

To: Council
Date: 28 January 2019
Title of Report: **Motions and amendments received in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.17**

Councillors are asked to debate and reach conclusions on the motions and amendment listed below in accordance with the Council's rules for debate.

The Constitution permits an hour for debate of these motions.

Introduction

This document sets out motions received by the Head of Law and Governance in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.17 by the deadline of 1.00pm on 16 January, as amended by the proposers.

All substantive amendments sent by councillors to the Head of Law and Governance by publication of the briefing note are also included below.

Motions will be taken in turn from the Liberal Democrat, Green, Labour groups in that order.

Contents

Introduction	1
a) Retaining democratic rights for EU27 citizens (proposed by Councillor Harris, seconded by Councillor Garden)	2
b) Declaring a Climate Emergency (proposed by Councillor Simmons, seconded by Councillor Wolff) (amendment proposed)	2
c) Adopting definition of Islamophobia (proposed by Councillor Arshad, seconded by Councillor Azad)	4
d) Opposition to Oxford-Cambridge expressway as currently proposed (proposed by Councillor Gant, seconded by Councillor Llandell Mills) (two amendments proposed) ...	5
e) Protecting the Oxford Name (proposed by Councillor Wolff, seconded by Councillor Simmons).....	7
f) Opposing mental health funding cuts by the County Council (proposed by Councillor Upton, seconded by Councillor Bely-Summers).....	8

a) Retaining democratic rights for EU27 citizens (proposed by Councillor Harris, seconded by Councillor Garden)

Liberal Democrat member motion

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

requests the leader of the Council to write to the Prime Minister

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

b) Declaring a Climate Emergency (proposed by Councillor Simmons, seconded by Councillor Wolff) (amendment proposed)

Green member motion

Council notes that:

- a) the recent 2018 IPCC report states that we have just 12 years to act on climate change if global temperature rises are to be kept within the recommended 1.5 degrees Celsius;
- b) all governments (national, regional and local) have a duty to limit the negative impacts of climate breakdown, and local governments that recognise this should not wait for their national governments to change their policies. UK cities need to commit to aggressive reduction targets and carbon neutrality as quickly as possible;
- c) cities are well placed to lead the world in reducing carbon emissions, as their higher density opens up a range of sustainable transport, buildings and energy opportunities;
- d) the Council's absolute carbon emissions have reduced by just over 10% (10.17%) over the last five years – an average of 2% per year (*Source: Oxford City Council 'Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Local Authority own estate and operations: Reporting year 2017-18' (August 2018)*);
- e) although the Council's carbon emissions reduced in 2017/18 due to changes in the national grid, the Council's underlying energy and fossil fuel consumption actually went UP slightly - a 2.1% increase in electricity, a 0.8% increase in gas and a 5.4% increase in carbon from vehicle fuel. (*Source: Oxford City Council 'Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Local Authority own estate and operations: Reporting year 2017-18' (August 2018)*);
- f) although the City Council is managing to deliver absolute carbon reductions – despite the upward pressures on carbon emissions caused by changes in the structure of its operations and services and variability caused by factors such as the weather - it is not delivering the necessary absolute carbon reductions fast enough to meet either the UK's 2050 80% reduction target or the 1.5 degree Celsius target.

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

- 1. Join other Councils in declaring a Climate Emergency;**

2. Call on Westminster to provide the necessary powers and resources to make local action on climate change easier;
3. Request Scrutiny to urgently review and make recommendations on revisions to the Council's 2017-2022 Carbon Management Plan in light of the recent IPCC report and the latest Oxford City Council data (published August 2018). This should include the setting of an early carbon neutral target for the City Council and a governance structure to ensure close monitoring of the Plan;
4. Continue to work with partners across the city and region to deliver widespread carbon reductions.

Amendment proposed by Councillor Hayes, seconded by Councillor Howlett

Council notes that:

a) the recent..... to c)energy opportunities;

INSERT NEW section as D:

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

e) (was (d))

f) although Reporting year 2017- 18' (August 2018));

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

g) *INSERT: This Council is only responsible for 1% of the city's CO₂ emissions and works in partnership to achieve ambitious city-wide targets to reduce emissions by 40% by 2020. Although target.*

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

Join other Councils in declaring a Climate Emergency;

1. *INSERT Continue to* call on Westminster to provide the necessary powers and resources to make local action on climate change easier;
2. ~~**REQUEST** Request Scrutiny to urgently review and make recommendations on revisions to the Council's 2017-2022 Carbon Management Plan in light of the recent IPCC report and the latest Oxford City Council data (published August 2018). This should include the setting of an early carbon neutral target for the City Council and a governance structure to ensure close monitoring of the Plan;~~
3. *REPLACE WITH: Encourage this Council to establish a Citizens Assembly made up of a representative range of Oxford citizens to establish the facts and make recommendations for our city.*

4. **Continue to work with partners across the city and region to deliver widespread carbon reductions.**
5. *INSERT new: Notes that this Council is a forward-looking council at tackling climate change with a very strong record. The Council has installed enough solar PV across its estate to generate the equivalent of 10% of our annual electricity from onsite generation, reducing CO2 emissions by 380tonnes/year and reduces bills by over £100,000/year). We currently purchase accredited green electricity for practically all sites and have a policy to buy green if the price is not more than 2% above the price of standard electricity. This Council uses a **£1m revolving loan fund** to reduced energy costs by over £400k/year.*
6. *INSERT new: Notes that this Council works heavily in partnership, including coordinating the Low Carbon Oxford network – a local collaborative of over 40 organisations that are responsible for the majority of Oxford’s CO₂ emissions and which have committed to reduce their emissions by 3% each year. The Council is participating in OxFutures II Growing Oxfordshire’s Low Carbon Economy, a multi-stakeholder partnership to grow Oxfordshire’s low carbon economy through assisting SMEs to reduce energy consumption and implement energy efficiency projects.*

If amendment is accepted, motion as amended would then read:

Council notes that:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The increasing commercial activity of the Council provides upward pressure on the carbon emissions, but in the main services are being offered locally and at a lower

carbon intensity than other commercial concerns providing the service from outside the area would be operating at.

f) This Council is only responsible for 1% of the city's CO₂ emissions and works in partnership to achieve ambitious city-wide targets to reduce emissions by 40% by 2020. Although the City Council is managing to deliver absolute carbon reductions – despite the upward pressures on carbon emissions caused by changes in the structure of its operations and services and variability caused by factors such as the weather - it is not delivering the necessary absolute carbon reductions fast enough to meet either the UK's 2050 80% reduction target or the 1.5 degree Celsius target.

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

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

c) Adopting definition of Islamophobia (proposed by Councillor Arshad, seconded by Councillor Azad)

Labour member motion

Oxford City Council is proud of its diversity and has a huge asset and a source of great strength. A substantial proportion of its residents are Muslim, who are an integral part of its make-up, playing a huge role in all aspects of the Oxford City's life.

Oxford City has a strong history of promoting cohesion and welcoming people from all over the world. Its residents have always united and supported each other in the fight against racism and discrimination in all its forms.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

d) Opposition to Oxford-Cambridge expressway as currently proposed (proposed by Councillor Gant, seconded by Councillor Llandell Mills) (two amendments proposed)

Liberal Democrat member motion

Council notes that the Oxford 2050 document launched jointly by Cllr Brown and former Cllr Price enthusiastically welcomes the perceived benefits of the Oxford-Cambridge Expressway.

Council also notes that at its meeting on 25 September 2018, the Growth Board instructed its Chair to write to both Highways England and the Transport Minister regretting the lack of clarity around the proposal, and that at its meeting of 27 November 2018 the Growth Board qualified its “welcome” for the principle of the Expressway.

Council notes the tension between these two positions.

Council also notes that this lack of clarity contributes to considerable uncertainty both about how the Expressway is intended to deliver benefit, and about the possible impact on homes, lives, the environment, amenities and facilities, including in and adjacent to the greater Oxford area.

In particular, Council notes with regret that:

1. It is unclear what the word “Expressway” means in this context
2. Insufficient work has been done on the potential of enhanced rail links to deliver better outcomes for passengers, freight, and sustainable economic growth
3. Actual and proposed consultation is inadequate
4. It is unclear which of a range of possible justifications for the Expressway, which potentially contradict each other, are being used, including:
 - a) A ‘strategic route’ to carry freight traffic from the west and south to the east.
 - b) A route to make commuting between Oxford/Milton Keynes/Bedford/Cambridge easier and quicker.
 - c) A road that will enable significant housing growth of 1,000,000 extra houses along its length.
 - d) Relieving traffic on the A34, as one member of the Growth Board has stated publicly (which does not appear to be one of the stated aims, and current plans do not rule out using the A34 in part as the Expressway, which would of course add more traffic to it)

5. Increased road building will inevitably have a serious negative impact on air quality at a time when all public bodies must seek to use every part of their planning, investment and delivery mechanisms to achieve the opposite.

Council therefore resolves to oppose the Expressway as it is currently proposed

Amendment proposed by Councillor Simmons seconded by Councillor Wolff

Delete and replace point 5 with

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

Amendment proposed by Councillor Hollingsworth

Replace first 3 paragraphs with:

Council notes that the Leader of the Council noted the Government’s announcement of the proposed corridor for the Oxford to Cambridge Expressway and then went on to say:

“However, this opaque process - with the decision made by Highways England – does little to reduce uncertainty for people in Oxford and those that travel to work here. It remains wholly unclear which side of Oxford the final route will take, let alone how the Expressway might help reduce the congestion on the overstretched A34 and A40.

“The interface between the proposed Expressway and the new East-West Rail is also key. We welcome the commitment to plan for and invest in major infrastructure to support housing and economic growth in Oxfordshire, but we want to see the development of integrated transport systems and the prioritisation of clean, green and public transport. These principles need to be central in determining the final detailed route. We will now look closely at the proposals and will want to make sure there is a meaningful public consultation conducted by Highways England.”

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

Then amend

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

In particular, Council notes with regret that:

Insert

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

Then renumber points 1-4 to be 2-5

Delete new point 6 (original point 5) entirely

Amend resolution to

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

If amendments are accepted, motion as amended would then read:

Council notes that the Leader of the Council noted the Government’s announcement of the proposed corridor for the Oxford to Cambridge Expressway and then went on to say:

“However, this opaque process - with the decision made by Highways England – does little to reduce uncertainty for people in Oxford and those that travel to work here. It remains wholly unclear which side of Oxford the final route will take, let alone how the Expressway might help reduce the congestion on the overstretched A34 and A40.

“The interface between the proposed Expressway and the new East-West Rail is also key. We welcome the commitment to plan for and invest in major infrastructure to support housing and economic growth in Oxfordshire, but we want to see the development of integrated transport systems and the prioritisation of clean, green and public transport. These principles need to be central in determining the final detailed route. We will now look closely at the proposals and will want to make sure there is a meaningful public consultation conducted by Highways England.”

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

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

In particular, Council notes with regret that:

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

2. It is unclear what the word “Expressway” means in this context

3. Insufficient work has been done on the potential of enhanced rail links to deliver better outcomes for passengers, freight, and sustainable economic growth

4. Actual and proposed consultation is inadequate
5. It is unclear which of a range of possible justifications for the Expressway, which potentially contradict each other, are being used, including:
 - a) A 'strategic route' to carry freight traffic from the west and south to the east.
 - b) A route to make commuting between Oxford/Milton Keynes/Bedford/Cambridge easier and quicker.
 - c) A road that will enable significant housing growth of 1,000,000 extra houses along its length.
 - d) Relieving traffic on the A34, as one member of the Growth Board has stated publicly (which does not appear to be one of the stated aims, and current plans do not rule out using the A34 in part as the Expressway, which would of course add more traffic to it)

Cllr Hollingsworth amendment: delete last point entirely

Or

Cllr Simmons amendment: replace last point with:

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

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

e) Protecting the Oxford Name (proposed by Councillor Wolff, seconded by Councillor Simmons)

Green member motion

Council notes UK trademark application No: UK00003296208 by The Chancellor Masters and Scholars of the University of Oxford, trading as Oxford University Press, which seeks to register the word 'Oxford' for use classes 9, 16 and 41. These cover a very wide range of activities including the provision of training, downloadable or printed documents, sporting and cultural activities and so on.

This Council notes the concern of residents and businesses that registering the word 'Oxford' could negatively impact on the freedom of other organisations to utilise the word and associated 'brand' in its own products and services without risking challenge or incurring a fee.

The Council also notes that its own activities, and those of its trading companies, could be impacted should the application be successful.

The Council therefore agree to oppose the application and, in the event of the application proceeding, seek the necessary guarantees from the trademark holder to protect Oxford's identity and economy.

f) Opposing mental health funding cuts by the County Council (proposed by Councillor Upton, seconded by Councillor Bely-Summers)

Labour member motion

Local authorities have taken the brunt of the cuts imposed by this government. Many councils have been put in to the invidious position of having to cut essential services to the bone. We recognise that Oxfordshire County Council faces the additional pressure of big increases in demand in both adult and child social care.

We are therefore relieved Oxfordshire County Council has listened to the Oxfordshire Mental Health Partnership, local people and campaigners and welcome the County's decision not to make the majority of the £1.6 million cuts that they had consulted on.

However, we are still deeply worried about the effect that removing the remaining £600,000 will have on people with serious mental illnesses in Oxford City and the County. This money funds specialist mental health Social Workers who carry out assessments and write Care Plans for people. Removing it will impact on people's ability to access services and could have severe consequences for them.

This is against a background of:

- Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) continuing to be the lowest funded CCG per capita in England, meaning funding for mental health services is becoming increasingly stretched.
- Oxfordshire adult mental health assessment teams having increased levels of referrals (up 36.6% from 4,651 in 2014/5 to 6,354 in 2017/8) with just a 1.1% increase in funding.
- An increase in sectioning because of lack of access to community provision for mental health before crisis (Rethink's recent Independent Review of the Mental Health Act and associated evidence).

We already see the human costs of underfunded services on the streets of Oxford with many people not coping and not getting the support they need. This is despite the excellent work done by a number of charities such as Restore, Mind, Crisis, Aspire and Homeless Oxfordshire. It should not be forgotten that those living with severe mental illness are expected to die between 15–20 years earlier than those without.

One of the saddest things about these “cost-saving” measures is that in the medium and long term, they will have the opposite effect. People who do not get the early mental health support they need will later appear at the more expensive acute services. Such cuts end up costing far more to the public purse as other services pick up the pieces. Our overstretched voluntary and statutory sector agencies across the county will struggle to cope.

We therefore call on Oxfordshire County Council to:

- 1. join Oxford City Council in lobbying the government for a portion of their reported increase in mental health spending to be given to local government to improve mental health and wellbeing;**
- 2. invest to save by increasing spending on initiatives that help children and adults be more resilient and keep them in good mental health. This is an investment that will improve mental health and benefit the public purse in the longer term;**
- 3. delete the remaining cut of £600k, already delayed until next year.**

This page is intentionally left blank