by the levy payers. Furthermore, it was also explained that University colleges have also been

engaged with to set up a College Task Group. There will also be consideration given to an overarching team to cross reference projects across both Task Groups.

The City Centre Manager outlined the next steps being taken, including setting up tourism task groups with hoteliers and colleges to consider projects and analyse numbers.

Finally, the City Centre Manager emphasised that the overarching aim of the Council in relation to the ABID is to facilitate bringing people together and to raise money for the city. The Committee also understood that the Council seeks to take time in considering this process rather than rushing to ensure that the most successful outcomes possible are achieved and strong relationships are developed.

Councillor Hollingsworth explained that the decision to adopt an ABID would not lie with the Council, however it can encourage the project by building partnerships and trust with a range of business and non-businesses. The Committee were also assured this was not a tourist tax; it is an option to raise money from tourism accommodation to spend on further supporting tourism in Oxford. Councillor Hollingsworth emphasised the preference for the Council to take time to garner support from decision makers.

The Chair invited the Committee to ask questions.

Councillor Jarvis left the meeting.

Councillor Qayyum asked what percentage increase was there in tourism from pre-Covid to 2023 and requested further information on the negative impacts of tourism specifically relevant to Oxford. Councillor Qayyum also commented positively on the ABID and the potential for it to include colleges.

Councillor Fry, in reference to the City Centre Action Plan not being funded by the City Council budget, asked whether it was likely that the ABID could pick up this gap.

Councillor Henwood requested clarification around the definition of a 'tourist' being utilised, and whether it includes groups such as persons on business trips.

Councillor Jarvis rejoined the meeting.

Councillor Hollingsworth clarified that 'tourist' is used as a collective term and specific groups within this, such as those on business trips, are not split out. In response to Councillor Qayyum, statistics relating to the pre-Covid period were not available but could be sourced. In regards negative impacts of tourism in Oxford specifically, Councillor Hollingsworth listed in detail some transport impacts and effects in

residential areas relating from short-term lets. In relation to the ABID and City Centre Action Plan, it was explained that if the project went ahead, levy payers could decide if they wanted to allocate funds to help alleviating some negative impacts of tourism e.g. better toilet facilities.

The City Centre Manager addressed the governance of meetings relating to the ABID to emphasise to the Committee that the choices of projects to fund are subject to agreement by levy payers through the task groups. A variety of stakeholders, including residents, could have their views heard by the Task Groups as to which projects they would like considered.

Councillor Mundy requested further clarification around what the money from the ABID could be spent on and what would classify as 'enhancements'.

Councillor Ottino firstly queried the admin costs to the Council and how they would be limited, and secondly, how communication and the spread of benefits from the ABID amongst residents living further from the city centre would be ensured. Lastly, Councillor Ottino asked whether any of the hotels included are those used by probation and social services for emergency accommodation, and how it could be ensured they were not subject to the levy costs.

Councillor Mundy asked further questions:

- Whether there is a cost impact on those choosing to stay overnight in the city and whether this could be a deterrent
- Whether a flat rate would be the most appropriate approach.
- Whether there are means of ensuring lesser-known areas of Oxford were promoted to tourists as a means of diversifying the attractions of the area, and if further thought could go into this.
- What is being done to improve the streets and reduce empty units.
- What is being done, or could be done, to ensure the salaries within the tourism sector are aligned with the living wage.

Councillor Hollingsworth clarified that the use of funds from the ABID is subject to current legislative requirements and could be used for items such as lighting improvements, for example. It was emphasised that it could not be used for Council services which are legally required or being funded. In regards communication with residents, Councillor Hollingsworth assured the Committee that it is key to consider how tourism is presented and how to ensure it benefits all persons within the area and is meaningful. In response to Councillor Mundy, it was agreed that there are lesser-known areas of Oxford such as the river which could be enhanced for tourism and efforts could be made to support this.

The City Centre Manager, in response to Councillor Ottino, explained that admin costs (including Officer time) and the appointment of consultants for the facilitation of the Task Groups are covered by the Shared Prosperity Fund. The Committee therefore understood that admin costs were not being covered by taxpayer money. Regarding communication with residents, the City Centre Manager listed the measures being taken including an imminent press release and resident engagement via the task groups. In response to Councillor Mundy's concern regarding cost implications, it was explained that based on existing examples, tourists are not being deterred by costs added to overnight stays. It was also emphasised that budget hotels could be excluded from the levy. In regards city centre management and city improvements, working groups have already been set up to listen to stakeholder views on areas which need work, including St. Michael's Street and the Botley Road Traders. The Committee learned that every quarter, residents, and businesses are invited to share their views at networking events and landlords are also engaged with in efforts to attract the right tenants in the city. Finally, the City Centre Manager responded to concerns around tourism sector wages and noted no significant awareness with issues.

Councillor Miles joined the meeting.

Councillor Azad asked what could be done to better the experience of tourists arriving in personal vehicles in relation to parking availability.

Councillor Fry emphasised the shortage of public toilets in Oxford City and the dissatisfaction that exists around the matter.

The Chair, in connection with Councillor Fry's query, asked whether money from the ABID could be used to support the availability of toilets which are not directly owned by the Council, such as those offered by private companies in the city centre.

Councillor Miles, in relation to the demographics of tourists frequenting Oxford, requested further information relating to the nationalities, languages, and ages of tourists. It was also asked how it can be ensured that the needs and interests of underrepresented groups be better met.

Councillor Hollingsworth, in response to Councillor Azad, explained that it would be impossible for Oxford city to sustain parking for the number of tourists arriving by car and therefore it is better to encourage transport to the area via alternative means.

The City Centre Manager thanked the Committee for the wide range of questions posed. In response to Councillor Fry and the Chair, it was acknowledged that there used to be a Community Toilet Scheme targeted at increasing availability of public toilets access across the city. However, the Committee heard of the complex problems and costs associated with this, and the valid unwillingness of businesses to participate without funding and support. The Committee were assured that case studies across

Europe are being assessed to consider future options for easing this issue in Oxford. In response to Councillor Miles, the City Centre Manager noted the difficulty in obtaining detailed demographic information but explained that with technological advancements, it is possible to analyse footfall and in future the origin registration of mobile phones. At present therefore, most demographic information is anecdotal. The Committee were informed that to cater to various tourist groups, information points located across the city, are currently being branded as tourist hubs and based on feedback other projects are being considered to support the visitor and resident experience. The City Centre Manager noted that these efforts seek to present Oxford as a welcoming and inclusive city. Councillor Hollingsworth reiterated the value on phone data and the use of online maps for tourists.

Councillor Miles queried firstly, whether the tourist offer around the river and water sports could be enhanced, and secondly, what work is being done to assess future purposes of the Town Hall building and its tunnels.

The Chair requested guidance on geographic modelling and where the city centre boundary ends, and asked what scope there is for democratic involvement of the Council in the ABID task groups.

Councillor Hollingsworth reiterated his earlier comments relating to the tourist offer of Oxford's rivers. In reference to the tunnels, it was noted that the costs relating to this would be beyond that which the ABID, as a private company, would unlikely be willing to invest in another private landowner.

The City Centre Manager agreed with comments relating to the underuse of Oxford's waterways within the tourism sector and informed the Committee that an app is being considered to support promotion of all locations. In response to the Chair, the City Centre Manager noted the risks of expecting too much Council involvement in the task groups and the possibility of this causing other task group attendees to disengage. The Committee understood that there was an expectation of some Senior council officer or Senior councillor involvement, but that the public and private balance would require careful consideration.

The Chair invited the Committee to discuss possible recommendations.

The Committee resolved to make the following recommendation(s) on the report to Cabinet:

1. That the Council take further steps to publicise the locations of public toilets that are accessible to visitors and residents alike, such as those in the Town Hall and other public buildings.
2. That Council encourage the highest possible level of elected representation within the ABID task groups, within the constraints of the scheme, in order to promote democratic accountability, recognising the Council's role as the scheme's facilitator.

The Chair thanked the Cabinet member and officers.

The City Centre Manager and Councillor Hollingsworth thanked the Committee for the variety of questions received.

The City Centre Manager and Councillor Hollingsworth left the meeting and did not return.

The Chair suggested that the Committee break for 5 minutes.

The Committee paused at 19.38.

The Committee resumed at 19.45.

Councillor Rowley had left the meeting during the break and did not return.

17. Citizen Experience Strategy 2025-27

Cabinet, at its meeting on 9 July 2025, will consider a report reviewing the Citizen Experience Strategy 2025-27 and approve the updated action plan.

The Committee was asked to consider the report and agree any recommendations.

Vicki Galvin, Citizen Experience Manager, and Helen Bishop, Director of Communities and Citizens Services, were present to respond to questions.

The Director of Communities and Citizens Services summarised the report, noting that the original strategy from 2023 is expected to be reviewed in full in 2027. This report offers a brief refresh which focused on updating the data and insight and using this to update the action plan. The demographic profile of the city demonstrates increasing diversity, healthy inequalities, poverty and a digital divide. The Committee understood that a lot of work has gone into the revised action plan to ensure that the Council services support the quality of life for all citizens of Oxford City. The report also considers feedback from a range of key stakeholders.

Councillor Azad and Councillor Mundy rejoined the meeting.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

Councillor Ottino requested examples of how they are reaching people that may not usually respond to survey and in places without community buildings. It was also asked what is being done to ensure that residents believe that their views are relevant and matter to the Council. Additionally, in relation to young people, it was asked what is being done to ensure engagement in the democratic process.

With a focus on AI, Councillor Jarvis asked how it is currently being utilised within Council services and whether it risks diminishing residents' service experiences. It was commented that AI is often variable in quality. The Chair supported this query and asked whether AI had been considered within the environmental impact assessment.

In response to Councillor Ottino, the Director of Communities and Citizens Services detailed examples of ongoing work to engage broadly within the local community. This included examples such as telephone contact centres, face to face services within the Westgate Library, and links with food larders across the city. The Committee heard that reviews are ongoing to assess the regularity of visits to food larders and possible new community locations to attend. To support digital access, work is also ongoing with Oxfordshire County Council to facilitate a digital cafe in the Westgate Library to support skill development. In response to the need to ensure residents' feel their voices are valued, the Director of Communities and Citizens Services emphasised that a new comments and complaints process has been installed across the Council and in-person walkabouts are taking place in localities. In respect of young people specifically, the Committee heard that a young person's panel has been established and there is ongoing work with schools.

In response to Councillor Jarvis, the Director of Communities and Citizens Services detailed the ongoing work relating to AI, including upskilling current staff and purchasing additional MS CoPilot licenses. The Committee also heard of an upcoming workstream which will focus on analysis of people's intents when phoning the Contact Centre to understand if AI, automation, and other digital services could be better utilised to signpost, triage or respond to these calls. Furthermore, it was clarified that a new policy has been drafted to support safe and transparent use of AI, and an AI Working Group has been established that is also currently developing an AI Strategy. Finally, in response to the Chair, it was explained that the current Equalities Impact Assessment does consider AI but that it could be a recommendation of the Committee that more focus is centred on this from an environmental perspective. The Citizen Experience Manager agreed.

The Chair clarified the reasons for which AI should be considered within the environmental impact assessment.

Councillor Miles expressed concern for vulnerable residents with chronic conditions who may experience limitations with engaging with the Council. To this end, she asked whether the Council engages with carers and relatives of frail residents and noted the hinderances of timed automated phone systems. Additionally, Councillor Miles queried if the Council engages with boat dwellers and young persons below the age of 12.

The Chair queried what contingency planning has taken place given the increased utilisation of digital contact points and the risks of web outages or technological limitations.

The Director of Communities and Citizens Services agreed that a separate Environmental Impact Assessment should be considered for the AI strategy and that this could also be a focus of the 2027 Citizen Experience Strategy refresh. In response to Councillor Miles, it was explained that work is ongoing to understand the demographic profiles of each locality and the Director of Communities and Citizens Services offered to sit down with Councillor Miles to discuss this in more detail. In relation to automated phone services, the Committee were reassured that if a caller does not select an option or speak, then the call is automatically connected to a real member of staff who can engage with the resident. Furthermore, the first option on the call is to select the phoneline for vulnerable persons which also connects to a real member of staff. In regards engagement with under 12's, the Committee heard that a consultation strategy is being worked on, but that further could be done for this age group.

In response to the Chair, the Director of Communities and Citizens Services explained that business continuity is a priority and that if required, the service could revert to using pen and paper to ensure continued contact with residents.

The Chair invited the Committee to discuss possible recommendations.

The Committee resolved to make the following recommendation(s) on the report to Cabinet:

1. That Cabinet consider incorporating physical presence in future consultations, particularly in areas further outside the city centre, and undertake support of language interpreters where appropriate.
2. That the environmental and equality impacts of AI use be considered as a core component of the full review of the Citizen Experience Strategy in 2027, adding dedicated sections addressing the implications of AI in both areas within the strategy.
3. That proactive efforts be made to consult children under 12, in recognition of the city's commitment to becoming an age and children friendly city.

The Chair thanked the Citizen Experience Manager and the Director of Communities and Citizens Services.

The Citizen Experience Manager and the Director of Communities and Citizens Services left the meeting and did not return.

18. Minutes

The Chair requested an amendment to Minute 7 of the minutes to note in his introduction that whilst it was not the appropriate time for members to raise broader concerns related to Serco Group, those concerns were nonetheless legitimate.

The Committee resolved to **approve** the minutes of the meeting held on 10 June 2025 as a true and accurate record incorporating the amendment from the Chair.

Councillor Fry left the meeting.

19. Work Plan and Forward Plan

The Chair informed the Committee that Cabinet has added a new item to its Forward Plan and would now be considering the Oxpens River Bridge at its next meeting in August. The Chair suggested that the Scrutiny Committee also considered the report at its meeting in August.

Councillor Henwood and Councillor Ottino requested clarification on what this would involve and what the Scrutiny Committee would be considering.

The Scrutiny and Governance Advisor informed members that Cabinet would be considering approval for power to be delegated and enter into necessary legal and funding agreements. Councillor Ottino questioned whether there was value in Scrutiny engaging meaningfully with the item given the scope of the report.

The Chair noted that the Committee may wish to scrutinise the delegations for the decision Cabinet will be taking and put forward recommendations given that the topic has been of great interest.

Councillor Miles reflected on previous discussions at the Scrutiny Committee and suggested that members could focus on lessons learned to inform future projects.

Upon a vote, the Committee voted in favour of adding the report to Scrutiny agenda for discussion at the meeting in August.

The Chair thanked Councillor Ottino for the issues he raised and committed to considering and managing the remit of the discussion.

The Scrutiny and Governance Advisor updated the Committee on the suggested topics added to the workplan, as detailed in the report, and explained how these topics were

selected. The Committee were assured that further additions could be made and would be agreed with the Chair.

In response to Councillor Ottino, the Scrutiny and Governance Advisor explained the TOPIC scoring system used to determine the addition of topics to the workplan.

Councillor Miles suggested that the Committee consider capacity constraints on the Council's environmental health team following discussion within Licensing Committees. The Chair supported the suggestion.

The Committee:

1. **Confirmed** its agreement to the Work Plan, or agree any amendments as required.
2. **Agreed** the Scrutiny-commissioned items for consideration during 2025/26, noting that exact scope and timescales may be dependent on resource capacity.
3. **Requested** that the Scrutiny and Governance Advisor liaise with relevant Cabinet Members and officers to schedule Scrutiny-commissioned items into the Work Plan.

20. Report back on recommendations and from Scrutiny Working Group meetings

The Chair detailed the response from Cabinet to the 5 recommendations made at the last meeting of the Scrutiny Committee. The Committee understood that all were agreed in full or in part. The Chair outlined each individually.

Councillor Jarvis left the meeting and did not return.

The Scrutiny and Governance Advisor summarised the recommendations resulting from the meetings of the Scrutiny Committee's working groups since its last meeting.

The Committee:

1. **Noted** Cabinet's responses to its recommendations.
2. **Endorsed** any recommendations from Working Group meetings.

21. Dates of future meetings

The Committee **noted** the dates of future meetings.

The meeting started at 6.00 pm and ended at 8.35 pm

**Chair
2025**

Date: Tuesday 5 August

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.