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| To: | Council |
| Date: | 20 July 2020 |
| 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 8 July 2020, 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.

Unfamiliar terms are explained in the glossary or in footnotes.

**Motions will be taken in turn from the Liberal Democrat group, the Green group, the Labour group, and an Independent member (if any) in that order.**

[1. Twinning with a locality on the island of Taiwan (proposed by Cllr Goddard, seconded by Cllr Wade) [amendment proposed by Cllr Clarkson]](#_Toc45876011)

[2. Adopting the C40 Mayors COVID-19 Recovery Task Force principles (proposed by Cllr Wolff, seconded by Cllr Simmons)](#_Toc45876012)

[3. Disproportionate deaths from Covid-19 of Health and care workers from Black, Asian and ethnic minorities (proposed by Cllr Bely-Summers, seconded by Cllr Azad)](#_Toc45876013)

[4. Celebrating Oxford’s Diversity (proposed by Cllr Gant, seconded by Cllr Altaf Khan) [amendment proposed by Cllr Brown]](#_Toc45876014)

[5. Against postponing County Council elections (proposed by Cllr Simmons, seconded by Cllr Wolff)](#_Toc45876015)

[6. Fossil fuel divestment (proposed by Cllr Hayes, seconded by Cllr Turner)](#_Toc45876016)

[7. Against postponing County Council elections (proposed by Cllr Roz Smith)](#_Toc45876017)

[8. Liveable Streets initiative (proposed by Cllr Wolff, seconded by Cllr Simmons) [amendment proposed by Cllr Henwood; amendment proposed by Cllr Arshad, seconded by Cllr Tanner]](#_Toc45876018)

# Twinning with a locality on the island of Taiwan (proposed by Cllr Goddard, seconded by Cllr Wade) [amendment proposed by Cllr Clarkson]

Liberal Democrat member motion

**Council notes:**

1. That Oxford currently has twin towns and cities in Europe, the Middle East and the Americas. However, at present it has no such links with anywhere in East Asia.
2. That [no town or city in the UK is currently twinned with any town or city on the island of Taiwan](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_twin_towns_and_sister_cities_in_Taiwan).
3. That amongst the achievements of the inhabitants of Taiwan are:
4. Building what [Freedom House](https://freedomhouse.org/country/taiwan/freedom-world/2020) describes as a *“vibrant and competitive democratic system has allowed three peaceful transfers of power between rival parties since 2000”* with *“generally robust protections”* for civil liberties. The organisation gives Taiwan a higher on their Global Freedom Index than the USA, France or Spain.
5. Creating an “[economic miracle](https://ourworldindata.org/economic-growth-since-1950)” by which real GDP per capita on the island has increased more than 30 times since 1950. This make it one of the five fastest growing economies in the whole world during that period.
6. Becoming the first jurisdiction in Asia to legalise same-sex marriage.
7. A World beating response to Coronavirus. At the time of writing, there have been just seven confirmed fatalities from COVID-19 on the island, despite it having a population of 24 million and being in close proximity to the initial outbreak in Wuhan.
8. In April 2020, donating [7 million face masks](https://focustaiwan.tw/politics/202004140006) to European countries, including the UK, dealing with a shortage due to COVID-19.
9. That [Taiwan is the UK’s second fastest growing export market](https://www.roc-taiwan.org/uk_en/post/5151.html) and that the UK government is undertaking [free trade talks](https://www.scmp.com/economy/china-economy/article/3032207/risking-china-backlash-taiwan-and-britain-push-ahead-free) with the Taiwan authorities.
10. Cities in numerous countries which take the same diplomatic stance towards Taiwan have ‘sister cities’ on the island.

**Council believes that:**

1. It should reaffirm [the view](https://www.oxford.gov.uk/twinning) that: *“Twin city links give citizens the chance to engage with other cultures and ways of life, and make these experiences more accessible through established contacts and networks in the linked cities. They also bring benefit to cities through knowledge-sharing activities, where people can learn from how problems are tackled in other countries, exchange ideas and understand different viewpoints.”*
2. That Oxford would have much to gain from twinning with a locality in Taiwan and expanding its international links to encompass East Asia.
3. That a municipality-to-municipality relationship is separate from the UK’s official diplomatic position of recognising the People’s Republic of China and avoiding dealing with the Taiwan authorities on a government to government basis. Oxford is grateful for the friendship of people from throughout the People’s Republic of China and the contribution its citizens make to the city as visitors, students and residents.

**Council resolves:**

1. that Oxford City Council shall negotiate a twinning agreement with an appropriate municipality on the island of Taiwan.
2. *to ask the Leader* to write to [the Taiwan Representative Office in the United Kingdom](https://origin-www.roc-taiwan.org/uk_en/index.html) to formally request their assistance in arranging this.

**Amendment proposed by Cllr Clarkson**

under ‘Council believes that’ bullet point 2 should read:

2. *That it would be worthwhile for Oxford to explore the possibility of establishing friendship links with a locality in Taiwan with a view to expanding its international links to encompass East Asia in the long term.*

The other bullet points in this section should remain unchanged.

Under ‘Council resolves’ the first bullet point should read:

1. *that Oxford City Council hereby encourages those interested to explore the possibility of establishing grassroots friendship links, in a similar way to those developed with Ramallah, with a longer term view of a twinning agreement with an appropriate municipality in Taiwan.*

*The second bullet points beginning ‘to ask the Leader’ is deleted in its entirety.*

**The amendment if accepted changes the motion to:**

**Council notes:**

[original text remains]

**Council believes that:**

1. It should reaffirm the view that: *“*Twin city links give citizens the chance to engage with other cultures and ways of life, and make these experiences more accessible through established contacts and networks in the linked cities. They also bring benefit to cities through knowledge-sharing activities, where people can learn from how problems are tackled in other countries, exchange ideas and understand different viewpoints.”
2. ~~That Oxford would have much to gain from twinning with a locality in Taiwan and expanding its international links to encompass East Asia.~~

*That it would be worthwhile for Oxford to explore the possibility of establishing friendship links with a locality in Taiwan with a view to expanding its international links to encompass East Asia in the long term.*

1. That a municipality-to-municipality relationship is separate from the UK’s official diplomatic position of recognising the People’s Republic of China and avoiding dealing with the Taiwan authorities on a government to government basis. Oxford is grateful for the friendship of people from throughout the People’s Republic of China and the contribution its citizens make to the city as visitors, students and residents.

**Council resolves:**

that Oxford City Council shall negotiate a twinning agreement with an appropriate municipality on the island of Taiwan.

~~to ask the Leader to write to the Taiwan Representative Office in the United Kingdom to formally request their assistance in arranging this.~~

# Adopting the C40 Mayors COVID-19 Recovery Task Force principles (proposed by Cllr Wolff, seconded by Cllr Simmons)

Green member motion

**This Council welcomes** the findings of the C40 Mayors COVID-19 Recovery Task Force that has published a set of principles aimed at rebuilding cities & economies in a way that ‘improves public health, reduces inequality and addresses the climate crisis’.

This Council notes the principles:

1. The recovery should not be a return to ‘business as usual’ - because that is a world on track for 3°C or more of over-heating;
2. The recovery, above all, must be guided by an adherence to public health and scientific expertise, in order to assure the safety of those who live in our cities;
3. Excellent public services, public investment and increased community resilience will form the most effective basis for the recovery;
4. The recovery must address issues of equity that have been laid bare by the impact of the crisis – for example, workers who are now recognised as essential should be celebrated and compensated accordingly and policies must support people living in informal settlements;
5. The recovery must improve the resilience of our city and communities. Therefore, investments should be made to protect against future threats – including the climate crisis – and to support those people impacted by climate and health risks;
6. Climate action can help accelerate economic recovery and enhance social equity, through the use of new technologies and the creation of new industries and new jobs. These will drive wider benefits for our residents, workers, students, businesses and visitors;
7. We commit to doing everything in our power to ensure that the recovery from COVID-19 is healthy, equitable and sustainable;
8. We commit to using our collective voices and individual actions to ensure that our national government supports both cities and the investments needed in cities, to deliver an economic recovery that is healthy, equitable and sustainable;
9. We commit to using our collective voices and individual actions to ensure that international and regional institutions invest directly in cities to support a healthy, equitable and sustainable recovery

**This Council agrees to monitor the on-going work of the Task Force and adopt the C40 Mayors principles in planning its own ‘build back better’ efforts.**

Source: <https://www.c40.org/other/covid-task-force>

# Disproportionate deaths from Covid-19 of Health and care workers from Black, Asian and ethnic minorities (proposed by Cllr Bely-Summers, seconded by Cllr Azad)

Labour member motion

People from Black, Asian and ethnic minority backgrounds are twice as likely to die of Covid-19 in the UK as white British people. This is the conclusion of the Public Health Report (PHE) Beyond the data: understanding the impact of Covid-19 on BAME groups.

44% of NHS doctors are from ethnic minority backgrounds but they accounted for 90% of the deaths of doctors. Black, Asians and ethnic minority nurses are 20% of the workforce but accounted for 75% of deaths.

Ethnic minority healthcare workers and care workers believe systemic racism and discrimination in the NHS and in the Social Care sector is one of the reasons many of their colleagues died.

The report highlights

* Lack of representation in senior roles
* Being less likely to seek care due to poorer experience with the NHS.
* Being less likely to speak up when they had concerns about PPE and risks
* A higher proportion of healthcare workers from ethnic minority working on Covid wards and care homes.

The Covid-19 pandemic has simply shone a light on a widespread entrenched problem. From the ongoing hostile environment and the Windrush scandal to the health surcharges for migrants. Local health unions have testimonies of ethnic minority healthcare workers and care workers not protected at work.

Some have left the profession, others have had to make life or death decisions. In modern Britain this is unacceptable.

The first PHE report commissioned by ministers explained why some populations groups are more affected than others but did not publish the recommendations which would have helped to reduce the disparities.

The chapter on community engagement was missing silencing again the voices of those who have been the most affected in spite of a very extensive consultation.

We have clapped for our NHS staff who have risked their lives to save us as well as our care workers. Far too many have made the ultimate sacrifice. Now it is time to address systemic racism, injustice and discriminations in our institutions and communities.

**Oxford City Council therefore**

1. **supports calls** for extensive research to be funded on the disproportionate number of deaths of ethnic minority workers and care workers with clear recommendations; **and**
2. **asks the Leader** to write to Matt Hancock, the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care, to request as a priority that PHE and the government implement in full and within a clear timeline all the seven recommendations set out in ‘*Beyond the data : understanding the impact of Covid-19 on BAME groups*’:

* comprehensive and quality ethnicity data collection and recording
* support community participatory research
* improve access, experiences and outcomes of NHS
* accelerate the development of culturally competent occupational risk assessment tools
* culturally competent Covid-19 education and prevention campaign
* target culturally competent health promotion and disease prevention programmes
* reduce inequalities caused by the wider determinants of health.

# Celebrating Oxford’s Diversity (proposed by Cllr Gant, seconded by Cllr Altaf Khan) [amendment proposed by Cllr Brown]

Liberal Democrat member motion

Council notes that varied communities make a huge contribution to the vitality and integrity of civic life here in Oxford. Council believes that contribution should be acknowledged as much as possible, and that this council should use its own resources of visibility and public leadership to do so.

**Council therefore agrees to** **ask Cabinet to** work towards establishing a list of the national days of the principal communities represented here in Oxford, to invite them to supply a flag, in consultation with officers over logistical matters such as size, which they would like to be flown from the Town Hall on their national day, and to instruct officers to undertake the necessary work.

**Amendment** proposed by Cllr Brown

Delete the second paragraph.

**The amendment if accepted changes the motion to:**

*Council notes that varied communities make a huge contribution to the vitality and integrity of civic life here in Oxford.*

*Council believes that contribution should be acknowledged as much as possible, and that this council should use its own resources of visibility and public leadership to do so.*

[ends]

# Against postponing County Council elections (proposed by Cllr Simmons, seconded by Cllr Wolff)

Green member motion

This Council opposes the proposal by the Conservative Leader of the County Council to delay the County elections planned for 2021 until 2022.

# Fossil fuel divestment (proposed by Cllr Hayes, seconded by Cllr Turner)

Labour member motion

Oxford City Council welcomes Oxfordshire Local Government Pension Fund’s climate-focused ambitions for its pension investments.

**This Council welcomes** the following changes by the Pension Fund as additions to an earlier decision to switch five per cent of its assets into a low carbon fund:

* To switch another six per cent of assets into a new Sustainable Equities Fund being developed by Brunel Pension Partnership, the company owned by Local Government Pension Funds to manage investments on their behalf.
* To introduce the target to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from investments by 7.6% p.a. in line with the Paris Agreement and a maximum 1.5°C increase in global temperatures. The world needs more business plans to be in line with or improve on the 2015 Paris Accord agreement over emission paths.

1. This Council congratulates the following for their contributions:

* Oxfordshire Pension Fund has travelled far in its plans to respond to the risks of climate breakdown, and this Council congratulates the Committee.
* the campaign group Fossil Free Oxfordshire and UNISON for co-operation with the Pension Fund and looks forward to seeing further collaboration.

Taking money out of fossil fuels is the right thing to do. It is also the financially prudent thing to do. Keeping fossil fuel companies in a portfolio reduces its total value, fossil fuel investments risk becoming ‘stranded assets’, and the climate crisis threatens the global economy and the ability of the Oxfordshire Local Government Pension Scheme to meet its liabilities.

In passing fossil fuel divestment motions, this Council has made clear that it makes no sense to invest in companies that undermine our future.

1. Oxfordshire Pension Fund’s journey must be completed.

**This Council asks the Leader to write to Oxfordshire Pension Fund to:**

* ensure the pledges to decarbonise the fund are underpinned by metrics that ensure the target emissions reductions will be met, including those that measure exposure to fossil fuel producers, not just fossil fuel users.
* request confirmation that it will exclude from the portfolio any companies that continue to explore for or develop new fossil fuel reserves.
* review the entire Climate Change Policy and Implementation Plan by 2022 at the latest, including 1) the effectiveness of engagement as stated in the implementation plan and; 2) progress on reducing greenhouse gas emissions (rather than waiting until 2025 as suggested in the implementation plan).

However ambitious a pension fund pool member may be, the pace toward emissions reductions of 7.6% p.a. will be limited by the fund offerings provided by Brunel.

Brunel has shown recent climate leadership, **but this Council asks the Leader to write to Oxfordshire Pension Fund to urge Brunel to go further by:**

* making a formal request to provide a range of funds that enable it to meet its 7.6% p.a. target while spreading risk, including zero carbon passive and managed funds.
* writing an open letter asking Brunel to reduce greenhouse gas emissions of all portfolios by 7.6% p.a. and to reduce the fossil fuel reserves exposure of their existing portfolios.

# Against postponing County Council elections (proposed by Cllr Roz Smith)

Liberal Democrat member motion

At the recent meeting of the County Council on July 14 the Leader of the Council, Cllr Ian Hudspeth, tabled a motion [[agenda item 15](https://mycouncil.oxfordshire.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=116&MId=5916&Ver=4)] which, among other things, called on the Leader to “write to the Secretary of State requesting that its 2021 elections are held over until 2022 to allow sufficient time to undertake an open and wide-ranging conversation with our local authority partners, residents and stakeholders to explore all options for a new future for Oxfordshire”.

**Council**

* **wholeheartedly opposes** any attempt to delay scheduled elections, further reducing democratic accountability, bearing in mind that other elections are also due to be held in May 2021, many of them already delayed by a year, and
* **instructs the Leader** to write to the Leader of the County Council and the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government communicating its view.

# Liveable Streets initiative (proposed by Cllr Wolff, seconded by Cllr Simmons) [amendment proposed by Cllr Henwood; amendment proposed by Cllr Arshad, seconded by Cllr Tanner]

Green member motion

**Council notes and supports** the County Council’s renewed interest in ‘liveable streets’ as evidenced by the inclusion of some low traffic neighbourhood (LTN) measures in the *Tranche 1 Active Travel* funding application and the inclusion of LTNs in the recently published Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP).

**Council also notes** that creating a liveable street requires coordinated action by both City and County Councils as many responsibilities span both authorities (e.g. noise, air quality, planting, community safety and so on). The City is also a potential contributor of funding and a key stakeholder for any infrastructure works within the City.

**Council notes** that the Greater London Authority has developed specific indicators (along with checklists, guidance and tools) for measuring the degree to which a street is ‘healthy’ and agrees to use these as part of its approach to designing and delivering liveable streets within the City.

[**The 10 key Healthy Streets Indicators**](https://healthystreets.com/home/about/), backed up by a measurement method, extensive case studies and guidance, are:

1. Everyone feels welcome
2. Easy to cross
3. Shade and shelter
4. Clean air
5. People feel relaxed
6. People choose to walk and cycle
7. Not too noisy
8. Places to stop and rest
9. People feel safe Things to see and do

Source: <https://healthystreets.com/home/about/>

Amendment proposed by Cllr Henwood

In the last paragraph, replace indicator *4 Clean air* with

*4 Air quality (to also include Low Traffic Neighbourhood Schemes and adjacent main roads)*

Amendment proposed by Cllr Arshad, seconded by Cllr Tanner

Insert new second paragraph:

***Council notes and supports t****he motion proposed by County Councillors John Sanders and Damian Haywood and passed unanimously by Oxfordshire County Council on 14 July 2020 to support the concept of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and aim to introduce them when and where feasible." Further, Council supports the efforts of Oxfordshire Liveable Streets (OLS) and Labour City and County Councillors throughout the City to give effect to this motion.*

Amend next two paragraphs to add words in italics:

**Council also notes** that creating a liveable street requires coordinated action by both City and County Councils as many responsibilities span both authorities (e.g. noise, air quality, planting, community safety and so on), *although ultimately responsibility sits with the County Council.* The City is also a potential contributor of funding and a key stakeholder for any infrastructure works within the City *and should continue to enable changes which are joined up and achieve an integrated transportation plan.*

**Council notes** that the Greater London Authority has developed specific indicators (along with checklists, guidance and tools) for measuring the degree to which a street is ‘healthy’ and agrees to *encourage the County Council to* use these as part of its approach to designing and delivering liveable streets within the City.

**The amendments if both are accepted change the motion to:**

**Council notes and supports** the County Council’s renewed interest in ‘liveable streets’ as evidenced by the inclusion of some low traffic neighbourhood (LTN) measures in the *Tranche 1 Active Travel* funding application and the inclusion of LTNs in the recently published Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP).

***Council notes and supports t****he motion proposed by County Councillors John Sanders and Damian Haywood and passed unanimously by Oxfordshire County Council on 14 July 2020 to support the concept of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and aim to introduce them when and where feasible." Further, Council supports the efforts of Oxfordshire Liveable Streets (OLS) and Labour City and County Councillors throughout the City to give effect to this motion.*

**Council also notes** that creating a liveable street requires coordinated action by both City and County Councils as many responsibilities span both authorities (e.g. noise, air quality, planting, community safety and so on), *although ultimately responsibility sits with the County Council.* The City is also a potential contributor of funding and a key stakeholder for any infrastructure works within the City *and should continue to enable changes which are joined up and achieve an integrated transportation plan.*

**Council notes** that the Greater London Authority has developed specific indicators (along with checklists, guidance and tools) for measuring the degree to which a street is ‘healthy’ and agrees to *encourage the County Council to* use these as part of its approach to designing and delivering liveable streets within the City.

**The 10 key Healthy Streets Indicators**, backed up by a measurement method, extensive case studies and guidance, are:

1. Everyone feels welcome
2. Easy to cross
3. Shade and shelter
4. *~~Clean air~~ Air quality (to also include Low Traffic Neighbourhood Schemes and adjacent main roads)*
5. People feel relaxed
6. People choose to walk and cycle
7. Not too noisy
8. Places to stop and rest
9. People feel safe Things to see and do

Source: <https://healthystreets.com/home/about/>