

**To:** Council  
**Date:** 29 January 2024  
**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 6 March 2024, 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 Independent Group, Labour, Liberal Democrat, Green, Oxford Social Independents groups in that order.**

### Introduction

- a) Cancel divisive non-evidence-based transport policies including traffic filters and strengthen citizens trust in democracy. (Proposed by Cllr Ajaz Rehman, seconded by Cllr Shaista Aziz) [Amendment proposed by Cllr Sandy Douglas, seconded by Cllr Mary Clarkson]
- b) Uniting to tackle Oxford's Housing Crisis (proposed by Cllr Linda Smith, seconded by Cllr Nigel Chapman) [Amendment proposed by Cllr Chris Jarvis, seconded by Cllr Lois Muddiman]
- c) In Support of Green Investment (proposed by Cllr Chris Snowton, seconded by Cllr Katherine Miles) [Amendment Proposed by Cllr Anna Railton, seconded by Cllr Alex Hollingsworth]
- d) Weight and emissions based parking charges (proposed by Cllr Emily Kerr, seconded by Cllr Lois Muddiman) [Amendment Proposed by Cllr Anna Railton, seconded by Cllr Louise Upton]
- e) The Cost-of-living crisis and local government funding (proposed by Cllr Ed Turner, seconded by Cllr Nigel Chapman)

**a) Cancel divisive non-evidence-based transport policies including traffic filters and strengthen citizens trust in democracy. (Proposed by Cllr Ajaz Rehman, seconded by Cllr Shaista Aziz) [Amendment proposed by Cllr Sandy Douglas, seconded by Cllr Mary Clarkson]**

Independent Group Motion

This council calls on the leader to write to Oxfordshire County Council and the transport minister to remove Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) and cancel planned traffic filters.

LTNs have been introduced as part of schemes to reduce congestion and encourage active travel. They have failed to meet their stated objectives.

Congestion has increased and cycling remains a hazardous mode of transport.<sup>1</sup>

Pollution has reduced in the streets where LTNs have been introduced, however the opposite has occurred on roads that are now heavily congested.<sup>2</sup>

The intention of congestion free bus travel has failed to materialise and Oxford's bus companies have expressed their disappointment at East Oxford LTNs being approved.<sup>3</sup>

Divisive transport policies are pitting people and communities against each other on class, social economic and racial lines in a way similar to the Tory Poll Tax, which was eventually scrapped. The most vulnerable in society have also been ignored with no amendments for the elderly<sup>4</sup> or residents with disabilities.<sup>5</sup>

As democratically elected representatives it is our duty to find answers and develop and support policies that work and are fair. Imposing unpopular and seemingly failing strategies will not achieve behavioural change in encouraging active travel.

Residential neighbourhoods such as Littlemore have been left feeling isolated and cut off.<sup>6</sup>

80% of businesses and 60% of consultation respondents oppose the introduction of East Oxford LTNs.<sup>7</sup>

Independent businesses are part of the life blood of what makes East Oxford the vibrant, diverse place it is.

Cowley Road business owners have been vocally opposed to the LTNs.<sup>8</sup>

To reverse years of neglect of Oxford's transport infrastructure requires real investment from central government. In the meantime, this council agrees to propose to the County Council that they:

- Prioritise bringing in School Streets for all Private schools in the city.
- Ensure NHS staff and school teachers are excluded from any work place levy across the city.
- Lobby central government for major investment in infrastructure with safe clear segregated routes for pedestrians and cyclists and roads for motor vehicles.

---

<sup>1</sup> [Oxfordshire County Council will add traffic lights to 'dangerous' roundabout - BBC News](#)

<sup>2</sup> [Oxford air pollution falls by 8% in 2022, council report says - BBC News](#)

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.oxfordmail.co.uk/news/23852089.oxford-bus-companies-disappointed-ltn-recommendation/>

<sup>4</sup> [East Oxford residents who are pro- LTN share early doubts about LTN trial | Oxford Mail](#)

<sup>5</sup> [Oxford LTNs: Council leaves 'most vulnerable' behind | thisisoxfordshire](#)

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.ipetitions.com/petition/end-traffic-barriers-in-littlemore-and-cowley>

<sup>7</sup> [aebhdfh \(oxfordshire.gov.uk\)](#)

<sup>8</sup> [Oxford Cowley Road traders produce shock business survey on LTNs | Oxford Mail](#)

- Scrap plans for divisive traffic filters - which are not evidence based.
- 

### Labour Group Amendment

#### **Amend ~~Cancel divisive non-evidence based transport policies including traffic filters and strengthen citizens' trust in democracy~~**

This Council calls on the Leader to write to Oxfordshire County Council Council to seek amendments to ~~the~~ and ~~the transport minister to remove~~ Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) and ~~cancel planned traffic filters trials~~.

LTNs have been introduced as part of schemes to reduce **road danger** congestion and encourage active travel. They ~~have failed to meet their stated objectives~~.

Congestion has increased **in some areas** and cycling **safety needs further improvement** ~~remains a hazardous mode of transport~~.

**Whilst** pollution has reduced in the streets where LTNs have been introduced, ~~however~~ the opposite has occurred on **some** roads that are now **more** heavily congested.

~~The intention of congestion free bus travel has failed to materialise and Oxford's bus companies have expressed their disappointment at the impact of the premature and badly co-ordinated implementation of the East Oxford LTNs~~ **East Oxford LTNs being approved**.

**Following poor consultation and communication by the County Council, they have** ~~divisive transport policies are pitting people and communities against each other squandered good will towards measures which can reduce traffic congestion and improve bus punctuality. on class, social economic and racial lines. in a way similar to the Tory Poll Tax, which was eventually scrap~~

**Despite extensive representations to the County Council by local councillors who know their wards well,** the most vulnerable in society have ~~also been ignored with no amendments~~ **agreed for elderly people** or residents with disabilities.

As democratically elected representatives, it is our duty to find answers and develop and support policies that work and are fair. ~~Imposing unpopular and seemingly failing strategies will not achieve behavioural change in encouraging active travel. Residential neighbourhoods such as Littlemore have been left feeling isolated and cut off.~~

~~80% of businesses and 60% of consultation respondents opposed~~ the introduction of East Oxford LTNs. Independent businesses are part of the life blood of what makes East Oxford the vibrant, diverse place it is. **Some** Cowley Road business owners have been vocally opposed to the LTNs.

To reverse years of neglect of Oxford's transport infrastructure requires real investment from central government. ~~In the meantime,~~ this Council agrees to propose to the County Council that they:

- Prioritise bringing in School Streets for ~~all private schools~~ **where appropriate** in the city **and work with private schools to reduce their impact on congestion.**
- Lobby central government for major investment in **public transport and infrastructure,** with safe clear segregated routes **and safer junctions** for pedestrians and cyclists ~~and roads for motor vehicles.~~
- ~~Ensure NHS and school teachers are excluded from any work place levy across the city.~~ **Work with the NHS and schools to understand the impact of the WPL upon them and ensure key workers have safe, convenient travel options.**

- Where LTN ANPR is in use and there is clear and sustained local demand, grant exemptions to blue badge holders and carers, and re-open these roads for local traffic outside school travel hours either by turning off cameras or using permits for local residents.
  - ~~Scrap plans for divisive traffic filters, which are not evidence based.~~ Commit to public and independent evaluation of the traffic filter trials against agreed success criteria before any decision to make them permanent, so that they only remain if supported by the evidence.
- 

If amended, the Motion would read:

### **Amend transport policies including traffic filters and strengthen citizens' trust in democracy**

This Council calls on the Leader to write to Oxfordshire County Council Council to seek amendments to the Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) and planned traffic filters trials.

LTNs have been introduced as part of **schemes** to reduce road danger and encourage active travel.

Congestion has increased in some areas and cycling safety needs further improvement.

Whilst pollution has reduced in the streets where LTNs have been introduced, however the opposite has occurred on some roads that are now more heavily congested.

Oxford's bus companies have expressed their disappointment at the impact of the premature and badly co-ordinated implementation of the East Oxford LTNs.

Following poor consultation and communication by the County Council, they have squandered good will towards measures which can reduce traffic congestion and improve bus punctuality.

Despite extensive representations to the County Council by local councillors who know their wards well, the most vulnerable in society have been ignored with no amendments agreed for elderly people or residents with disabilities.

As democratically elected representatives, it is our duty to find answers and develop and support policies that work and are fair. Residential neighbourhoods such as Littlemore have been left feeling isolated and cut off.

60% of consultation respondents opposed the introduction of East Oxford LTNs. Independent businesses are part of the life blood of what makes East Oxford the vibrant, diverse place it is. Some Cowley Road business owners have been vocally opposed to the LTNs.

To reverse years of neglect of Oxford's transport infrastructure requires real investment from central government. This Council agrees to propose to the County Council that they:

- Prioritise bringing in School Streets where appropriate in the city and work with private schools to reduce their impact on congestion.
- Lobby central government for major investment in public transport and infrastructure, with safe clear segregated routes and safer junctions for pedestrians and cyclists.

- Work with the NHS and schools to understand the impact of the WPL upon them and ensure key workers have safe, convenient travel options.
- Where LTN ANPR is in use and there is clear and sustained local demand, grant exemptions to blue badge holders and carers, and re-open these roads for local traffic outside school travel hours either by turning off cameras or using permits for local residents.
- Commit to public and independent evaluation of the traffic filter trials against agreed success criteria before any decision to make them permanent, so that they only remain if supported by the evidence.

**b) Uniting to tackle Oxford's Housing Crisis (proposed by Cllr Linda Smith, seconded by Cllr Nigel Chapman) [Amendment proposed by Cllr Chris Jarvis, seconded by Cllr Lois Muddiman]**

Labour Group Motion

This Council notes with alarm the growing number of local households facing homelessness in Oxford and the increased pressure this has placed on our homelessness prevention services and on access to temporary accommodation.

This Council had brought down the number of people in temporary accommodation to around 100 households. But over the past year, this number has increased to approximately 220 households, and the figure is projected to reach 315 by July.

The rapid rise means that the 120 units of temporary accommodation owned by the council are no longer sufficient and we need to increasingly rely on hotel rooms to meet our statutory duties. This is a miserable and difficult situation for the families being placed in hotels and it has a huge unbudgeted financial cost for this council which is being left to pick up the bill.

This Council has moved swiftly to mitigate the situation by buying and leasing more temporary accommodation, block-booking hotels, hiring new staff to prevent homelessness and using more of our council owned homes for temporary accommodation.

These efforts have saved Oxford taxpayers about £2m, but this Council is still projecting a hole in the budget of as much as £3m every year – equivalent to 12.5% of the Council's annual net budget.

This Council is also finding it increasingly difficult to help people in temporary accommodation and our non-statutory homeless services to find affordable long-term homes.

This Council is working hard on behalf of the people of Oxford to deliver the affordable high-quality homes our city needs. We have retained our 7,900 council homes and we set up OX Place, our wholly owned housing company, to build 2,000 new homes over the next decade. Working in partnership with housing associations, we have a four-year programme to deliver 1600 affordable homes, including over 850 for social rent.

We also fund over 400 beds in supported accommodation for adults not entitled to statutory support.

We call upon:

- Council, regardless of the political groups, to unite behind our Labour Cabinet led housing programme. With limited land available for development in the city, we need to ensure sites identified for housing development in the Oxford Local Plan are used for that purpose. It is not responsible to debate alternative uses or play politics by appealing to narrow sectional interests and NIMBYism.
- The Leader of the Council to write to our neighbouring district councils to request, on behalf of this Council, that they unite with us, honour their duty to co-operate, and deliver the over 100 homes per year until 2040 which Oxford needs but cannot accommodate within our tight city boundaries.

- The Council to support the Leader of the Council's request for a meeting with Michael Gove, SoS for DLUHC, to discuss the spiralling costs of providing temporary accommodation. The extra £240,000 so far allocated is inadequate and the Tory Government needs to properly reimburse this council for the costs involved in picking up the pieces of their failures on housing and the economy.
- 

### Green Group Amendment

This Council notes with alarm the growing number of local households facing homelessness in Oxford and the increased pressure this has placed on our homelessness prevention services and on access to temporary accommodation.

This Council had brought down the number of people in temporary accommodation to around 100 households. But over the past year, this number has increased to approximately 220 households, and the figure is projected to reach 315 by July.

The rapid rise means that the 120 units of temporary accommodation owned by the council are no longer sufficient and we need to increasingly rely on hotel rooms to meet our statutory duties. This is a miserable and difficult situation for the families being placed in hotels and it has a huge unbudgeted financial cost for this council which is being left to pick up the bill.

This Council has moved swiftly to mitigate the situation by buying and leasing more temporary accommodation, block-booking hotels, hiring new staff to prevent homelessness and using more of our council owned homes for temporary accommodation.

These efforts have saved Oxford taxpayers about £2m, but this Council is still projecting a hole in the budget of as much as £3m every year – equivalent to 12.5% of the Council's annual net budget.

This Council is also finding it increasingly difficult to help people in temporary accommodation and our non-statutory homeless services to find affordable long-term homes.

This Council is working hard on behalf of the people of Oxford to deliver the affordable high-quality homes our city needs. We have retained our 7,900 council homes and we set up OX Place, our wholly owned housing company, to build 2,000 new homes over the next decade. Working in partnership with housing associations, we have a four-year programme to deliver 1600 affordable homes, including over 850 for social rent.

We also fund over 400 beds in supported accommodation for adults not entitled to statutory support.

We call upon:

- ~~Council, regardless of the political groups, to unite behind our Labour Cabinet led housing programme. With limited land available for development in the city, we need to ensure sites identified for housing development in the Oxford Local Plan are used for that purpose. It is not responsible to debate alternative uses or play politics by appealing to narrow sectional interests and NIMBYism.~~
- ~~The Leader of the Council to write to our neighbouring district councils to request, on behalf of this Council, that they unite with us, honour their duty to co-~~

~~operate, and deliver the over 100 homes per year until 2040 which Oxford needs but cannot accommodate within our tight city boundaries.~~

- Council to continue to support an ambitious programme of housebuilding within Oxford to play our part in alleviating the housing and temporary accommodation crises, recognising that remaining space within the city is limited.
  - The leader of the council to write to neighbouring districts asking them to continue to honour agreements to meet some of Oxford's unmet housing need.
  - Council to support the Leader of the Council's request for a meeting with Michael Gove, SoS for DLUHC, to discuss the spiralling costs of providing temporary accommodation. The extra £240,000 so far allocated is inadequate and the Tory Government needs to properly reimburse this council for the costs involved in picking up the pieces of their failures on housing and the economy.
  - The leader of the council to write to Michael Gove reiterating our call to be given powers to introduce controls on private sector rents and the short term let sector, as well as calling for an end to the disastrous right to buy policy to begin to tackle the housing and temporary accommodation crises.
- 

If amended, the motion would read:

This Council notes with alarm the growing number of local households facing homelessness in Oxford and the increased pressure this has placed on our homelessness prevention services and on access to temporary accommodation.

This Council had brought down the number of people in temporary accommodation to around 100 households. But over the past year, this number has increased to approximately 220 households, and the figure is projected to reach 315 by July.

The rapid rise means that the 120 units of temporary accommodation owned by the council are no longer sufficient and we need to increasingly rely on hotel rooms to meet our statutory duties. This is a miserable and difficult situation for the families being placed in hotels and it has a huge unbudgeted financial cost for this council which is being left to pick up the bill.

This Council has moved swiftly to mitigate the situation by buying and leasing more temporary accommodation, block-booking hotels, hiring new staff to prevent homelessness and using more of our council owned homes for temporary accommodation.

These efforts have saved Oxford taxpayers about £2m, but this Council is still projecting a hole in the budget of as much as £3m every year – equivalent to 12.5% of the Council's annual net budget.

This Council is also finding it increasingly difficult to help people in temporary accommodation and our non-statutory homeless services to find affordable long-term homes.

This Council is working hard on behalf of the people of Oxford to deliver the affordable high-quality homes our city needs. We have retained our 7,900 council homes and we set up OX Place, our wholly owned housing company, to build 2,000 new homes over the next decade. Working in partnership with housing associations, we have a four-year programme to deliver 1600 affordable homes, including over 850 for social rent.



We also fund over 400 beds in supported accommodation for adults not entitled to statutory support.

We call upon:

- Council to continue to support an ambitious programme of housebuilding within Oxford to play our part in alleviating the housing and temporary accommodation crises, recognising that remaining space within the city is limited.
- The leader of the council to write to neighbouring districts asking them to continue to honour agreements to meet some of Oxford's unmet housing need.
- Council to support the Leader of the Council's request for a meeting with Michael Gove, SoS for DLUHC, to discuss the spiralling costs of providing temporary accommodation. The extra £240,000 so far allocated is inadequate and the Tory Government needs to properly reimburse this council for the costs involved in picking up the pieces of their failures on housing and the economy.
- The Leader of the Council to write to Michael Gove reiterating our call to be given powers to introduce controls on private sector rents and the short term let sector, as well as calling for an end to the disastrous right to buy policy to begin to tackle the housing and temporary accommodation crises.

**c) In Support of Green Investment (proposed by Cllr Chris Smowton, seconded by Cllr Katherine Miles) [Amendment Proposed by Cllr Anna Railton, seconded by Cllr Alex Hollingsworth]**

Liberal Democrat Group Motion

Council notes that:

- A report by the Office for National Statistics in 2022 noted that over 40% of dwellings in Oxford had wall insulation rated Poor or Very Poor.<sup>9</sup>
- Analysis by the Institute for Public Policy Research found that the government is falling short if its home retrofit investment target, that billions of pounds a year are required to fully realise the benefits, and that households could save hundreds of pounds a year on their energy bills if those benefits are realised.<sup>10</sup>
- National Grid's plan for energy decarbonisation over the next ten years indicates a need for a radical increase in investment in grid infrastructure, grid-attached storage, and enabling works for green generation.<sup>11</sup>
- The government's own road map for heat pump rollout suggests a need for billions of pounds more in investment.<sup>12</sup>
- Not only is the government failing to meet its investment in green infrastructure as noted above, but the Leader of the Opposition has slashed plans for major green investment.<sup>13</sup>

Council resolves:

- That the Leader should write to both the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition expressing this council's support for a truly transformative green investment programme that will put the country on the path to net zero, place the UK as a world leader in green technology, and support hundreds of thousands of green jobs.
  - That the Leader should further write to Oxford's MPs requesting that they in turn pressure both government and opposition to deliver large-scale green investment.
- 

Labour Group Amendment

**Council notes that:**

- A report by the Office for National Statistics in 2022 noted that over 40% of dwellings in Oxford had wall insulation rated Poor or Very Poor.<sup>14</sup>
- Analysis by the Institute for Public Policy Research found that the government is falling short if its home retrofit investment target, that billions of pounds a year are required to fully realise the benefits, and that households could save hundreds of pounds a year on their energy bills if those benefits are realised.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> [Insulation and energy efficiency of housing in England and Wales - Office for National Statistics \(ons.gov.uk\)](https://ons.gov.uk)

<sup>10</sup> [UK is falling billions short of investment needed in current parliament for energy efficiency and clean heat | IPPR](https://www.ippr.org)

<sup>11</sup> [download \(nationalgrid.com\)](https://nationalgrid.com)

<sup>12</sup> [Heat Pump Investment Roadmap \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://publishing.service.gov.uk)

<sup>13</sup> [Starmer to announce scale-back of £28bn-a-year green pledge \(energyvoice.com\)](https://energyvoice.com)

<sup>14</sup> [Insulation and energy efficiency of housing in England and Wales - Office for National Statistics \(ons.gov.uk\)](https://ons.gov.uk)

<sup>15</sup> [UK is falling billions short of investment needed in current parliament for energy efficiency and clean heat | IPPR](https://www.ippr.org)

- National Grid’s plan for energy decarbonisation over the next ten years indicates a need for a radical increase in investment in grid infrastructure, grid-attached storage, and enabling works for green generation.<sup>16</sup>
- The government’s own road map for heat pump rollout suggests a need for billions of pounds more in investment.<sup>17</sup>
- ~~Not only is~~ **The government is** failing to meet the needed investment in green infrastructure as noted above, ~~but the Leader of the Opposition has slashed plans for major green investment.~~<sup>18</sup>
- **This council estimates retrofitting all of its operational buildings to net zero would be £30m, with all of its council housing to EPC C would cost £150m, and to net zero £500m. 300 homes are being retrofitted over the next two years at a cost of £7.6m.**

### **Council resolves:**

- That the Leader should write to both the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition expressing this council’s support for a truly transformative green investment programme that will put the country on the path to net zero, place the UK as a world leader in green technology, and support hundreds of thousands of green jobs.
  - That the Leader should further write to Oxford’s MPs requesting that they in turn pressure both government and opposition to deliver large-scale green investment.
- 

If amended, the Motion would read:

### **Council notes that:**

- A report by the Office for National Statistics in 2022 noted that over 40% of dwellings in Oxford had wall insulation rated Poor or Very Poor.<sup>19</sup>
- Analysis by the Institute for Public Policy Research found that the government is falling short of its home retrofit investment target, that billions of pounds a year are required to fully realise the benefits, and that households could save hundreds of pounds a year on their energy bills if those benefits are realised.<sup>20</sup>
- National Grid’s plan for energy decarbonisation over the next ten years indicates a need for a radical increase in investment in grid infrastructure, grid-attached storage, and enabling works for green generation.<sup>21</sup>
- The government’s own road map for heat pump rollout suggests a need for billions of pounds more in investment.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> [download \(nationalgrid.com\)](https://www.nationalgrid.com)

<sup>17</sup> [Heat Pump Investment Roadmap \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://publishing.service.gov.uk)

<sup>18</sup> [Starmer to announce scale back of £28bn a year green pledge \(energyvoice.com\)](https://www.energyvoice.com)

<sup>19</sup> [Insulation and energy efficiency of housing in England and Wales - Office for National Statistics \(ons.gov.uk\)](https://ons.gov.uk)

<sup>20</sup> [UK is falling billions short of investment needed in current parliament for energy efficiency and clean heat | IPPR](https://www.ippr.org)

<sup>21</sup> [download \(nationalgrid.com\)](https://www.nationalgrid.com)

<sup>22</sup> [Heat Pump Investment Roadmap \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://publishing.service.gov.uk)

- The government is failing to meet the needed investment in green infrastructure as noted above.
- This council estimates retrofitting all of its operational buildings to net zero would be £30m, with all of its council housing to EPC C would cost £150m, and to net zero £500m. 300 homes are being retrofitted over the next two years at a cost of £7.6m.

**Council resolves:**

- That the Leader should write to both the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition expressing this council's support for a truly transformative green investment programme that will put the country on the path to net zero, place the UK as a world leader in green technology, and support hundreds of thousands of green jobs.
- That the Leader should further write to Oxford's MPs requesting that they in turn pressure both government and opposition to deliver large-scale green investment

**d) Weight and emissions based parking charges (proposed by Cllr Emily Kerr, seconded by Cllr Lois Muddiman) [Amendment Proposed by Cllr Anna Railton, seconded by Cllr Louise Upton]**

Green Group Motion

**Council notes:**

1. Larger cars cause more damage to our roads, are more likely to seriously injure or kill pedestrians, and take up more valuable public space. They're outgrowing the design of our cities, especially small medieval cities like Oxford.
2. Cars have been growing at an astonishing 0.5cm per year since 2000.<sup>23</sup> The growth in size is very pronounced among luxury SUVs. For example, The Land Rover Defender grew by 20.6cm in just 6 years.<sup>24</sup>
3. Large SUVs are now around 2m wide, or 220cm with mirrors, compared to a minimum parking width of just 180cm. In typical off street parking spaces (240cm), large SUVs often leave too little space for occupants to get in and out of vehicles. Data published last month shows half of new cars are too wide for parking spaces.<sup>25</sup>
4. Wider cars reduce the road space available to pedestrians, scooters, and cyclists: and creates more danger for all of them. As Transport & Environment has said: "Cars have been getting wider for decades and that trend is likely to continue until we set a stricter limit. Currently the law allows new cars to be as wide as trucks. The result has been big SUVs and American style pick-up trucks parking on our footpaths and endangering pedestrians, cyclists and everyone else on the road."<sup>26</sup>
5. Owners of larger and higher emitting vehicles cost the public purse more than owners of smaller and greener vehicles due to the higher number of fatalities and serious illnesses caused by pollution and accidents and the greater amount of damage to roads.<sup>27 28</sup>
6. Cities across the world are taking a stand:
  - a. Paris has recently tripled charges for SUVs parking inside the city<sup>29</sup>
  - b. Bath now charges higher-emitting vehicles more, having first considered it under the Tories in 2018.<sup>30</sup>
  - c. Lyon charges heavier vehicles more.<sup>31</sup>
  - d. London boroughs have long had emissions based parking fees, including Greenwich, Lewisham, Merton, Newham, Croydon, Lambeth, City of

---

<sup>23</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2024/jan/22/cars-growing-wider-europe-report>

<sup>24</sup> <https://airqualitynews.com/cars-freight-transport/suvs-leading-the-way-as-cars-found-to-be-getting-1cm-wider-every-two-years/>

<sup>25</sup> <https://airqualitynews.com/cars-freight-transport/suvs-leading-the-way-as-cars-found-to-be-getting-1cm-wider-every-two-years/>

<sup>26</sup> <https://airqualitynews.com/cars-freight-transport/suvs-leading-the-way-as-cars-found-to-be-getting-1cm-wider-every-two-years/>

<sup>27</sup> <https://www.npr.org/2023/11/14/1212737005/cars-trucks-pedestrian-deaths-increase-crash-data>

<sup>28</sup> <https://edition.cnn.com/2023/03/01/world/suv-cars-emissions-iea-climate-intl/>

<sup>29</sup> <https://news.sky.com/story/paris-votes-to-triple-parking-charges-for-some-suvs-13064477>

<sup>30</sup> <https://beta.bathnes.gov.uk/emission-based-car-parking-charges>

<sup>31</sup> <https://www.connexionfrance.com/article/French-news/French-first-as-city-brings-in-parking-charges-linked-to-car-s-weight>

London. Westminster under the Tories launched a diesel parking surcharge in 2017.<sup>32</sup>

### Council believes:

1. It would be relatively simple to introduce increased parking charges for higher emitting and/or heavier vehicles, as the DVLA holds all this information on every car based on number-plate. Enforcement of car parks could be managed using cameras.
2. While Oxfordshire County Council and Oxford City Council work together to manage car parks, and residents parking is managed exclusively by County, a joint project between City and County to come up with a fairer and more equitable charging system that more accurately reflects the greater cost to the public purse generated by larger, higher emitting vehicles would be beneficial.

### Council resolves:

- To request the Cabinet Member for Planning and Healthier Communities and the Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford and Climate Justice work closely with the County to design a more equitable system of parking charges.
  - To request that these Cabinet Members report back to this Council within 6 months on any proposals they have developed with County colleagues.
- 

### Labour Group Amendment

#### Council notes:

1. Larger cars cause more damage to our roads, are more likely to seriously injure or kill pedestrians, and take up more valuable public space. They're outgrowing the design of our cities, especially small medieval cities like Oxford.
2. Cars have been growing at an astonishing 0.5cm per year since 2000.<sup>33</sup> The growth in size is very pronounced among luxury SUVs. For example, The Land Rover Defender grew by 20.6cm in just 6 years.<sup>34</sup>
3. Large SUVs are now around 2m wide, or 220cm with mirrors, compared to a minimum parking width of just 180cm. In typical off street parking spaces (240cm), large SUVs often leave too little space for occupants to get in and out of vehicles. Data published last month shows half of new cars are too wide for parking spaces<sup>35</sup>. **On narrow residential streets this often leads to pavement parking.**
4. Wider cars reduce the road space available to pedestrians, scooters, and cyclists: and creates more danger for all of them. ~~As Transport & Environment has said: "Cars have been getting wider for decades and that trend is likely to continue until we set a stricter limit. Currently the law allows new cars to be as wide as trucks. The result has been big SUVs and American style pick-up trucks parking on our footpaths and endangering pedestrians, cyclists and everyone else on the road."~~<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> <https://cities-today.com/more-uk-councils-adopt-emissions-based-parking-charges/>

<sup>33</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2024/jan/22/cars-growing-wider-europe-report>

<sup>34</sup> <https://airqualitynews.com/cars-freight-transport/suvs-leading-the-way-as-cars-found-to-be-getting-1cm-wider-every-two-years/>

<sup>35</sup> <https://airqualitynews.com/cars-freight-transport/suvs-leading-the-way-as-cars-found-to-be-getting-1cm-wider-every-two-years/>

<sup>36</sup> <https://www.npr.org/2023/11/14/1212737005/cars-trucks-pedestrian-deaths-increase-crash-data>

5. Owners of larger and higher emitting vehicles cost the public purse more than owners of smaller and greener vehicles due to the higher number of fatalities and serious illnesses caused by pollution and accidents and the greater amount of damage to roads.<sup>37 38</sup>
6. Cities across the world are taking a stand:
  1. Paris has recently tripled charges for SUVs parking inside the city<sup>39</sup>
  2. Bath now charges higher-emitting vehicles more, having first considered it under the Tories in 2018.<sup>40</sup>
  3. Lyon charges heavier vehicles more.<sup>41</sup>
  4. London boroughs have long had emissions based parking fees, including Greenwich, Lewisham, Merton, Newham, Croydon, Lambeth, City of London. Westminster under the Tories launched a diesel parking surcharge in 2017.<sup>42</sup>
  5. In November 2023, Cllrs Railton and Upton investigated introducing emissions or weight based parking in our city car parks. They established with officers that it would require significant capital investment & infrastructure in place before implementation. This under consideration for the 2025/6 budget.

Council believes:

1. It would be relatively simple to introduce increased parking charges for higher emitting and/or heavier vehicles, as the DVLA holds all this information on every car based on number-plate. Enforcement of car parks could be managed using cameras.
2. While Oxfordshire County Council and Oxford City Council work together to manage car parks, and residents parking is managed exclusively by County, a joint project between City and County to come up with a fairer and more equitable charging system that more accurately reflects the greater cost to the public purse generated by larger, higher emitting vehicles would be beneficial.

Council resolves:

- To request the Cabinet Member for Planning and Healthier Communities and the Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford and Climate Justice work closely with the County to **investigate** designing a more equitable system of parking charges.
  - To request that these Cabinet Members report back to this Council within 6 months on any proposals they have developed with County colleagues.
- 

<sup>37</sup> <https://www.npr.org/2023/11/14/1212737005/cars-trucks-pedestrian-deaths-increase-crash-data>

<sup>38</sup> <https://edition.cnn.com/2023/03/01/world/suv-cars-emissions-iea-climate-intl/>

<sup>39</sup> <https://news.sky.com/story/paris-votes-to-triple-parking-charges-for-some-suvs-13064477>

<sup>40</sup> <https://beta.bathnes.gov.uk/emission-based-car-parking-charges>

<sup>41</sup> <https://www.connexionfrance.com/article/French-news/French-first-as-city-brings-in-parking-charges-linked-to-car-s-weight>

<sup>42</sup> <https://cities-today.com/more-uk-councils-adopt-emissions-based-parking-charges/>

If amended, the Motion would read:

Council notes:

1. Larger cars cause more damage to our roads, are more likely to seriously injure or kill pedestrians, and take up more valuable public space. They're outgrowing the design of our cities, especially small medieval cities like Oxford.
2. Cars have been growing at an astonishing 0.5cm per year since 2000.<sup>43</sup> The growth in size is very pronounced among luxury SUVs.
3. Large SUVs are now around 2m wide, or 220cm with mirrors, compared to a minimum parking width of just 180cm. In typical off street parking spaces (240cm), large SUVs often leave too little space for occupants to get in and out of vehicles. Data published last month shows half of new cars are too wide for parking spaces<sup>44</sup>. On narrow residential streets this often leads to pavement parking.
4. Wider cars reduce the road space available to pedestrians, scooters, and cyclists: and creates more danger for all of them.
5. Owners of larger and higher emitting vehicles cost the public purse more than owners of smaller and greener vehicles due to the higher number of fatalities and serious illnesses caused by pollution and accidents and the greater amount of damage to roads.<sup>45 46</sup>
6. Cities across the world are taking a stand:
  6. Paris has recently tripled charges for SUVs parking inside the city<sup>47</sup>
  7. Bath now charges higher-emitting vehicles more, having first considered it under the Tories in 2018.<sup>48</sup>
  8. Lyon charges heavier vehicles more.<sup>49</sup>
  9. London boroughs have long had emissions based parking fees, including Greenwich, Lewisham, Merton, Newham, Croydon, Lambeth, City of London. Westminster under the Tories launched a diesel parking surcharge in 2017.<sup>50</sup>
  10. In November 2023, Cllrs Railton and Upton investigated introducing emissions or weight based parking in our city car parks. They established with officers that it would require significant capital investment & infrastructure in place before implementation. This under consideration for the 2025/6 budget.

Council believes:

3. It would be relatively simple to introduce increased parking charges for higher emitting and/or heavier vehicles, as the DVLA holds all this information on every car based on number-plate. Enforcement of car parks could be managed using cameras.

---

<sup>43</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2024/jan/22/cars-growing-wider-europe-report>

<sup>44</sup> <https://airqualitynews.com/cars-freight-transport/suvs-leading-the-way-as-cars-found-to-be-getting-1cm-wider-every-two-years/>

<sup>45</sup> <https://www.npr.org/2023/11/14/1212737005/cars-trucks-pedestrian-deaths-increase-crash-data>

<sup>46</sup> <https://edition.cnn.com/2023/03/01/world/suv-cars-emissions-iaa-climate-intl/>

<sup>47</sup> <https://news.sky.com/story/paris-votes-to-triple-parking-charges-for-some-suvs-13064477>

<sup>48</sup> <https://beta.bathnes.gov.uk/emission-based-car-parking-charges>

<sup>49</sup> <https://www.connexionfrance.com/article/French-news/French-first-as-city-brings-in-parking-charges-linked-to-car-s-weight>

<sup>50</sup> <https://cities-today.com/more-uk-councils-adopt-emissions-based-parking-charges/>



4. While Oxfordshire County Council and Oxford City Council work together to manage car parks, and residents parking is managed exclusively by County, a joint project between City and County to come up with a fairer and more equitable charging system that more accurately reflects the greater cost to the public purse generated by larger, higher emitting vehicles would be beneficial.

Council resolves:

- To request the Cabinet Member for Planning and Healthier Communities and the Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford and Climate Justice work closely with the County to investigate designing a more equitable system of parking charges.
- To request that these Cabinet Members report back to this Council within 6 months on any proposals they have developed with County colleagues.

## **e) The Cost-of-living crisis and local government funding (proposed by Cllr Ed Turner, seconded by Cllr Nigel Chapman)**

### Labour Group Motion

This Council believes that the English local government finance settlement proposed by the Tories for 24/25 is thoroughly inadequate and penalises our poorest citizens the most, who are least well equipped to face the continuing cost-of-living crisis.

Government pronouncements about increased funding are “smoke and mirrors” and do not reflect the reality that costs are rising faster than any increases in funding, and that increases in “core spending power” largely come from local residents, not government funding.

Council is very concerned that a one-year increase in local housing allowances (after years of freeze) will be eroded by the Government’s failure to increase the benefits cap and temporary accommodation housing benefit, thus offering support with one hand and then denying it with the other. That failure will be exacerbated by reintroducing the housing allowance freeze again in April 25. This will once again increase homelessness in areas like Oxford.

In addition, this Council is angry that the Conservative Government has abolished funding for the Household support grant from May 24 – denying poorer people a welcome source of cash support for household and fuel bills, and vital heating repairs. This comes in addition to the end of centrally provided fuel bill support for many who had been in receipt of it.

Overall, English local government faces a huge funding crisis and cannot close the gap without cutting front line services, especially those aimed at its poorest citizens. This is evidenced by the high-profile and very severe cuts forced upon councils in Birmingham and Nottingham.

More widely, Council believes households are feeling huge pressure because of substantial increases in taxes as well as, for many, higher mortgage costs and rents due to the chaos caused by Liz Truss’ mini-budget, and a sharp focus on the cost of living is urgently needed.

This Council calls upon the Leader of the Council to write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government demanding:

1. A sustainable long term funding settlement for councils like Oxford, facing a funding squeeze due to inflation and the rising costs of homelessness.
2. A commitment to increasing local housing allowances annually in line with local housing costs and scrapping the benefits cap.
3. The re-instatement of funding for the Household Support Grant which provides a flexible and rapid response to people with urgent needs.
4. Support for councils like Oxford which retains a Council Tax reduction scheme for people struggling to pay these costs, and encouragement that other councils should instigate such schemes.

It also asks the Leader of the Council to contact our two local MPs, for Oxford East and Oxford West and Abingdon respectively, and ask them to write with the same demands to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.