

To: Council
Date: 21 March 2022
Report of: Head of Law and Governance
Title of Report: **Motions and amendments received in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.18**

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 11.18 by the deadline of 1.00pm on 09 March 2022, 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 Labour, Liberal Democrat, Green, Independent groups in that order.

Introduction

- a) End Fire and Rehire (proposed by Cllr Mundy, seconded by Cllr Dunne)
- b) No Greyhound Racing in Oxford (proposed by Cllr Wade, seconded by Cllr Fouweather) [amendment proposed by Cllr Brown, seconded by Cllr Linda Smith]
- c) Opposition to the privatisation of the Vaccine Manufacturing and Innovation Centre (proposed by Cllr Jarvis, seconded by Cllr Pegg) [amendment proposed by Cllr Aziz]
- d) A Sanctuary Strategy for Oxford (proposed by Cllr Gant, seconded by Cllr Miles) [amendment proposed by Cllr Diggins, seconded by Cllr Chapman]
- e) Using Doughnut Economics (proposed by Cllr Pegg, seconded by Cllr Wolff)
- f) Set up a Drug Consumption Room (proposed by Cllr Wade) [amendment proposed by Cllr Linda Smith, seconded by Cllr Upton]

a) End Fire and Rehire (proposed by Cllr Mundy, seconded by Cllr Dunne)

Labour Group member motion

This Council notes that:

The practice of Fire and Rehire, or dismissal and reengagement, has come to public attention in recent years. This involves an employer dismissing staff and reoffering their roles under inferior conditions, usually to effectively change the contract of employment. The currently legal practice has been increasingly threatened by employers. The prevalence and impact of Fire and Rehire has been researched by the Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (Acas).¹ Though not new, there is suggestion that the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic has spurred an increase in its use. Others have told Acas that the pandemic is being used “opportunistically as a smokescreen to diminish workers’ terms and conditions”. This has impacted a range of employees, many of whom have been key workers such as factory, utilities, and retail workers. These are people who have kept working and kept our country going during the pandemic and lockdowns.

According to TUC research² nearly 1 in 10 workers have been told to re-apply for their jobs on worse terms and conditions or face the sack. Working-class people (12%) are nearly twice as likely than those from higher socio-economic groups (7%) to face Fire and Rehire. For black and ethnic minority workers (15%) the rate is nearly twice the rate of white workers (8%).

Here, and across the country, Fire and Rehire is increasing the precariousness of work and financially and mentally compromising people who work hard to put food on the table and pay their bills. It is shackling our trade unions and making it impossible for them to fight for a fair deal for their members.

According to the National Union of Journalists (NUJ), our city’s own newspapers The Oxford Mail and The Oxford Times threatened to Fire and Rehire NUJ members over bank holiday pay. In August the NUJ agreed a deal to end the dispute, but they could not get Fire and Rehire taken off the table in negotiations with the newspapers’ owners Newsquest Media Group.³

In Oxfordshire, workers at the Jacob Douwe Egberts coffee factory in Banbury were threatened with Fire and Rehire in early 2020. The profitable factory succeeded in settling an agreement with Unite the Union in August 2021.⁴

Council resolves:

- To publicly oppose any future use or threat of Fire and Rehire by employers in our City.
- For the review of future contracts, contract renewals and procurement to seek to include a commitment for employers to not use or threaten Fire and Rehire, as part of their social clause.

¹ <https://www.acas.org.uk/fire-and-rehire-report/html>

² “Fire and rehire” tactics have become widespread during pandemic – warns TUC January 2021
<https://www.tuc.org.uk/news/fire-and-rehire-tactics-have-become-widespread-during-pandemic-warns-tuc>

³ <https://www.nuj.org.uk/resource/oxford-mail-and-times-use-fire-and-rehire-tactic-to-end-bank-holiday-working-payments.html>

<https://www.holdthefrontpage.co.uk/2021/news/daily-journalists-facing-fire-and-rehire-after-rejecting-pay-change-union-says/>

⁴ <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-oxfordshire-58078221>

- For our City Council Leader to add her voice to that of our MPs Anneliese Dodds and Layla Moran in supporting national legislation to ban Fire and Rehire.
- For our City Council Leader to write to the Business Secretary on behalf of Council, urging him to reverse the current government position, support a ban of Fire and Rehire, and back the workers of our country.

b) No Greyhound Racing in Oxford (proposed by Cllr Wade, seconded by Cllr Fouweather) [amendment proposed by Cllr Brown, seconded by Cllr Linda Smith]

Liberal Democrat Group member motion

Council notes:

The reopening of the stadium in Sandy Lane is a welcome addition to the leisure activities available to Oxford people.

The stadium has had a chequered history since the mid-1970s and decreasing interest in greyhound racing directly contributed to its decline.

In 2005 Risk Capital Partners with Galliard Homes purchased the failing stadium. Plans for 150 houses and 75 flats were mooted but the Council's statement in favour of keeping the land for leisure use stalled the development, and greyhound racing and speedway continued until 2012 when the Greyhound Racing Association closed the stadium down.

After a decade of disuse, Mr Boothby 'stadium director' announced⁵ he had bought the lease and planned to bring back greyhound racing.

This is a concern for the following reasons:

- The number of injuries caused to dogs on the racetrack (In 2019, the last full year of racing, the Greyhound Board of Great Britain recorded 4,970 injuries on registered tracks, in 2020: 3,575). Their welfare is poorly regulated on and off the track⁶. Often these dogs cannot race again and rehoming is far from guaranteed. The Government has failed to back up the Welfare of Racing Greyhounds Regs 2010 with stronger legislation⁷.
- The 2014 Appraisal which led to the Oxford Stadium being listed as a Conservation Area refers to the stadium's heritage significance – the 'physical evidence that represents the collective memory of those working communities and their leisure pursuits.' But these communities have moved on since the 1930s when the stadium was built and, while it should remain as evidence of an earlier era, people should be consulted about the future of this valuable space. British Cycling has informally suggested it would work as a velodrome combined with a BMX track and ancillary activities. Peckham BMX has revolutionised a Southwark neighbourhood⁸
- Inevitably greyhound-racing is focused on gambling. There has been considerable research about the effect of gambling on individuals and

⁵ <https://www.oxfordmail.co.uk/news/19764740.oxford-stadium-managing-director-reveals-plans-insists-greyhound-racing-safe/>

⁶ The State of Greyhound Racing in Great Britain: a mandate for change: (2014) League against Cruel Sports.

⁷ <https://www.parliament.uk/globalassets/documents/commons-committees/environment-food-rural-affairs/2nd-report-greyhound-welfare.pdf>

https://www.league.org.uk/media/filer_public/2d/19/2d19e03c-909f-449c-bccc-cf97287347bf/greyhound_report_2014_league_against_cruel_sports.pdf

⁸ <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/resources/idt-sh/parklife>

communities, recently by Dr N. Muggleton (Brasenose College): “gambling is associated with addiction and harmful outcomes for others.”⁹

- The Local Plan designates the site for leisure purposes with the implication that in these times the activities provided will facilitate active participation.
- Galliard Homes bills itself as ‘the capital’s largest privately-owned residential property developer.’ If the greyhound-racing venture fails, the way will be open for Galliard to revive its estate development plan, which will be difficult for city planners to contest.

This Council calls on the Leader to:

- Issue a press release publicly opposing the return of greyhound racing to Oxford.
- Write to the UK Government calling for the introduction of legislation incorporating the recommendations of the 2016 Greyhound Welfare EFRA Report.

This Council resolves to:

- Support consultation with Oxford residents on their preferred options for leisure activities at the stadium as a part of the Local Plan Review and the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 Reg 19 consultation¹⁰

Amendment proposed by Cllr Brown seconded by Cllr Linda Smith

Add the words in bold italics and delete words struck through.

[No changes to first part]

- The 2014 Appraisal which led to the Oxford Stadium being listed as a Conservation Area refers to the stadium’s heritage significance – the ‘physical evidence that represents the collective memory of those working communities and their leisure pursuits.’ ~~But these communities have moved on since the 1930s when the stadium was built and, while it should remain as evidence of an earlier era, people should be consulted about the future of this valuable space. British Cycling has informally suggested it would work as a velodrome combined with a BMX track and ancillary activities. Peckham BMX has revolutionised a Southwark neighbourhood¹¹~~
- Inevitably greyhound-racing is focused on gambling. There has been considerable research about the effect of gambling on individuals and communities, recently by Dr N. Muggleton (Brasenose College): “gambling is associated with addiction and harmful outcomes for others.”¹²
- The Local Plan designates the site for leisure purposes with the implication that in these times the activities provided will facilitate active participation. ***This***

⁹ <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41562-020-01045-w542>

¹⁰ <https://oxfordshireplan.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/OX2050-PLAN-FULL-TEXT-V30-23-July-2021-with-para-nos.pdf> (paragraph 297)

¹¹ <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/resources/1dt-sh/parklife>

¹² <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41562-020-01045-w542>

council welcomes the reopening of the stadium and the use once more of the space for dance and boxing classes and other leisure activities.

- Galliard Homes bills itself as ‘the capital’s largest privately-owned residential property developer.’ If the greyhound-racing venture fails, the way will be open for Galliard to revive its estate development plan, which will be difficult for city planners to contest. ***This council is pleased that the site has been retained for leisure use in spite of attempts by Galliard Homes to run it down and make it unusable.***

This Council calls on the Leader to:

- ~~Issue a press release publicly opposing the return of greyhound racing to Oxford.~~
- Write to the UK Government calling for the introduction of legislation incorporating the recommendations of the 2016 Greyhound Welfare EFRA Report.

~~This Council resolves to:~~

- ~~Support consultation with Oxford residents on their preferred options for leisure activities at the stadium as a part of the Local Plan Review and the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 Reg 19 consultation¹³~~

If the amendment is agreed the motion would read:

Council notes:

The reopening of the stadium in Sandy Lane is a welcome addition to the leisure activities available to Oxford people.

The stadium has had a chequered history since the mid-1970s and decreasing interest in greyhound racing directly contributed to its decline.

In 2005 Risk Capital Partners with Galliard Homes purchased the failing stadium. Plans for 150 houses and 75 flats were mooted but the Council’s statement in favour of keeping the land for leisure use stalled the development, and greyhound racing and speedway continued until 2012 when the Greyhound Racing Association closed the stadium down.

After a decade of disuse, Mr Boothby ‘stadium director’ announced¹⁴ he had bought the lease and planned to bring back greyhound racing.

This is a concern for the following reasons:

- The number of injuries caused to dogs on the racetrack (In 2019, the last full year of racing, the Greyhound Board of Great Britain recorded 4,970 injuries on registered tracks, in 2020: 3,575). Their welfare is poorly regulated on and off the track¹⁵. Often these dogs cannot race again and rehoming is far from

¹³ <https://oxfordshireplan.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/OX2050-PLAN-FULL-TEXT-V30-23-July-2021-with-para-nos.pdf> (paragraph 297)

¹⁴ <https://www.oxfordmail.co.uk/news/19764740.oxford-stadium-managing-director-reveals-plans-insists-greyhound-racing-safe/>

¹⁵ The State of Greyhound Racing in Great Britain: a mandate for change: (2014) League against Cruel Sports.

guaranteed. The Government has failed to back up the Welfare of Racing Greyhounds Regs 2010 with stronger legislation¹⁶.

- The 2014 Appraisal which led to the Oxford Stadium being listed as a Conservation Area refers to the stadium's heritage significance – the 'physical evidence that represents the collective memory of those working communities and their leisure pursuits.'
- Inevitably greyhound-racing is focused on gambling. There has been considerable research about the effect of gambling on individuals and communities, recently by Dr N. Muggleton (Brasenose College): "gambling is associated with addiction and harmful outcomes for others."¹⁷
- The Local Plan designates the site for leisure purposes with the implication that in these times the activities provided will facilitate active participation. This council welcomes the reopening of the stadium and the use once more of the space for dance and boxing classes and other leisure activities.
- Galliard Homes bills itself as 'the capital's largest privately-owned residential property developer.' This council is pleased that the site has been retained for leisure use in spite of attempts by Galliard Homes to run it down and make it unusable.

This Council calls on the Leader to:

- Write to the UK Government calling for the introduction of legislation incorporating the recommendations of the 2016 Greyhound Welfare EFRA Report.

c) Opposition to the privatisation of the Vaccine Manufacturing and Innovation Centre (proposed by Cllr Jarvis, seconded by Cllr Pegg) [amendment proposed by Cllr Aziz]

Green Group member motion

Council notes

- The Vaccine Manufacturing and Innovation Centre (VMIC), based at the Harwell Campus in Oxfordshire was established in 2018 as an institution that would develop vaccines and prepare for future pandemics.
- The VMIC was established by a consortium of universities - the University of Oxford, Imperial College and the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. It now operates as a non-profit company in which the founding universities are shareholders.
- The VMIC is set to become operational in 2022, and would be the UK's first strategy vaccine development and advanced manufacturing facility.
- Reports from the *Financial Times*, *Observer* and *Independent* among others have indicated that government officials are currently reviewing bids from the private sector to manage the centre - including multinational biotechnology firms and healthcare manufacturers.

¹⁶ <https://www.parliament.uk/globalassets/documents/commons-committees/environment-food-rural-affairs/2nd-report-greyhound-welfare.pdf>

https://www.league.org.uk/media/filer_public/2d/19/2d19e03c-909f-449c-bccc-cf97287347bf/greyhound_report_2014_league_against_cruel_sports.pdf

¹⁷ <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41562-020-01045-w542>

- Civil society groups including Keep Our NHS Public Oxfordshire and We Own It have publicly opposed any move to place the VMIC in the hands of the private sector.

Council believes

- Throughout the Covid-19 pandemic, private involvement in the health sector has been hugely damaging, with companies prioritising profit above public health.
- Allowing the VMIC to pass into the hands of profit-driven private companies will reduce the efficacy of the centre, inhibit its ability to deliver proper preparedness for future pandemics and reduce the innovation in vaccine manufacturing the centre was designed to achieve.

Council resolves

- To oppose the privatisation of the VMIC.
- To request the Leader write to the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy expressing the Council's view that the VMIC should not be privatised.
- To request the Leader write to the three founding universities expressing the Council's view that the VMIC should not be privatised.

Amendment proposed by Cllr Aziz

Add the words in bold italics and delete words struck through.

[No changes to first part]

Council believes

- Throughout the Covid-19 pandemic, private involvement in the health sector has been hugely damaging, with companies prioritising profit above public health.
- Allowing the VMIC to pass into the hands of profit-driven private companies will reduce the efficacy of the centre, inhibit its ability to deliver proper preparedness for future pandemics ~~and reduce the innovation in vaccine manufacturing the centre was designed to achieve.~~ ***and will not ensure that vaccines developed in Oxford are shared equitably to save the lives of people across the world. We must end the Covid-19 vaccine apartheid that is prioritising big pharma profits over saving the lives of predominately Black and Brown people in low income countries. While Britain has vaccinated the vast majority of its population, the whole of the continent of Africa has only been able to fully vaccinate 11% of its people, while low income countries, as a group, reached only 5.5%. This inequality is obscene.***

[No changes to last part]

If the amendment is agreed the motion would read:

Council notes

- The Vaccine Manufacturing and Innovation Centre (VMIC), based at the Harwell Campus in Oxfordshire was established in 2018 as an institution that would develop vaccines and prepare for future pandemics.
- The VMIC was established by a consortium of universities - the University of Oxford, Imperial College and the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. It now operates as a non-profit company in which the founding universities are shareholders.
- The VMIC is set to become operational in 2022, and would be the UK's first strategy vaccine development and advanced manufacturing facility.
- Reports from the *Financial Times*, *Observer* and *Independent* among others have indicated that government officials are currently reviewing bids from the private sector to manage the centre - including multinational biotechnology firms and healthcare manufacturers.
- Civil society groups including Keep Our NHS Public Oxfordshire and We Own It have publicly opposed any move to place the VMIC in the hands of the private sector.

Council believes

- Throughout the Covid-19 pandemic, private involvement in the health sector has been hugely damaging, with companies prioritising profit above public health.
- Allowing the VMIC to pass into the hands of profit-driven private companies will reduce the efficacy of the centre, inhibit its ability to deliver proper preparedness for future pandemics and will not ensure that vaccines developed in Oxford are shared equitably to save the lives of people across the world. We must end the Covid-19 vaccine apartheid that is prioritising big pharma profits over saving the lives of predominately Black and Brown people in low income countries. While Britain has vaccinated the vast majority of its population, the whole of the continent of Africa has only been able to fully vaccinate 11% of its people, while low income countries, as a group, reached only 5.5%. This inequality is obscene.

Council resolves

- To oppose the privatisation of the VMIC.
- To request the Leader write to the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy expressing the Council's view that the VMIC should not be privatised.
- To request the Leader write to the three founding universities expressing the Council's view that the VMIC should not be privatised.

d) A Sanctuary Strategy for Oxford (proposed by Cllr Gant, seconded by Cllr Miles) [amendment proposed by Cllr Diggins, seconded by Cllr Chapman]

Liberal Democrat Group member motion

Council notes:

The contribution that refugees and migrants seeking sanctuary have made to the city throughout recent history, and has played its part through past and existing programmes.

We understand that Afghan refugees have been housed in hotels since their arrival. This is not a sustainable solution as it prevents these refugees from beginning to rebuild their new lives. It is also very costly to the public purse.

The rapid displacement of Ukrainian civilians calls for decisive action to provide safe routes. But the government's response is completely out of step with both the need for protection, as well as public opinion.

Whilst other countries are waiving visas, government have announced two pathways for people to get to the UK - but both are bureaucratic, and in practice make it very difficult for people to reach safety and family in the UK.

When someone is fleeing for their life, it is simply not practical or possible to wait for months, even years. We as a council need to be ready to make the best of schemes that are announced.

At the same time, the UK government is pushing through the damaging and reactionary Nationality and Borders Bill, the biggest roll-back of refugee rights that this country has ever seen.

The Council recognises that a comprehensive, co-ordinated, cross-council and forward-looking approach is needed.

We recognise that 'welcome' needs a whole community approach that engages with local refugee organisations, third sector partners, and other local stakeholders.

The Council resolves to:

1. Request that the Executive Director for Communities and People submits a report to Cabinet with options to:
 - a) Develop a **Sanctuary Strategy** to ensure that the council can respond quickly and efficiently to humanitarian crises such as the two (Afghanistan and Ukraine) we have seen unfold in just 6 short months.
 - b) Undertake a review of service areas to ensure they are accessible to people fleeing war and persecution.
 - c) Undertake a review which explores an approach that incentivises private landlords to come forward with offers of housing.
 - d) Mark Refugee Week (End of June) (e.g. St Helens Refugee week 2021 featured a football match between sanctuary seekers and Cllrs).
 - e) Ensure the council plays its part resettling Ukrainian refugees, when details of the Humanitarian Sponsorship scheme become available.

- f) Engage proactively with local and national third sector partners and stakeholders to ensure we can mitigate against 'hostile environment' policies within the limits of the current legal framework.
2. Ask the leader to write to the Home Secretary Priti Patel to highlight the challenges with the current way resettlement works, such as, but not limited to:
- o South East and the challenges around finding housing limited by benefit cap.
 - o The difficulty with having many different schemes (7 in total) which creates confusion and delay in welcoming people of sanctuary seeking background (unable to plan).
 - o Scrap the Nationality and Borders bill, a bill predicted to add an additional £2.7bn a year, and is likely to be unworkable and dehumanising.

Amendment proposed by Cllr Diggins, seconded by Cllr Chapman

Add the words in bold italics and delete words struck through.

[No changes to first six paragraphs]

~~The Council recognises that a comprehensive, co-ordinated, cross-council and forward-looking approach is needed.~~

~~We recognise that 'welcome' needs a whole community approach that engages with local refugee organisations, third sector partners, and other local stakeholders.~~

The Council resolves to:

1. Request that the Executive Director for Communities and People submits a report to Cabinet with options to ***setting out what the Council is doing and considers whether it would be necessary to develop a Sanctuary Strategy to:***
 - a) ~~Develop a~~ ***Sanctuary Strategy*** to ensure that the council can respond quickly and efficiently to humanitarian crises such as the two (Afghanistan and Ukraine) we have seen unfold in just 6 short months.
 - b) ~~Undertake a review of~~ ***Ensure*** service areas are accessible to people fleeing war and persecution.
 - c) ~~Undertake a review which explores an approach that incentivises~~ ***Encourage*** private landlords to come forward with offers of housing.
 - d) Mark Refugee Week (End of June) (e.g. St Helens Refugee week 2021 featured a football match between sanctuary seekers and Cllrs).
 - e) ~~Ensure the Council plays its part resettling~~ ***look after*** Ukrainian refugees, once details of the Humanitarian Sponsorship scheme become available.
 - f) Engage proactively with local and national third sector partners and stakeholders to ensure we can mitigate against 'hostile environment' policies within the limits of the current legal framework.

2. Ask the leader to write to the Home Secretary Priti Patel to highlight the challenges with the current way resettlement works, such as, but not limited to:

- South East and the challenges around finding housing limited by benefit cap.
- The difficulty with having many different schemes (7 in total) which creates confusion and delay in welcoming people of sanctuary seeking background (unable to plan).
- ***The need for far more affordable housing to meet the existing and future housing needs locally***
- Scrap the Nationality and Borders bill, a bill predicted to add an additional £2.7bn a year, and is likely to be unworkable and dehumanising.

3. *Acknowledge the motion that we passed in October on Afghanistan and Refugees which raised a lot of the same issues.*

If the amendment is agreed the motion would read:

Council notes:

The contribution that refugees and migrants seeking sanctuary have made to the city throughout recent history, and has played its part through past and existing programmes.

We understand that Afghan refugees have been housed in hotels since their arrival. This is not a sustainable solution as it prevents these refugees from beginning to rebuild their new lives. It is also very costly to the public purse.

The rapid displacement of Ukrainian civilians calls for decisive action to provide safe routes. But the government's response is completely out of step with both the need for protection, as well as public opinion.

Whilst other countries are waiving visas, government have announced two pathways for people to get to the UK - but both are bureaucratic, and in practice make it very difficult for people to reach safety and family in the UK.

When someone is fleeing for their life, it is simply not practical or possible to wait for months, even years. We as a council need to be ready to make the best of schemes that are announced.

At the same time, the UK government is pushing through the damaging and reactionary Nationality and Borders Bill, the biggest roll-back of refugee rights that this country has ever seen.

The Council resolves to:

1. Request that the Executive Director for Communities and People submits a report to Cabinet setting out what the Council is doing and considers whether it would be necessary to develop a Sanctuary Strategy to:

- a) Ensure that the council can respond quickly and efficiently to humanitarian crises such as the two (Afghanistan and Ukraine) we have seen unfold in just 6 short months.

- b) Ensure service areas are accessible to people fleeing war and persecution.
 - c) Encourage private landlords to come forward with offers of housing.
 - d) Mark Refugee Week (End of June) (e.g. St Helens Refugee week 2021 featured a football match between sanctuary seekers and Cllrs).
 - e) Look after Ukrainian refugees, once details of the Humanitarian Sponsorship scheme become available.
 - f) Engage proactively with local and national third sector partners and stakeholders to ensure we can mitigate against 'hostile environment' policies within the limits of the current legal framework.
2. Ask the leader to write to the Home Secretary Priti Patel to highlight the challenges with the current way resettlement works, such as, but not limited to:
- South East and the challenges around finding housing limited by benefit cap.
 - The difficulty with having many different schemes (7 in total) which creates confusion and delay in welcoming people of sanctuary seeking background (unable to plan).
 - The need for far more affordable housing to meet the existing and future housing needs locally
 - Scrap the Nationality and Borders bill, a bill predicted to add an additional £2.7bn a year, and is likely to be unworkable and dehumanising.
3. Acknowledge the motion that we passed in October on Afghanistan and Refugees which raised a lot of the same issues.

e) Using Doughnut Economics (proposed by Cllr Pegg, seconded by Cllr Wolff)

Green Group member motion

This council notes:

1. That Doughnut Economics offers a vision of what it means for humanity to thrive in the 21st century. It identifies a safe and just space for human society, supported by a strong social foundation of life's essentials but sitting below the ecological ceiling, beyond which lies climate collapse.
2. Doughnut Economics can guide local authorities to provide for a thriving city whilst keeping their activities within our social and planetary boundaries.
3. The work done by Oxford University and Oxfam's Kate Raworth and Oxford's Doughnut Economics Action Lab (DEAL) to develop city-scale iterations of Doughnut Economics
4. The adoption of the Doughnut Economics model globally, including in Cornwall, Amsterdam, Portland and Philadelphia.

This council resolves to:

1. Request that the Executive Director for Development submits a report to Cabinet with options to:
 - a) Run a series of workshops with the DEAL, the public, local organisations, council officers and members, and businesses to assess what Doughnut Economics means for Oxford. From this the Council will develop an "Oxford City Doughnut" to guide decision making.

- b) Use the Oxford City Doughnut to inform its decision making and achieve balance between social needs and ecological boundaries in the creation of its policies. This will include all cabinet decisions and procurement decisions, as well as the Oxford Economic Growth Strategy and the next iteration of the Local Plan.
 - c) Ask its wholly-owned companies to also adopt the Oxford City Doughnut in its decision making.
 - d) Use the Oxford City Doughnut to inform its responses to consultations and inquiries from external bodies, including those from national Government and other local authorities with which it works.
2. Request that the Scrutiny Committee evaluates its success after twelve months of the Council using the Oxford City Doughnut.

f) Set up a Drug Consumption Room (proposed by Cllr Wade) [amendment proposed by Cllr Linda Smith, seconded by Cllr Upton]

Liberal Democrat Group member motion

One in five Local Authorities in England have cut budgets for addiction services and for support for drug users by more than half since 2015/16 and, with drug-related deaths at a record high, this Council believes that there needs to be greater commitment to setting up drug consumption rooms (DCRs).

These are units where drug users can take street drugs in a safe and clean environment, where antidotes are available for overdoses, and where users ready to move away from their drug habit can find support. The street homeless population is particularly vulnerable, so this Council seeks to give them the protection of a DCR.

Drugs policy is currently the province of the Home Office, which since June 2018 has been resisting calls from the Scottish Government and Glasgow City Council for leave to open the first heroin assisted-treatment facility in the city, which would allow addicts to use drugs in a regulated environment.

In 2006 the Joseph Rowntree Independent Working Group on DCRs concluded that 'well-designed and well-implemented DCRs would have an impact on some of the serious drug-related problems experienced in the UK' and proposed the setting up of pilot DCRs. Its recommendations have not been taken forward.

- This Council regrets the 2020 Home Office statement that it would not be decriminalising drug use.
- This Council proposes a public health evidence-based approach to drug use. Reliance on the criminal justice system has been at best ineffective, and at worst has driven drug dealers and users underground.
- Oxford City Council calls on the UK Government:
 1. To seek an explicit statement from the Home Office that the operation of DCRs is a matter for Local Authorities; specific rules can then be agreed by Police Forces, the CPS, Health Bodies and Local Authorities
 2. To make a ministerial commitment through the Home Secretary to protect the budgets of alcohol and drug partnerships
 3. To fund drug-testing services to be deployed at localities where there is a need, allowing 'at risk' users to find out what is in a substance and to offer advice on harm reduction.

4. To allow the setting up of a pilot drug consumption room in Oxford City under an exemption from the 1971 UK Misuse of Drugs Act.

Oxford City Council asks the Leader of the Council to write to the Home Office and to Oxford's MPs to inform them of this Resolution and urge them to take appropriate action.

References:

1. Independent Working Group on DCRs (Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2006)
<https://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/default/files/jrf/migrated/files/9781859354711.pdf>
2. Volteface: Are DCRs viable in the UK? (28.11.17)
<https://volteface.me/drug-consumption-rooms-viable-uk/>
3. Room for Improvement: How Drug Consumption Rooms save lives (01.04.19)
<https://www.adamsmith.org/research/room-for-improvement-how-drug-consumption-rooms-save-lives>
4. HIV Scotland 'Charity backs plans for unofficial DCRs' (07.03.20)
<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-51782882>
5. British Medical Journal (5.08.21)
Scotland intends to set up safe spaces for drug users in defiance of UK Govt.
<https://www.bmj.com/content/374/bmj.n1957>
6. Safer drug consumption facilities: Glasgow Health & Social Care Partnership
<https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=38604&p=0>
7. Mobilizing DCRs
<http://www.sfu.ca/~emccann/HealthPlace%20DCRs.pdf>
8. A critical analysis of UK news media representations of proposals (Liverpool John Moores University)
<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/10656/>
9. Review of Drugs Pt 2: prevention, treatment and recovery (Dame Carol Black, 2.08.21)
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/review-of-drugs-phase-two-report/review-of-drugs-part-two-prevention-treatment-and-recovery#contents>

Amendment proposed by Cllr Linda Smith, seconded by Cllr Upton

Add the words in bold italics and delete words struck through.

[No changes to first paragraph]

These are units where drug users can take street drugs in a safe and clean environment, where antidotes are available for overdoses, and where users ready to move away from their drug habit can find support. The street homeless population is particularly vulnerable, so this Council ~~seeks to give~~ **would consider given** them the protection of a DCR **if local health providers such as Turning Point were supportive**

[No changes to following paragraphs]

If the amendment is agreed the motion would read:

One in five Local Authorities in England have cut budgets for addiction services and for support for drug users by more than half since 2015/16 and, with drug-related deaths at a record high, this Council believes that there needs to be greater commitment to setting up drug consumption rooms (DCRs).

These are units where drug users can take street drugs in a safe and clean environment, where antidotes are available for overdoses, and where users ready to

move away from their drug habit can find support. The street homeless population is particularly vulnerable so this Council would consider giving them the protection of a DCR if other local health providers such as Turning Point were supportive.

Drugs policy is currently the province of the Home Office, which since June 2018 has been resisting calls from the Scottish Government and Glasgow City Council for leave to open the first heroin assisted-treatment facility in the city, which would allow addicts to use drugs in a regulated environment.

In 2006 the Joseph Rowntree Independent Working Group on DCRs concluded that 'well-designed and well-implemented DCRs would have an impact on some of the serious drug-related problems experienced in the UK' and proposed the setting up of pilot DCRs. Its recommendations have not been taken forward.

- This Council regrets the 2020 Home Office statement that it would not be decriminalising drug use.
- This Council proposes a public health evidence-based approach to drug use. Reliance on the criminal justice system has been at best ineffective, and at worst has driven drug dealers and users underground.
- Oxford City Council calls on the UK Government:
 5. To seek an explicit statement from the Home Office that the operation of DCRs is a matter for Local Authorities; specific rules can then be agreed by Police Forces, the CPS, Health Bodies and Local Authorities
 6. To make a ministerial commitment through the Home Secretary to protect the budgets of alcohol and drug partnerships
 7. To fund drug-testing services to be deployed at localities where there is a need, allowing 'at risk' users to find out what is in a substance and to offer advice on harm reduction.
 8. To allow the setting up of a pilot drug consumption room in Oxford City under an exemption from the 1971 UK Misuse of Drugs Act.

Oxford City Council asks the Leader of the Council to write to the Home Office and to Oxford's MPs to inform them of this Resolution and urge them to take appropriate action.

References:

1. Independent Working Group on DCRs (Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2006)
<https://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/default/files/jrf/migrated/files/9781859354711.pdf>
2. Volteface: Are DCRs viable in the UK? (28.11.17)
<https://volteface.me/drug-consumption-rooms-viable-uk/>
3. Room for Improvement: How Drug Consumption Rooms save lives (01.04.19)
<https://www.adamsmith.org/research/room-for-improvement-how-drug-consumption-rooms-save-lives>
4. HIV Scotland 'Charity backs plans for unofficial DCRs' (07.03.20)
<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-51782882>
5. British Medical Journal (5.08.21)
Scotland intends to set up safe spaces for drug users in defiance of UK Govt.
<https://www.bmj.com/content/374/bmj.n1957>
6. Safer drug consumption facilities: Glasgow Health & Social Care Partnership
<https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=38604&p=0>
7. Mobilizing DCRs
<http://www.sfu.ca/~emccann/HealthPlace%20DCRs.pdf>
8. A critical analysis of UK news media representations of proposals (Liverpool John Moores University)
<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/10656/>
9. Review of Drugs Pt 2: prevention, treatment and recovery (Dame Carol Black, 2.08.21)
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/review-of-drugs-phase-two-report/review-of-drugs-part-two-prevention-treatment-and-recovery#contents>

This page is intentionally left blank