

**To: Council**  
**Date: 5 October 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 23 September 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.

**Cross party motions as agreed by the group leaders will be taken first. Motions will be then taken in turn from the Green group, the Labour group, the Liberal Democrat group, and an Independent member (if any) in that order.**

### Introduction

- a) Cross party motion: Designated Bathing Water Status for the River Thames (proposed by Cllr Linda Smith, seconded by Cllr Simmons, supported by Cllr Gant)
- b) Applying and monitoring Coronavirus Restrictions (proposed by Cllr Wolff, seconded by Cllr Simmons) [amendment proposed by Cllr Brown]
- c) Local Government reorganisation (proposed by Cllr Brown, seconded by Cllr Hayes) [amendment proposed by Cllr Gant]
- d) Introduction of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods to Oxford City (proposed by Cllr Landell Mills, seconded by Cllr Roz Smith) [amendment proposed by Cllr Wolff and amendment proposed by Cllr Hayes]
- e) Going wild (proposed by Cllr Henwood, seconded by Cllr Goddard) [amendment proposed by Cllr Linda Smith]
- f) A consistent definition of net zero buildings (proposed by Cllr Wolff, seconded by Cllr Simmons) [amendment proposed by Cllr Turner]
- g) Government Proposals for Planning Reform (proposed by Cllr Hollingsworth,)
- h) Planning system and undermining of Local Democracy (proposed by Cllr Gant, seconded by Cllr Garden) [amendment proposed by Cllr Hollingsworth]

- i) Chinese New Year 2021 (proposed by Cllr Henwood)
- j) Liveable streets (proposed by Cllr Simmons, seconded by Cllr Wolff) [amendment proposed by Cllr Tanner]
- k) Domestic Abuse and Covid-19 workplace and community safety (proposed by Cllr Aziz, seconded by Cllr Taylor)
- l) Carbon targets (proposed by Cllr Gant, seconded by Cllr Wade)

**a) Cross party motion: Designated Bathing Water Status for the River Thames (proposed by Cllr Linda Smith, seconded by Cllr Simmons, supported by Cllr Gant)**

Cross party motion

**This Council notes** that the River Thames is chronically polluted with sewage. It is currently legal for Thames Water to dump raw, untreated sewage into the river at times of heavy rainfall when treatment works are overwhelmed. Its sewage works spilled untreated liquid waste into the upper Thames for over 17,000 hours during 2019.

Contact with polluted water can endanger people's health; furthermore untreated sewage is bad for wildlife.

**This Council asks** Thames Water to immediately provide real time data of where and when sewage works are overflowing so that Oxford residents will know without delay about the risks of taking to the river to swim or participate in other water sports.

**This Council calls** on Thames Water to upgrade its sewage treatment works so they are fit for the 21st Century, and take account of a growing population and more extreme rainfall events due to climate change.

**This Council notes** that the Environment Agency has had its funding slashed since 2010 which has reduced its capacity to enforce environmental regulations. Environment Agency staff numbers have been cut and there has been a sharp decline in the amount of sampling carried out. Consequently pollution incidents have increased while the number of prosecutions have fallen.

**This Council asks the Leader to write to urge** the city's Members of Parliament to demand adequate government funding for the Environment Agency and to do all they can to hold the agency to account for the important responsibility it has protecting our waterways and to ask our MPs to support stricter environmental legislation for the UK after we leave the EU, and reject any proposals to use Brexit to weaken current environmental protection laws.

**This Council requests Cabinet** adopt plans for an application for Designated Bathing Water Status for a stretch of the Thames in Oxford.

Designation by the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs would mean improved monitoring of water quality and better protection for the river from pollution. It will ensure Oxford residents have access to the information they need to be properly informed about the risks of enjoying our beautiful river Isis.

**b) Applying and monitoring Coronavirus Restrictions (proposed by Cllr Wolff, seconded by Cllr Simmons) [amendment proposed by Cllr Brown]**

Green member motion

**Original motion**

Council notes that concerns over coronavirus (Covid19) continue with the ever present threat of even tighter restrictions being implemented here in Oxford. At the time of writing, Oxford City has entered amber alert on several occasions, based on weekly case numbers per 100,000.

On September 22 the Government announced further restrictions in England.

Under the Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions) (England), published in July 2020, considerable powers have been given to Oxfordshire County Council to make a direction to, for example, to restrict access to, or close, individual premises, to prohibit certain events and to restrict access to, or close, public outdoor places in Oxford and elsewhere across the County. In September, the County agreed to pass on the powers to enforce these rules to the City alongside its existing environmental health duties.

This Council hopes that these new powers will never be needed, but agrees that it needs to be prepared to respond rapidly, strategically and decisively to the issuing of any direction as well as responding in a coordinated manner (alongside other authorities) on other local matters relating to management of coronavirus, the provision of public information and the impact on Council service delivery in Oxford (for example, liaising with the universities, public health authorities and others).

This Council therefore agrees to ask the Assistant Chief Executive and Head of Regulatory Services to bring a report to Cabinet setting out how these powers will be implemented, including the decision making process, and how Members will be kept informed of action taken under these powers to ensure transparency and accountability.

**Amendment proposed by Cllr Brown and accepted by Cllr Wolff**

Amend the last paragraph to read:

*This Council therefore agrees to ask the Assistant Chief Executive and Head of Regulatory Services to ~~bring a report to Cabinet~~ produce a detailed briefing for members setting out how these powers will be implemented, including the decision making process, and how Members will be kept informed of action taken under these powers to ensure transparency and accountability.*

**The substantive motion (including the amendment) for debate now reads:**

Council notes that concerns over coronavirus (Covid19) continue with the ever present threat of even tighter restrictions being implemented here in Oxford. At the time of writing, Oxford City has entered amber alert on several occasions, based on weekly case numbers per 100,000.

On September 22 the Government announced further restrictions in England.

Under the Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions) (England), published in July 2020, considerable powers have been given to Oxfordshire County Council to make a direction to, for example, to restrict access to, or close, individual premises, to prohibit certain events and to restrict access to, or close, public outdoor places in Oxford and

elsewhere across the County. In September, the County agreed to pass on the powers to enforce these rules to the City alongside its existing environmental health duties.

This Council hopes that these new powers will never be needed, but agrees that it needs to be prepared to respond rapidly, strategically and decisively to the issuing of any direction as well as responding in a coordinated manner (alongside other authorities) on other local matters relating to management of coronavirus, the provision of public information and the impact on Council service delivery in Oxford (for example, liaising with the universities, public health authorities and others).

This Council therefore agrees to ask the Assistant Chief Executive and Head of Regulatory Services to *produce a detailed briefing for members* setting out how these powers will be implemented, including the decision making process, and how Members will be kept informed of action taken under these powers to ensure transparency and accountability.

### **c) Local Government reorganisation (proposed by Cllr Brown, seconded by Cllr Hayes) [amendment proposed by Cllr Gant]**

#### Labour member motion

#### **Original motion**

This Council notes that despite the urgent need to concentrate on recovery from the COVID pandemic and lockdown, the Government seem determined to pursue local government reorganisation as part of an explicit centralising and anti-democratic agenda. Evidence of the same agenda is clear in proposals for planning and for the NHS. The Government's criteria require over-large local authorities remote from their populations, and elected mayors whose primary accountability will be to Central Government rather than to local people.

This Council recognises the enormous economic and social challenge currently facing our city and our most vulnerable citizens and states its firm resolve to take every opportunity to support local businesses, local people and their health and well-being.

Council notes that local business leaders and employers have clearly said that now is not the time for local government to be looking inward, but to be working together to solve the problems the current crisis has caused. This Council agrees.

This Council is appalled that it is in this context that the government is proposing instead to reorganise local government for ideological reasons, putting at risk our ability to support our city and its citizens in their time of need.

If, as now seems possible, the government itself feels that this is not the right approach, this Council calls upon them to make that clear. This council notes that leading Labour, Tory, Liberal Democrat and Green councillors from across the county are on the record as saying they do not support the imposition against local people's wishes of a large, remote and over centralised authority.

This Council makes clear that the expense and disruption caused by a reorganisation now would be a wilful act of harm to Oxford, our economy and our citizens.

**This Council therefore asks the Leader** to write to the Secretary of State to make clear their proposals for local government and to seek reassurance for local citizens that no such reorganisation will be imposed upon Oxford. Instead this Council asks that the Government gives the necessary powers and financial support to all Oxfordshire's local authorities in this time of crisis.

### **Amendment proposed by Cllr Gant**

**Insert** new 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> paragraphs:

*Council recognises that the current two-tier system is far from perfect. Regular disconnects between councils have included this council and the county taking opposing positions on the extension of Seacourt Park and Ride, and cabinet members of this council openly acknowledging disagreements with their county colleagues on, for example, the extent of the proposed Workplace Parking Levy and on other traffic-management measures. The result, too often, has been delay, indecision, and lack of delivery. Clearly, the ideal is a genuinely coherent programme for government across all our councils.*

*However, central government is once again hitting us with the triple whammy of a staggering lack of clarity about their intentions and timings, a centralising agenda utterly antipathetic to local democracy, and a failure to fund local services sustainably; all combined with their own basic lack of competence. The only thing this government is good at is U-turns.*

### **If agreed the amended motion would read:**

This Council notes that despite the urgent need to concentrate on recovery from the COVID pandemic and lockdown, the Government seem determined to pursue local government reorganisation as part of an explicit centralising and anti-democratic agenda. Evidence of the same agenda is clear in proposals for planning and for the NHS. The Government's criteria require over-large local authorities remote from their populations, and elected mayors whose primary accountability will be to Central Government rather than to local people.

This Council recognises the enormous economic and social challenge currently facing our city and our most vulnerable citizens and states its firm resolve to take every opportunity to support local businesses, local people and their health and well-being.

*Council recognises that the current two-tier system is far from perfect. Regular disconnects between councils have included this council and the county taking opposing positions on the extension of Seacourt Park and Ride, and cabinet members of this council openly acknowledging disagreements with their county colleagues on, for example, the extent of the proposed Workplace Parking Levy and on other traffic-management measures. The result, too often, has been delay, indecision, and lack of delivery. Clearly, the ideal is a genuinely coherent programme for government across all our councils.*

*However, central government is once again hitting us with the triple whammy of a staggering lack of clarity about their intentions and timings, a centralising agenda utterly antipathetic to local democracy, and a failure to fund local services sustainably; all combined with their own basic lack of competence. The only thing this government is good at is U-turns.*

Council notes that local business leaders and employers have clearly said that now is not the time for local government to be looking inward, but to be working together to solve the problems the current crisis has caused. This Council agrees.

This Council is appalled that it is in this context that the government is proposing instead to reorganise local government for ideological reasons, putting at risk our ability to support our city and its citizens in their time of need.

If, as now seems possible, the government itself feels that this is not the right approach, this Council calls upon them to make that clear. This Council notes that leading Labour, Tory, Liberal Democrat and Green councillors from across the county are on the record as saying they do not support the imposition against local people's wishes of a large, remote and over centralised authority.

This Council makes clear that the expense and disruption caused by a reorganisation now would be a wilful act of harm to Oxford, our economy and our citizens.

This Council therefore asks the Leader to write to the Secretary of State to make clear their proposals for local government and to seek reassurance for local citizens that no such reorganisation will be imposed upon Oxford. Instead this Council asks that the Government gives the necessary powers and financial support to all Oxfordshire's local authorities in this time of crisis.

**d) Introduction of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods to Oxford City (proposed by Cllr Landell Mills, seconded by Cllr Roz Smith) [amendment proposed by Cllr Wolff and amendment proposed by Cllr Hayes]**

Liberal Democrat member motion

**Original motion**

This Council welcomes the public discussions which are taking place in this city about the value of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) in encouraging walking and cycling, preventing rat-running, and decreasing air pollution, while also having the positive effect of opening up residential and shopping streets for local communities, supporting local businesses and boosting community ties. This ongoing discussion is informed by successful LTNs in Waltham Forest, Groeningen in the Netherlands and Ghent in Belgium.

This Council notes that Tranche 1 money received by the County Council was a fraction of that expected due in part to the short time scale and projects, including design of LTNs not being fully worked up. The County Council Tranche 2 bid is more ambitious with LTNs for the Florence Park, Church Cowley, Divinity Road, Jericho and Headington areas.

**This Council therefore commits**

1. to help local residents' groups fight for LTNs to be designed so as to get the main benefits but without imposing unreasonable, adverse consequences.
2. to support further studies and consultation as required to develop LTNs.
3. to agree to provide financial support to the capital cost, as appropriate to the delivery of each LTN. subject to the allocation of a budget by Council and/or Cabinet

\* Part of Dept of Transport [Emergency active travel fund: local transport authority allocations](#)

**1. Amendment 1 proposed by Cllr Wolff, seconded by Cllr Simmons**

In 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph:

Insert after 'due in part to' the words '*lack of ambition,*'

Delete list of LTNs and replace with '*St Mary's, St Clements, Divinity Road, Old Headington, New Headington, Quarry, Jericho and Walton Manor*'

Delete Florence Park and Church Cowley as these were Tranche 1 schemes.

So that paragraph now reads:

*This Council notes that Tranche 1\* money received by the County Council was a fraction of that expected due in part to the lack of ambition, short time scale and projects, including design of LTNs not being fully worked up. The County Council Tranche 2 bid is more ambitious with LTNs for the St Mary's, St Clements, Divinity Road, Old Headington, New Headington, Quarry, Jericho and Walton Manor areas.*

Add new recommendation

*4. To provide clear guidance to Councillors on the use of ward member CIL funds to support LTN scheme design and implementation*

## 2. Amendment 2 proposed by Cllr Hayes

**Insert the words in red italics and remove the words struckthrough:**

This Council welcomes the public discussions which are taking place in this city about the value of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) in encouraging walking and cycling, preventing rat-running, and decreasing air pollution, while also having the positive effect of opening up residential and shopping streets for local communities, supporting local businesses and boosting community ties. This ongoing discussion is informed by successful LTNs in Waltham Forest, Groeningen in the Netherlands and Ghent in Belgium.

*Council supports the efforts of Oxfordshire Liveable Streets (OLS) and the motion proposed by County Councillors John Sanders and Damian Haywood and passed unanimously by Oxfordshire County Council on 14 July 2020 to back Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and introduce them when and where feasible.*

*Nationwide there is a debate about LTNs. LTNs may create differences of views in a diverse city such as Oxford. In a democracy, we can all air our views and, through the pressing of points, deepening of understanding, and forging of consensus, we can ensure that LTNs are introduced in the right way in the right places. That way change can be lasting and widely supported.*

This Council notes that Tranche 1\* money received by the County Council was *half* of that expected *because of*:

- *The Department for Transport explicitly saying that bolder T1 proposals would win larger sums of funding, leading to the implication that less ambitious T1 proposals would win smaller sums of funding. Oxfordshire did not receive its entitlement because the schemes of the County Council were not sufficiently ambitious about meaningful change or reallocation of road space.*
- *Short timescales for the preparation and submission of a bid, although many other local authorities were awarded a full allocation of funding, with some receiving even more (for example, Bucks and Central Bedfordshire receiving 112% of their funding allocation).*
- *The rural focus of the County Council's T1 bid when the Department for Transport sought to fund areas capable of making tangible changes. This requirement should have led the County Council to focus on the transport needs of urban areas such as Oxford City.*

The County Council Tranche 2 bid is more ambitious with LTNs for the Florence Park, Church Cowley, Divinity Road, Jericho and Headington areas.

This Council therefore commits

1. to *encourage* local residents' groups *and elected members in their efforts to engage communities in discussion about* LTNs, so that they may be designed to get the main benefits without imposing unreasonable, adverse consequences. *Local people know their streets better than anyone else and must be able to shape their communities. Consultation should precede the introduction of LTNs.*
2. to support further studies and consultation to develop LTNs *as an evidence-based and democratic approach. The benefits of transportation changes should not be conferred upon one community at the expense of any other.*



3. *to continue to encourage the County Council as transport authority to fund schemes including LTNs.*
4. *to continue to encourage the County Council to submit funding requests to national Government to deliver LTNs and related transportation changes.*

**If both amendments are agreed, motion as amended would read:**

[Cllr Hayes 'amendment in red italic, Cllr Wolff's in blue underlined italics]

This Council welcomes the public discussions which are taking place in this city about the value of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) in encouraging walking and cycling, preventing rat-running, and decreasing air pollution, while also having the positive effect of opening up residential and shopping streets for local communities, supporting local businesses and boosting community ties. This ongoing discussion is informed by successful LTNs in Waltham Forest, Groeningen in the Netherlands and Ghent in Belgium.

*Council supports the efforts of Oxfordshire Liveable Streets (OLS) and the motion proposed by County Councillors John Sanders and Damian Haywood and passed unanimously by Oxfordshire County Council on 14 July 2020 to back Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and introduce them when and where feasible.*

*Nationwide there is a debate about LTNs. LTNs may create differences of views in a diverse city such as Oxford. In a democracy, we can all air our views and, through the pressing of points, deepening of understanding, and forging of consensus, we can ensure that LTNs are introduced in the right way in the right places. That way change can be lasting and widely supported.*

This Council notes that Tranche 1\* money received by the County Council was *half* of that expected *due in part to the lack of ambition and because of:*

- *The Department for Transport explicitly saying that bolder T1 proposals would win larger sums of funding, leading to the implication that less ambitious T1 proposals would win smaller sums of funding. Oxfordshire did not receive its entitlement because the schemes of the County Council were not sufficiently ambitious about meaningful change or reallocation of road space.*
- *Short timescales for the preparation and submission of a bid, although many other local authorities were awarded a full allocation of funding, with some receiving even more (for example, Bucks and Central Bedfordshire receiving 112% of their funding allocation).*
- *The rural focus of the County Council's T1 bid when the Department for Transport sought to fund areas capable of making tangible changes. This requirement should have led the County Council to focus on the transport needs of urban areas such as Oxford City.*

The County Council Tranche 2 bid is more ambitious with LTNs for the *St Mary's, St Clements, Divinity Road, Old Headington, New Headington, Quarry, Jericho and Walton Manor areas.*

This Council therefore commits

1. *to encourage local residents' groups and elected members in their efforts to engage communities in discussion about LTNs, so that they may be designed to get the main benefits without imposing unreasonable, adverse consequences. Local people know their streets better than anyone else and must*

*be able to shape their communities. Consultation should precede the introduction of LTNs.*

2. *to support further studies and consultation to develop LTNs as an evidence-based and democratic approach. The benefits of transportation changes should not be conferred upon one community at the expense of any other.*
3. *to continue to encourage the County Council as transport authority to fund schemes including LTNs.*
4. *to continue to encourage the County Council to submit funding requests to national Government to deliver LTNs and related transportation changes.*
5. *To provide clear guidance to Councillors on the use of ward member CIL funds to support LTN scheme design and implementation*

**e) Going wild (proposed by Cllr Henwood, seconded by Cllr Goddard)  
[amendment proposed by Cllr Linda Smith]**

Independent member motion

**Original motion**

Managed Wildlife corridors are an important means of preserving and developing a bio-diversity in towns and cities. Oxford City Council in collaboration with interested parties will review how verges adjacent to pathways, roads, playing fields and cemeteries are managed with the aim of developing managed wildlife verges of bio-diversity.

Council resolves to

liaise with its stakeholders and partners including schools, colleges, Universities, community centres, Parish Councils to convert verges into wildlife habitats, by reducing the number of times verges are cut each year (currently monthly during the growing season) and proactively encouraging the introduction of wildlife plants to populate managed areas within Oxford City.

Therefore, the Council asks that:

- on the Council's behalf the Leader writes to the Leader of Oxfordshire County Council requesting the review of verge management practice, and the introduction of wildlife flowers.
- the Transition Director brings a report to Cabinet with proposals for setting up a review of current practice and presenting a scheme to introduce wild flowers and pollinators to verges within Oxford City, and local councillors and residents or interested parties liaise with any proposed city council working group to review future practice of verge management.

**Amendment proposed by Cllr Linda Smith**

**Insert words in red italics and remove struck-through words:**

Managed Wildlife corridors are an important means of preserving and developing bio-diversity in towns and cities. ~~Oxford City Council in collaboration with interested parties will review how verges adjacent to pathways, roads, playing fields and cemeteries are managed with the aim of developing managed wildlife verges of bio-diversity~~ *and there is the potential in Oxford to create more of these important habitats.*

Council resolves to ~~liaise~~ work with ~~its~~ stakeholders and partners including schools, colleges, Universities, community centres and Parish Councils to convert verges into wildlife habitats ~~by reducing the number of times verges are cut each year (currently monthly during the growing season) and proactively encouraging the introduction of wildlife plants to populate managed areas within Oxford City.~~ *where possible.*

Delete from ...'Therefore the Council asks.... ' to the end and replace with

*Members of the council give their thanks to the council officers and ODS staff who have worked on proposals for increasing biodiversity in the city, these proposals include the possibility of less frequent mowing of some verges as well as the creation of additional wildlife areas in our parks and open spaces.*

*This council notes that these proposals involve additional expenditure and are being considered as part of the 2021/2022 budget setting process.*

This *Council* requests *that the* Cabinet Member for Leisure and Parks continues to work *with officers, local councillors, residents*, park user groups and other interested local community groups to improve biodiversity in our city.

**If agreed the motion as amended would read**

Managed Wildlife corridors are an important means of preserving and developing biodiversity in towns and cities *and there is the potential in Oxford to create more of these important habitats.*

Council resolves to work with stakeholders and partners including schools, colleges, Universities, community centres and Parish Councils to convert verges into wildlife habitats *where possible.*

*Members of the council give their thanks to the council officers and ODS staff who have worked on proposals for increasing biodiversity in the city, these proposals include the possibility of less frequent mowing of some verges as well as the creation of additional wildlife areas in our parks and open spaces.*

*This Council notes that these proposals involve additional expenditure and are being considered as part of the 2021/2022 budget setting process.*

This *Council* requests *that the* Cabinet Member for Leisure and Parks continues to *work with officers, local councillors, residents*, park user groups and other interested local community groups to improve biodiversity in our city.

**f) A consistent definition of net zero buildings (proposed by Cllr Wolff, seconded by Cllr Simmons) [amendment proposed by Cllr Turner]**

Green member motion

Oxford City Council is listed as a member of the UK Green Building Council (UKGBC), along with Cambridge, Bristol and 43 other local authorities.

1. For the sake of clarity in public discourse, the Council therefore accepts at a point in the future the 'framework definition' of 'net zero carbon buildings' as developed by the UKGBC, which in summary states:

*Net zero carbon – construction (1.1):*

*When the amount of carbon emissions associated with a building's product and construction stages up to practical completion is zero or negative, through the use of offsets or the net export of on-site renewable energy.*

*Net zero carbon – operational energy (1.2):*

*When the amount of carbon emissions associated with the building's operational energy on an annual basis is zero or negative. A net zero carbon building is highly energy efficient and powered from on-site and/or off-site renewable energy sources, with any remaining carbon balance, after all efforts have been otherwise made, offset.*

*Note: The framework also provides reporting templates, which (if followed) enable claims of 'net zero' construction and operation to be supported with evidence.*

2. **Council will ensure that:**

- 'net zero' claims made by house-builders and the Council are evidentially supportable
3. **Council asks** that the Head of Regeneration & Economy brings a report to Cabinet setting out proposals as to how the authority can ensure that:
    - its own properties meet net-zero operational standards by 2030 at the latest
    - all new build by the Council meets net zero carbon construction standards by 2030 at the latest; and
    - this is reflected in the relevant planning policies and guidance when they are reviewed in the future.

**Amendment proposed by Cllr Turner**

Insert words in red italics

in 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph (point 1)

For the sake of clarity in public discourse, the Council therefore accepts at a point in the future the 'framework definition' of 'net zero carbon buildings' as developed by the UKGBC *would be a positive step*, which in summary states:

In points 2

*Council will ask the Cabinet to investigate ways to ensure that:* net zero' claims made by house-builders and the Council are evidentially supportable

In point 3

Council asks that the Head of Regeneration & Economy brings a report to Cabinet setting out *the cost that would be attached to* proposals as to how the authority can ensure that:

- its own properties meet net-zero operational standards by 2030 at the latest; *and*
- all new build by the Council meets net zero carbon construction standards by 2030 at the latest; and
- *it further explores the possibility of reflecting* this ~~-is reflected-~~ in the relevant planning policies and guidance when they are reviewed in the future.

### **If agreed the motion as amended would read**

Oxford City Council is listed as a member of the UK Green Building Council ([UKGBC](#)), along with Cambridge, Bristol and 43 other local authorities.

1. For the sake of clarity in public discourse, the Council therefore accepts at a point in the future the 'framework definition' of 'net zero carbon buildings' as developed by the UKGBC *would be a positive step*, which in summary states:

*Net zero carbon – construction (1.1):*

*When the amount of carbon emissions associated with a building's product and construction stages up to practical completion is zero or negative, through the use of offsets or the net export of on-site renewable energy.*

*Net zero carbon – operational energy (1.2):*

*When the amount of carbon emissions associated with the building's operational energy on an annual basis is zero or negative. A net zero carbon building is highly energy efficient and powered from on-site and/or off-site renewable energy sources, with any remaining carbon balance, after all efforts have been otherwise made, offset.*

*Note: The framework also provides reporting templates, which (if followed) enable claims of 'net zero' construction and operation to be supported with evidence.*

2. *Council will ask the Cabinet to investigate ways to ensure that:* net zero' claims made by house-builders and the Council are evidentially supportable
3. Council asks that the Head of Regeneration & Economy brings a report to Cabinet setting out *the cost that would be attached to* proposals as to how the authority can ensure that:
  - its own properties meet net-zero operational standards by 2030 at the latest; *and*
  - all new build by the Council meets net zero carbon construction standards by 2030 at the latest; and
  - *it further explores the possibility of reflecting* this in the relevant planning policies and guidance when they are reviewed in the future.

## **g) Government Proposals for Planning Reform (proposed by Cllr Hollingsworth,)**

### Labour member motion

The planning system created by the Town and Country Planning Act 1947 strikes a balance between the rights of individual landowners and the rights of past, present and future citizens. That balance is sometimes uncomfortable and difficult to manage, but on the whole it has worked.

The Government's Planning White Paper and the simultaneous proposals to cut affordable and social housing contributions from developments of up to 50 homes, sets out to destroy that balance.

The Town and Country Planning Association say “ *the proposals will undermine local democracy, marginalise local councils and fail to achieve the kind of high-quality places that the government is committed to delivering*” and that “*the tendency to side-line the voice of people and centralise the system a clearly expressed in the intent of this White Paper*”.

### **This Council agrees.**

The basis for the proposed ‘reforms’ is the claim that the planning system holds up development; this is demonstrably false. More than one million homes with planning permission have not been built, and more than 90% of planning applications are approved. The failure to build new housing is not a result of the planning system, but of market failure and above all the failure to invest in social housing.

The proposed Zoning system will take away most of the rights for local people to raise concerns and objections to planning applications. The increase in permitted development rights gives power to those who already have it and takes power away from those without; we have seen the consequences of this sort of deregulation in homes built without windows, what the RIBA rightly called ‘tomorrow’s slums’.

The proposal to allow automatically developments that are ‘beautiful’ – a term that is impossible to define meaningfully – reduces the debate to what buildings look like, and doesn’t allow local communities any input into what those buildings are for.

Rather than provide more desperately needed social housing, the Government’s proposals will cut it. In Oxford, where the largest development sites are rare, the changed definition of a small site means that hundreds of social housing units will be lost.

And worse, that number will be further reduced by the proposed requirement that 25% of affordable homes should be First Homes, homes to buy at a small discount.

In total more than 900 council homes for rent – the only genuinely affordable tenure for so many people – will be lost.

This city, like so many places across the county does not need attacks on the planning system and local democracy; what it needs is a mass programme of social housing to provide affordable, secure and decent homes for all our citizens.

### **This Council therefore:**

- **supports** all efforts to oppose the anti-democratic and centralising proposals put forward by the Government;
- **asks the Leader of the Council** to write to the Government, to the Local Government Association and to other bodies expressing that view;
- **supports** Shelter’s campaign that the Government should commit to building 200,000 new social homes a year by 2035.

## **h) Planning system and undermining of Local Democracy (proposed by Cllr Gant, seconded by Cllr Garden) [amendment proposed by Cllr Hollingworth]**

### Liberal Democrat member motion

Given the Secretary of State said in a recent interview that he wants to introduce changes to the planning system that allow local people to protect environmentally sensitive land like Green Belt, and SSSI to "hand it onto the next generation", this Council calls on the leader to write to the Secretary of State for Housing Communities and Local Government stating its agreement with that principle.

### Amendment proposed by Cllr Hollingsworth

DELETE words struck through: ~~Given the Secretary of State said in a recent interview that he wants to introduce changes to the planning system that allow local people to protect environmentally sensitive land like Green Belt, and SSSI to "hand it onto the next generation"~~, this Council calls on the leader [remainder of motion unchanged]

AMEND TO add words in red italics: *The purpose of the planning system has always been to provide decent homes, jobs and communities for current and future generations while protecting our natural environment using tools like Green Belt designation, something that should only be changed in exceptional circumstances. Striking those balances is something that is best done by local planning authorities elected by local people and taking all views into consideration.* This Council therefore calls on the Leader.....

### If agreed the motion as amended would read

(original text in black, amended text in red italics)

*The purpose of the planning system has always been to provide decent homes, jobs and communities for current and future generations while protecting our natural environment using tools like Green Belt designation, something that should only be changed in exceptional circumstances. Striking those balances is something that is best done by local planning authorities elected by local people and taking all views into consideration.* This Council therefore calls on the Leader to write to the Secretary of State for Housing Communities and Local Government stating its agreement with that principle.



## **i) Chinese New Year 2021 (proposed by Cllr Henwood)**

### Independent member motion

Some 24,000 students study at Oxford University, including approximately 1,068 students from China of which 631 are graduates and 360 undergraduates and the remainder visiting students.

Oxford also remains a popular destination for Chinese tourists that number 13,000 (from a Visit Britain report) annually. China contributes much to Oxford's economy and cultural diversity.

In recent months the Chinese government has been under pressure to contain the coronavirus. China's resolve in trying to contain this virus has received global recognition, however, at the same time Chinese and Asian citizens living in Oxford have been subject to prejudicial statements.

The Chinese New Year celebration is organised by the Chinese Community Advice Centre every year at Oxford Town Hall and in 2020 it was decided to cancel the event due to the coronavirus outbreak in China.

2021 is the year of Chinese zodiac Ox sign. Ox people born in this year should have a particular connection to Oxford. A connection Oxford City Council should also recognise and celebrate.

**Council is resolved to** reassure Chinese and Asian stakeholders that Oxford will not tolerate of any kind of discrimination, and to further demonstrate that Oxford is a welcoming and diverse city to all.

**Therefore, Council asks** that the Head of Communities offer to rescind charges for renting the town hall for next years (2021) Chinese New Year celebrations.

**j) Liveable streets (proposed by Cllr Simmons, seconded by Cllr Wolff)  
[amendment proposed 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 and Tranche 2 Active Travel funding applications and the inclusion of LTNs in the recently published Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP).

Council notes and supports the motion 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 also notes that creating a liveable street requires more than just traffic reduction (which of course is the primary responsibility of the County Council). A liveable or 'healthy' street requires, for example, it is quiet and clean, has good air quality, has attractive planting, encourages biodiversity and is safe for residents. These aspects are the primary responsibility of the City Council.

With this wider definition of a liveable street in mind, the Greater London Authority has developed a specific set of indicators (along with checklists, guidance and tools) for measuring the degree to which a street is 'healthy'.

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

Council agrees to adopt and be guided by the Healthy Streets Indicators when considering how to best support the introduction of LTNs and when considering other neighbourhood or street level regeneration.

**Amendment proposed by Cllr Tanner**

Insert in the final paragraph, after '*Council agrees to adopt and.....*'

The words: "*subject to finance and prior public consultation*".

The final paragraph would then read:

'Council agrees to adopt and, *subject to finance and prior public consultation*, be guided by the Healthy Streets Indicators when considering how to best support the introduction of LTNs and when considering other neighbourhood or street level regeneration.

**If agreed the motion as amended would read**

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 and Tranche 2 Active Travel funding applications and the inclusion of LTNs in the recently published Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP).

Council notes and supports the motion 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 also notes that creating a liveable street requires more than just traffic reduction (which of course is the primary responsibility of the County Council). A liveable or 'healthy' street requires, for example, it is quiet and clean, has good air

quality, has attractive planting, encourages biodiversity and is safe for residents. These aspects are the primary responsibility of the City Council.

With this wider definition of a liveable street in mind, the Greater London Authority has developed a specific set of indicators (along with checklists, guidance and tools) for measuring the degree to which a street is 'healthy'.

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

Council agrees to adopt and, *subject to finance and prior public consultation*, be guided by the Healthy Streets Indicators when considering how to best support the introduction of LTNs and when considering other neighbourhood or street level regeneration.

## **k) Domestic Abuse and Covid-19 workplace and community safety (proposed by Cllr Aziz, seconded by Cllr Taylor)**

### Labour member motion

This Council notes more than 40,000 calls and contacts were made to the National Domestic Abuse Helpline during the first three months of the Covid-19 lockdown, as reported by the BBC in July 2020.

Domestic Abuse is a common form of violence, overwhelmingly impacting women and girls globally and nationally and here in Oxford. Men and children are also impacted by domestic abuse as are non-binary and LGBTQI+ people.

According to women's groups, at least twenty six women including children have been killed in domestic homicides since the lockdown started, the eldest victim was over 82 years old and the youngest were four and two, killed alongside their mother.

Domestic Abuse impacts people of all ages, genders, race, disabilities and class, as well as work places, places of worship, places of learning and all communities.

This Council recognises people with insecure immigration status are especially vulnerable to seeking help due to the Hostile Environment, leaving many homeless and facing additional threats with pregnant migrant women facing particular risks.

This Council recognises the Covid pandemic, lockdowns and restriction of movement, means there is a greater need for increased protection and support for victims and survivors in Oxford.

### **This Council resolves:**

#### **to ask the Head of Business Improvement to submit a report to Cabinet setting out proposals to**

- Develop a Domestic Abuse in the Workplace Policy for Oxford City Council and encourage Oxford's workplaces to do the same. As the government instructs people to work from home over the next six months, this council encourages all workplaces to prioritise domestic abuse as a work place and community safety issue.
- Support and build links with trade unions and employers to implement work place domestic abuse policies.
- Raise awareness and provide information on how to help friends, family members and colleagues affected by domestic abuse.
- Campaign and lobby for increased sustainable and emergency funding from central government for organisations working with victims and survivors, especially services for BAME women, which are hugely underfunded.

This Council thanks Oxford's frontline domestic abuse workers, charities and organisations for their life saving work.

## **l) Carbon targets (proposed by Cllr Gant, seconded by Cllr Wade)**

### Liberal Democrat member motion

This Council notes that in January 2019 Oxford City Council declared a climate emergency and committed to making the council's own activities net-zero carbon as soon as possible.

**Council therefore asks the Executive Director for Development to submit a report to Cabinet setting out proposals as below:**

- Starting immediately, ensuring that all new council-owned public buildings will be carbon neutral throughout their entire lifespan (with Oxfordshire-based carbon offsetting to capture any technically unavoidable performance gap).
- As far as is it is possible to do so legally, to bind developers, or work with procured developers, to ensure that all residential and commercial developments on council-owned disposed land are carbon neutral throughout their entire life-span (with developers funding Oxfordshire-based carbon offsetting to capture any technically unavoidable performance gap).

This page is intentionally left blank