

## **Minutes of a meeting of Council on Monday 18 March 2024**

www.oxford.gov.uk



### **Council members present:**

Councillor Arshad (Lord Mayor)	Councillor Fry (Deputy Lord Mayor)
Councillor Lygo (Sheriff)	Councillor Altaf-Khan
Councillor Aziz	Councillor Brown
Councillor Chapman	Councillor Clarkson
Councillor Corais	Councillor Coyne
Councillor Diggins	Councillor Djafari-Marbini
Councillor Douglas	Councillor Dunne
Councillor Fouweather	Councillor Gant
Councillor Hollingsworth	Councillor Humberstone
Councillor Jarvis	Councillor Landell Mills
Councillor Latif	Councillor Malik
Councillor Miles	Councillor Muddiman
Councillor Mundy	Councillor Munkonge
Councillor Nala-Hartley	Councillor Pegg
Councillor Pressel	Councillor Railton
Councillor Rawle	Councillor Rehman
Councillor Sandelson	Councillor Linda Smith
Councillor Roz Smith	Councillor Snowton
Councillor Turner	Councillor Upton
Councillor Waite	

### **Also present for all or part of the meeting:**

Caroline Green, Chief Executive  
Nigel Kennedy, Head of Financial Services  
Tom Hook, Executive Director (Corporate Resources)  
Mish Tullar, Head of Corporate Strategy  
Emma Jackman, Head of Law and Governance  
Jonathan Malton, Committee and Member Services Manager

Celeste Reyeslao, Committee and Member Services Officer

Tanaka Merralls, Trainee Solicitor

Amber Khaloon, Trainee Solicitor

### **Apologies:**

Councillor(s) Hall, Hunt, Kerr, Morris, Thomas and Walcott sent apologies.

The minutes show when Councillors who were absent for part of the meeting arrived and left.

## **102. Declarations of interest**

### **Item 7: Licensed Vehicles Emission Standards Amendment**

Councillor Sajjad Malik stated he had an interest on this decision item which had been entered in his register of interest as a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI); he indicated that he would leave the room during the consideration of this item.

Councillor Edward Mundy stated he was the Chair of the General Purposes Licensing Committee and was present during the consideration of this report at the Licensing Committee meeting held 5 February 2024. He indicated that he will consider this item with an open mind.

Councillors Mary Clarkson, Rae Humberstone, Mark Lygo, Louise Upton, Naomi Waite, Katherine Miles, Lois Muddiman, Rosie Rawle and Barbara Coyne also declared their membership to the Licensing Committee and stated they were present at the Licensing Committee meeting held 5 February 2024. They indicated they would consider this item with an open mind.

### **Item 13a: Cancel divisive non-evidence-based transport policies including traffic filters and strengthen citizens trust in democracy**

Councillor Gant stated that this motion related to his County's portfolio responsibilities and indicated he would not participate in the consideration of this item.

## **103. Minutes**

Council **agreed** to approve the minutes of the ordinary meeting of Council held on 29 January 2024 and Budget Council held on 21 February 2024.

## **104. Announcements**

The Lord Mayor announced that she had attended the SHE (Saluting, Honouring and Excellence) Awards on International Women's Day, 8 March 2024, where she was recognised for her dedication and hard work within the community. She had also attended the National Peace Symposium at Europe's largest mosque on 9 March 2024 which aimed to inspire a concerted effort to achieve lasting peace.

*Cllr Pressel arrived at the meeting.*

The Lord Mayor also announced the presence of Dr Husam Zomlot, Head of the Palestinian Mission to the UK, to address the Council following the previously passed motion concerning the situation in Gaza and Israel. Dr Zomlot was invited to address the Council in place of Mayor of Ramallah Issa Kassis who had understandably been unable to respond to the request.

Dr Zomlot addressed the Council. He spoke about the twinship of the Cities of Oxford and Ramallah, the deadly situation in Gaza and Palestine, and a call for local councils to remind its government of its responsibilities in maintaining peace.

The Leader of the Council expressed gratitude to Dr Zomlot for accepting the Lord Mayor's invitation, which received strong cross party support, to address the Council. She conveyed the Council's empathy towards the humanitarian crisis experienced by the people of Gaza and Ramallah. She expressed the Council's desire for peace and position to recognise the State of Palestine.

The Leader of the Council announced the following nominations for Civic Office-holders for the 2024-25 municipal year:

- Mike Rowley for Lord Mayor
- Tiago Corais for Deputy Lord Mayor
- James Fry for Sheriff

Lastly, the Leader of the Council wished to put on record a list of thanks to Councillors who had made the decision to stand down in the upcoming council year:

To Councillor Tom Hayes for his longstanding service as Councillor and as Cabinet Member whose work contributed towards the City's pathway to becoming a Zero Carbon city.

To Councillor Tom Landell-Mills for his service on the Council.

To Councillor Lucy Pegg for her service as a Councillor and as Chair of the Scrutiny Committee.

To Councillor Shaista Aziz for all her services she had given to the Council and the City of Oxford.

And to Councillor Rae Humberstone for his dedication to the City, amounting to 19 years of service on the Council and in Civic offices.

*Cllr Morris arrived at the meeting.*

The City Rector addressed the Council and spoke about service to others, thankfulness for one another, and remembrance of the suffering around the world. He gave words of

hope and blessings for the upcoming spring, Ramadan, Passover, and Easter, along with well wishes for the Council in the forthcoming elections.

### **105. Public addresses and questions that relate to matters for decision at this meeting**

Council heard one address. Councillor Edward Mundy, Chair of the General Purposes Licensing Committee provided a verbal response.

The address and response are set out in full in the minutes pack.

1. Address from Mr. Bashir Ahmed, President of C. O. L. T. A (City of Oxford Licensed Taxicab Association)

The Lord Mayor thanked the speaker for their contribution.

### **106. Appropriation of land at Railway Lane.**

Council considered a report from the Executive Director (Development) seeking approval to appropriate a parcel of land (change the statutory basis on which it is held by the Council from one function to another) at Railway Lane from the General Fund to the Housing Revenue Account in order that the land can be used for the development of new council housing, and to update Cabinet on certain aspects of the development.

Councillor Linda Smith, Cabinet Member for Housing introduced the report, proposed the recommendation and answered questions.

The recommendation was agreed on being seconded by Councillor Susan Brown, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Inclusive Economy and Partnerships, and put to the vote.

#### **Council resolved to:**

1. **Agree** the appropriation of the land owned by Oxford City Council that forms part of the development site for housing at Railway Lane from the General Fund (GF) into the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) at the established red book valuation figure.

### **107. Licensed Vehicles Emission Standards Amendment**

*Cllr Malik left the meeting, having declared an interest on this item, and returned to the meeting at the start of the next item.*

Council considered a report from the Executive Director (Communities and People) which set out the decision of the General Purposes Licensing Committee to delay the introduction of new emission standards for Hackney Carriage Vehicles licensed by this Authority by one year.

Councillor Edward Mundy, Chair of the General Purposes Licensing Committee, on being seconded by Councillor Anna Railton, Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford and Climate Justice, introduced the report and proposed the recommendation.

Councillor Ajaz Rehman, seconded by Councillor Amar Latif, proposed an amendment to the recommendation. Following debate, and on being put to the vote, the amendment was not carried.

*Following agreement from Council, the meeting broke at 6.00 pm to allow Members observing Ramadan time for Iftar and Prayer, and reconvened at 7.00 pm.*

The recommendation was put to the vote.

**Council resolved to:**

1. **Agree** on a delay to the introduction of new emission standards to Hackney Carriage Vehicles licenced by this Authority by one year, as agreed by the General Purposes Licensing Committee.

*Council agreed to consider item 11 of the agenda next, and then return to the remaining items on the agenda as listed.*

## **108. Public addresses and questions that do not relate to matters for decision at this Council meeting**

Council heard four addresses and one question from members of the public. Cabinet Members read or summarised their written responses. A further question was withdrawn ahead of the meeting.

The addresses, questions and responses are set out in full in the minutes pack.

1. Address from Zuhura Plummer
2. Address from Dr Sheikh Ramzy
3. Address from Danny Yee
4. Question from Richard Parnham
5. Question from Dr. Dominik Metz – *Withdrawn*
6. Address from Kaddy Beck

The Lord Mayor thanked the speakers for their contributions.

## **109. Pay Policy Statement 2024**

Council received a report from the Head of Business Improvement requesting that Council approve the Annual Pay Policy Statement.

Councillor Nigel Chapman, Cabinet Member for Citizen Focused Services and Council Companies introduced the report and proposed the recommendation.

The recommendation was agreed on being seconded by Councillor Susan Brown, Leader of the Council Cabinet Member for Inclusive Economy and Partnerships, and put to the vote.

**Council resolved to:**

1. **Approve** the Annual Pay Policy Statement 2024/25 and the new 2 year pay agreement in Appendix 1.

## **110. Questions on Cabinet minutes**

**a) Minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 7 February 2024**

None.

**b) Draft Minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 13 March 2024**

In response to questions from Council, Councillor Louise Upton, Cabinet Member for Planning and Healthier Communities, stated that global car companies had the freedom to select their operational locations and acknowledged that allocating £800k in discretionary relief was not ideal. The discretionary relief scheme set out in the Council's policy permitted any business to seek funding, including the BMW Group. Having sought extensive legal advice, the decision was made to mitigate the risk of BMW relocating elsewhere.

The Monitoring Officer clarified that whilst the planning applications fell within the scope of the Planning Committee as a Council function, the assessment of liability was a matter reserved for Cabinet and executive powers.

## **111. Questions on Notice from Members of Council**

29 written questions were asked of the Cabinet Members and the Leader. The questions and written responses were published before the meeting.

These along with summaries of the 15 supplementary questions and responses asked and given at the meeting are set out in the minutes pack.

## **112. Outside organisation/Committee Chair reports and questions**

**a) Scrutiny Committee update report**

Councillor Lucy Pegg, Chair of the Scrutiny Committee, introduced the report updating the Council on the activities of the Committee from 01 January 2024 to 29 February 2024. She highlighted the two meetings held during this period, in addition to two Panel meetings, which collectively made 57 recommendations to Cabinet. She expressed her gratitude to members of the Scrutiny Committee for their commitment to cross party scrutiny, the Panel Chairs, and to Alice Courtney for her exceptional work as Scrutiny Officer.

Council **noted** the report.

### **113. Motions on notice 18 March 2024**

Council had before it five motions on notice submitted in accordance with Council procedure rules and reached decisions as set out below.

Motions agreed as set out below:

- 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 Douglas, seconded by Cllr Railton]**

Motions not taken as the time allocated for debate had finished:

- b) Uniting to Tackle Oxford's Housing Crisis (proposed by Cllr Linda Smith, seconded by Cllr Nigel Chapman)**
  - c) In Support of Green Investment (proposed by Cllr Chris Smowton, seconded by Cllr Katherine Miles)**
  - d) Weight and emissions based parking charges (proposed by Cllr Chris Jarvis, seconded by Cllr Lois Muddiman)**
  - 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 Douglas, seconded by Cllr Railton]**

*Cllr Gant left the meeting having declared an interest on this item.*

Councillor Ajaz Rehman, seconded by Councillor Shaista Aziz, proposed the motion as set out in the briefing notes.

*Cllrs R Smith, Nala-Hartley and Dunne left the meeting.*

Councillor Sandy Douglas proposed an amendment to the motion and was seconded by Councillor Anna Railton. Council debated the amended motion. Following debate and on being put to the vote, the proposed amendment was agreed.

On being put to the vote, the amended motion was agreed:

#### **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)**

This motion was not taken as the time allocated for debate had finished.

- c) In Support of Green Investment (proposed by Cllr Chris Smowton, seconded by Cllr Katherine Miles)**

This motion was not taken as the time allocated for debate had finished.

- d) Weight and emissions based parking charges (proposed by Cllr Emily Kerr, seconded by Cllr Lois Muddiman)**

This motion was not taken as the time allocated for debate had finished.

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

This motion was not taken as the time allocated for debate had finished.

**The meeting started at 5.00 pm and ended at 9.35 pm**

**Lord Mayor .....**

**Date: Thursday 16 May 2024**

*Decisions on items of business take effect immediately:*

*Motions may be implemented immediately or may require further budget provision and/or reports to Cabinet before implementation.*

*Details are in the Council's Constitution.*

This page is intentionally left blank

**To: Council**

**Date: 18 March 2024**

**Report of: Head of Law and Governance**

**Title of Report: Public addresses and questions that relate to matters for decision – as submitted by the speakers and with written responses from Cabinet Members**

## **Introduction**

1. Addresses made by members of the public to the Council, and questions put to the Cabinet members or Leader, registered by the deadline in the Constitution, are below. Any written responses available are also below.
2. The text reproduces that sent in the speakers and represents the views of the speakers. This is not to be taken as statements by or on behalf of the Council
3. This report will be republished after the Council meeting as part of the minutes pack. This will list the full text of speeches delivered as submitted, summaries of speeches delivered which differ significantly from those submitted, and any further responses.

Addresses and questions to be taken in Part 1 of the agenda

1. Address from Mr. Bashir Ahmed, President of C. O. L. T. A (City of Oxford Licensed Taxicab Association)

## **Addresses and questions to be taken in Part 1 of the agenda**

1. **Address from Mr. Bashir Ahmed, President of C. O. L. T. A (City of Oxford Licensed Taxicab Association)**

*Mr Bashir Ahmed was deputised by Mr Sajad Khan, Secretary of COLTA.*

The secretary of our Association, Mr Sajad Khan, recently spoke at the general purpose licensing committee (GPLC) on 5th February 2024 highlighting the difficulties and the challenges our trade had endured since the onset of Covid back in 2020.

With the initial plan for the emission standard policy to begin in January 2025, after our secretary spoke at the GPLC meeting, Councillors agreed to allow a one-year delay to the emission standards policy, and for it to begin in January 2026. This 1 year delay was offered and approved as a compromise by both the Councillors and portfolio holders for Planning and healthier communities and Zero carbon/climate justice.

As a trade, we don't think the 1 year compromise was a balanced judgment of the facts available to all of us. The trade has lost 4 productive years since March 2020 since the initiation of Covid. There was no work for us for 18 months all the way through till the end of 2021. Then the trade suffered due to the unimaginable rise in living costs due to the financial crisis and very high interest rates. The trade was further impacted with industrial action which crippled the U.K. and still continues till this date. And lastly, the impact of road closures which includes LTNs and the ongoing closure of Botley Road have created a huge disruption to the service we are meant to provide. All of these issues impact taxi drivers and our earnings have reduced drastically.

Unfortunately, at the GPLC meeting, it seems like our concerns were largely ignored. We lost 4 productive years and in return a one year compromise was given. This is regrettable.

I hope that the members have had sight of and read the 2 important pieces of information available to them. I had sent all of you the relevant link to access these documents.

Firstly, the results of the public consultation where over 80% of the general public supported the delay of the emission standards policy till January 2028. Secondly, the 'Hackney carriage fleet Affordability' report presents to everyone findings which highlight our plight. To briefly summarise, it clearly states in there that under current circumstances, it is actually more viable to operate in the current TX4 diesel Cab than it is in the electric one because the cost associated with operating in an electric cab are greater. This includes the 200% increase in energy cost to charge the battery on the cab.

The report also highlights that in 2018, our trade was responsible for LESS THAN 1% of the harmful emissions within Oxford. We are now in 2024 and have 34 electric cabs operating out of 107. I ask the members, what do you think that would have done to the

1 % figure? That would have significantly reduced further. We are an insignificant number of road users which contribute a minuscule of emissions which hardly contribute to the environment. These reports seem to have been ignored.

To us, a fair compromise would have been an extra two years delay from 2025. We were hoping that the members at the GPLC would understand our concerns and appreciate the reports in front of them including the public consultation. On that basis, we were hoping that the emission standard policy would be delayed till January 2027. This would have been a compromise. Unfortunately, this wasn't the case.

I don't need to emphasise the point of our willingness and the corporation we've had with authorities that has got us to this stage. Thirty four (34) of our cabs are electric. This is due to the good relations we've had with the authority which included financial grants available to 20 proprietors who made use of the grant and purchased an electric cab.

No such grant is currently available to us. Unfortunately, what the GPLC had failed to realise in our opinion, is that the circumstances for the trade had changed drastically since 2020 with all the issues explained.

So we ask all of you to help the trade and support us drivers of the trade who are your constituents by delaying the emission standard policy by an extra year from 2026 to 2027. As I've explained, we have always been cooperative, but at times, a common

sense approach needs to be taken without ignoring the facts in front of you. Delaying the emission standards policy to 2027 will certainly give drivers who are faced with this daunting investment a bit more breathing space, drivers who can then plan their investment accordingly with the prospect of 2027 in their mind. Currently we are all paying very high prices in everything whether it's fuel food and bills, including Mortgages.

The expanded ZEZ is planned for sometime in 2026. Probably the middle of 2026. To ask for the emission standard policy to be delayed till January 2027 is not a big ask whatsoever in light of this development. This will give some proprietors a little bit more time to invest than others. Some proprietors will have their license renewals in early 2027. So we shouldn't consider delaying till 2027 as something which is criminal.

As I've said, it will certainly give the extra breathing space to all of us that have yet to change to electric cabs. Thank you to everyone for listening.

Thank you

Colta

**Response from Councillor Edward Mundy, Chair of the General Purposes Licensing Committee**

*Thank you, Mr Ahmed and Mr Khan, for your services to the licensed taxi drivers of Oxford, and for addressing the Council today. As you know we are debating the Licensed Vehicles Emission Standards amendment later this evening, your comments will be taken into consideration by the Council.*

This page is intentionally left blank

**To: Council**

**Date: 18 March 2024**

**Report of: Head of Law and Governance**

**Title of Report: Public addresses and questions that do not relate to matters for decision – as submitted by the speakers and with written responses from Cabinet Members**

## Introduction

1. Addresses made by members of the public to the Council, and questions put to the Cabinet members or Leader, registered by the deadline in the Constitution, are below. Any written responses available are also below.
2. The text reproduces that sent in the speakers and represents the views of the speakers. This is not to be taken as statements by or on behalf of the Council
3. This report will be republished after the Council meeting as part of the minutes pack. This will list the full text of speeches delivered as submitted, summaries of speeches delivered which differ significantly from those submitted, and any further responses.

Addresses and questions to be taken in Part 2 of the agenda

1. Address from Zuhura Plummer
2. Address from Dr. Sheikh Ramzy
3. Address from Danny Yee
4. Question from Richard Parnham
5. ~~Question from Dr Dominik Metz~~
6. Address from Kaddy Beck

## Addresses and questions to be taken in Part 2 of the agenda

### 1. Address from Zuhura Plummer

This motion mixes up three different traffic interventions – the LTNs, the filters and the workplace parking levy - and casually asks that all of them are dropped despite them being very different policies, covering different areas, with different aims, at totally different stages of implementation. This clearly demonstrates that while the proposers claim they are interested in evidence; they're not.

If they were interested in evidence they might note that in 2013 a poll of Oxfordshire business showed 76% thought congestion adversely affected them<sup>1</sup>. In 2016, the Strategic Economic Plan put congestion and housing as the two most pressing challenges for the economy.

In the same year, the Oxford Mail reported “traffic jams ... worse than ever” and mentioned bad jams on Botley Road, Cowley Road, London Road and Iffley Road<sup>2</sup>. This was way before any LTNs.

We have 100,000 houses being built in our county<sup>3</sup>, which means about 142k more cars on our roads<sup>4</sup>. If cars remain the default we are **all** going to be sitting in gridlock. It's common sense that some of us are going to have to swap out some car journeys to keep the city moving. Few people are going to do that by being asked nicely – hence traffic filters and LTNs which make driving less convenient, *while* making the alternatives better – the filters speed up buses and LTNs make cycling and walking safer and nicer.

The LTNs have manifestly succeeded in their primary goal of making walking and cycling safer and more accessible. For example, at Larkrise primary - a school with 20% pupil premium children and 40% on the SEN register - the LTNs and school streets have enabled ninety children, a fifth of the pupils, to switch from being driven to walking, cycling, scooting<sup>5</sup>. That's 360 fewer times cars are driven to the school and out again.

Let's look at the evidence around the Cowley Road

We tracked every opening and closing of business from 2010 to the present day on the Cowley Road from the Cape of Good Hope to Divinity Road –168 premises. Between 15-16 open and close along the stretch every year. These figures remained the same since the LTNs went in, in fact there was a dip in closures in 2022<sup>6</sup>. The Cowley Road is a vibrant and brilliant place because 40,000 people live within walking distance<sup>7</sup>, something that's nicer to do with LTNs.

Let's look at the evidence around air pollution. The article which Cllr Reham and Aziz have referenced clearly stats that air pollution at the Plain was still lower 2022, post the LTNs, than it was in that same location in 2019 before the LTNs<sup>8</sup>. Of course, there was a rise between 2021 to 2022 as we all returned to normal life. The article they reference, which is based on the City Council annual air quality report, shows you huge reductions in pollution within LTNs while simultaneously having a slight decrease at Oxford most polluted spot<sup>9</sup>. This is a win for everyone.

But it is telling what issues the proposers do not mention where there is extremely strong evidence. For example, around inactivity. The Royal College of Surgeons recently announced that 20 minutes of light exercise daily, such as walking or cycling a short journey, cuts the risk of dementia by 30%, type 2 diabetes by 40%, breast cancer by 25%, depression by 30%, heart disease by 40% and osteoporosis by 50%<sup>10</sup>. Some people might look at this evidence and say ‘my gosh, we should make it as easy as possible for people to make better choices for themselves! Despite a multi-billion dollar

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.oxfordmail.co.uk/business/news/10743126.traffic-jams-major-threat-county-economy/>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.oxfordmail.co.uk/news/14639676.traffic-jams-worse-ever-oxfordshire-businesses-count-cost-congestio>

<sup>3</sup> [https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/file/roads-and-transport-connecting-oxfordshire/Strategic\\_Assessment\\_traffic\\_filter.pdf](https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/file/roads-and-transport-connecting-oxfordshire/Strategic_Assessment_traffic_filter.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.nimblefins.co.uk/cheap-car-insurance/number-cars-great-britain>

<sup>5</sup> [https://primariesite-prod-sorted.s3.amazonaws.com/larkrise-ps/UploadedDocument/f050dbcf-503e-42a9-8932-b8425be8dfb3/27.larkrise-news-2021\\_2022-13th-may-2022.pdf](https://primariesite-prod-sorted.s3.amazonaws.com/larkrise-ps/UploadedDocument/f050dbcf-503e-42a9-8932-b8425be8dfb3/27.larkrise-news-2021_2022-13th-may-2022.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> [https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1m-MKf46mp3iUxr5ijD\\_vKsziSD5ENg-e/edit#gid=405704725](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1m-MKf46mp3iUxr5ijD_vKsziSD5ENg-e/edit#gid=405704725)

<sup>7</sup> www.dataptive.com based on Census 2021

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/cgr61x5y28zo.amp>

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.oxford.gov.uk/downloads/file/833/air-quality-annual-status-report-2022>

<sup>10</sup> <https://publishing.rcseng.ac.uk/doi/full/10.1308/rcsbull.2020.28>



car industry wanting us to drive everywhere, let's make it more inconvenient to drive, and nicer to walk or cycle! But no, they're suggesting we do the opposite.

Let's also look at what might happen if the County were to follow this suggestion and just dump the traffic filters. The traffic filters speed up buses. This is overriding, overwhelming reason they were chosen above other measures. This is what would happen if the filters were dumped:

Two brand new bus routes wouldn't happen. These are outer loops and will around the city so you don't have to change in the centre. Both will serve the hospital from the west, south and east. Maybe the proposers would like these to be cancelled?

- Would they like the planned increased frequency of the 3a and 5a serving Littlemore to be cancelled?
- Would they like the planned increase frequency of buses serving Wallingford, Didcot and Banbury to be cancelled?
- Would they like the planned increased frequency of P&R services on Sundays to be cancelled?
- Would like the 159 electric buses, invested in as a direct result of the traffic filters, to be cancelled? Would they prefer big petrol buses to keep pumping out toxic fumes on the arterial roads of Oxford?

Those bus improvements are coming about because buses are going to be faster, which frees up drivers and vehicles along a route.

I have some sympathy for the request around school streets for private schools. These schools tend to have far, far higher rates of car drop offs as they are non-catchment schools<sup>11</sup>, and compared to state schools they are located closer into the centre of Oxford<sup>12</sup> – driving traffic right into the centre of our city. I believe the schools need to be far more proactive about a school bus for each individual school, and simply buy HomeRun, which is a secure app designed especially for school liftsharing. Luckily for the people of Oxford, the traffic filters are likely to drive behaviour changes around private schools, although, like Cllr Rehman and Aziz I would like to see much more done in this area.

I would urge you to oppose this motion today.

### **Response from Councillor Brown, Leader and Cabinet Member for Inclusive Economy and Partnerships**

*Thank you for your address Zuhura. And thank you in particular for highlighting – as I need to do repeatedly – that it is the County Council, not this Council, which holds responsibility for transport in Oxford and across Oxfordshire. I'm sure we will have an interesting debate subsequently but I should highlight that the LTNs were a County Council project introduced under the previous Conservative administration with which we have had no involvement. The traffic filters however, have been a joint project to tackle Oxford's awful congestion.*

---

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.solvetheschoolrun.org/our-data>

<sup>12</sup> [https://www.google.com/maps/d/u/0/edit?mid=1iAf6p2z4rYLu\\_mKTJ2WiASnjRtA5WqA&ll=51.75615078985504%2C-1.2346043499999948&z=12](https://www.google.com/maps/d/u/0/edit?mid=1iAf6p2z4rYLu_mKTJ2WiASnjRtA5WqA&ll=51.75615078985504%2C-1.2346043499999948&z=12)

## **2. Address from Dr. Sheikh Ramzy**

Honourable esteemed Members of the Oxford City Council,

Greetings and blessings

In light of our city's rich history and commitment to inclusivity, I would like to request that Oxford City Council consider giving its support to a two state solution to end the conflict in Gaza. This proposal reflects our shared values of justice, equality, and the pursuit of peace, aligning with the United Kingdom government's endorsement of a two-state solution for the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The enduring conflict between Israel and Palestine has resulted in profound suffering and loss for both sides of the conflict. It is widely acknowledged that a comprehensive resolution is essential to ensure the security and rights of all parties involved. Central to this resolution is the establishment of a viable and independent Palestinian state alongside Israel.

Should Oxford City Council provide support for such a solution it represents a significant and symbolic step towards the parties to the conflict advancing the peace process. It underscores our solidarity with the Palestinian people and affirms the Council believes that a solution should be underpinned by international law, self-determination, and human rights. By confirming its support the Council will demonstrate support for a just and lasting solution to the conflict.

Oxford City Council, as the authority of a city renowned for its prestigious academic institutions and diverse community, is well-suited to lead by example in supporting the recognition of Palestine. As a city that values inclusivity and tolerance, Oxford City Council has a responsibility to champion the rights of marginalized communities. By endorsing this proposal, the Council honour our tradition of standing up for justice and equality.

In 2014 Sweden to recognised Palestine as a state in 2014, setting an important precedent for other nations and municipalities. By supporting a two-state solution, Oxford City Council will be lending its voice to the global momentum behind the recognition of Palestine. Such collective action amplifies the voices of the Palestinian people and strengthens calls for constructive dialogue and negotiation.

In conclusion, I urge the Oxford City Council to consider lending its support to the two-state solution to the conflict, demonstrating Oxford's unwavering commitment to peace and human rights, affirming your values as a compassionate and progressive city and standing in solidarity with those striving for dignity and freedom.

### **Response from Councillor Brown, Leader and Cabinet Member for Inclusive Economy and Partnerships**

*Thank you for your address Dr Ramzy. Although this is a matter for the United Nations and the UK Government rather than Oxford City Council, I think I can speak on behalf of us all in saying that councillors would also support a two-state solution for Israel and Palestine.*

### 3. Address from Danny Yee

Outside my front door is a marked parking bay which can, if everyone parks carefully, just fit four small cars. But even one large car reduces its capacity to three.

Those of you who drive may have experienced finding a space in a car parking lot only for there to be wide vehicles on either side, right up to the dividing line, making the space impossible or very difficult to use. And car parks that might have had a hundred spaces twenty years ago may now only have eighty, because they have to cater for wider cars.

So charging larger vehicles more for parking would be justified simply on fairness grounds. But larger vehicles also create a whole range of community harms - pretty much all the harms created by cars are worse with larger and heavier cars.

In some places on-street parking has been shifted onto pavements, making them difficult or impossible to use for people walking or wheeling, because wider cars parked on the carriageway wouldn't leave enough room for bin lorries or fire engines.

A child is eight times more likely to die in a collision with an SUV than with an ordinary car, because they go under the SUV rather than onto the bonnet of the car. And because larger vehicles have poor visibility they are more likely to hit children, especially when reversing. Larger vehicles also contribute to road danger indirectly, even when parked or stationary, because they block visibility, raising the risk of collisions between other people - walking, wheeling, cycling or driving.<sup>13</sup>

Heavier vehicles cause more damage than lighter ones, both to the carriageway and to pavements. This is non-linear, and some analyses suggest the heaviest SUVs may do twenty times as much damage as a typical car.

Particulate air pollution largely comes from tyre wear, road dust resuspension, and brake wear. This means it is not solved by electrification, but also that larger vehicles create more of it. There is no safe level of particulate air pollution, which is why the World Health Organisation guidelines are now 20% of the UK legal limits.

Finally, larger vehicles burn more fuel and emit more carbon dioxide. All the decarbonisation gains achieved by vehicle electrification have been undone by increasing vehicle size.<sup>14</sup>

So we need to discourage the ownership and use of larger vehicles, especially in urban areas such as Oxford with large numbers of people walking and cycling and breathing the air. Increased parking charges would be a small but direct deterrent but would also, if accompanied by a suitable explanatory campaign, provide moral and psychological suasion.

Many other local authorities have emissions-based charging and a few have size or weight-based charging. Oxford and Oxfordshire should follow them. Please support this motion.

---

<sup>13</sup> <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0022437522000810>

<sup>14</sup> <https://infotec.news/2023/11/28/suvs-massively-undermine-efforts-to-decarbonise-transport-says-report/>

## **Response from Councillor Brown, Leader and Cabinet Member for Inclusive Economy and Partnerships**

*I'm not sure whether or not we will reach this motion tonight but in my view, the most sensible and easily operationalised option to deliver these measures would be a countywide review of the permit system so that all permit costs reflect the size and emissions of vehicles. Therefore, this might be a representation to make to the County Council.*

### **4. Question from Richard Parnham**

This question is mainly directed at Anne Railton, Oxford City Council Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford and Climate Justice.

"Can the cabinet member for Zero Carbon Oxford and Climate Justice explain whether or not the Oxford Air Quality Annual Status report for 2023 will include a detailed analysis of historic / recent NO2 pollution levels across the planned Oxford ZEZ expansion zone?"

## **Response from Councillor Railton, Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford and Climate Justice**

*Thank you for your question Mr Parnham. As I know you're already aware, Oxford City Council manages one of biggest air quality networks operated by a local authority in the UK.*

*This extensive air quality monitoring network consists of 3 automatic monitoring sites measuring NO2, PM10, PM2.5 and O3 and 133 diffusion tubes measuring NO2 levels across the city of Oxford.*

*The monitoring coverage encompasses all the key areas included in Oxfordshire County Council's proposed ZEZ expansion.*

*As you also know, it is our statutory duty to report to DEFRA all the air quality data from this network on annual basis, every June. And so, in three months' time we will be publishing our Air Quality Annual Status Report, which will contain all the information about the levels that were measured by our network of sensors in 2023, including the most recent trends.*

*But why wait? You can check current air quality levels which are monitored live on the countywide air quality website, also created by Oxford City Council. That's [www.oxonair.uk](http://www.oxonair.uk).*

### **5. Question from Dr Dominik Metz**

~~Dear Leader of the Cabinet Member,~~

~~I am a GP working in a community with a hotel housing asylum seekers. As more asylum seekers are granted refugee status, they are also being given 1 month notice (or less) of eviction from the hotels they reside in. As many will not have received any state financial support by this time and will not have had the necessary documents to find a job, they are facing destitution. As a GP working with asylum seekers, I can~~

~~confirm that many are vulnerable for multiple reasons. My personal experience is that this month alone over 25 refugees from an Oxfordshire hotel are being evicted. I am very concerned for their welfare and ask the council if this current situation can be classed a housing/homelessness emergency? What measures can the Council take to support such persons?~~

***The question from Dr Dominik Metz was withdrawn.***

## **6. Address from Kaddy Beck**

We are campaigning to save Bertie Park, the only recreation ground in the southern half of the Hinksey Park ward.

How many times have you told us:

“Bertie Park has been on local plans for 20 years,” and “there’s been extensive consultation?”

Both are false. Your proposals depart from all previous plans which all required the park to be moved. You never asked us if we wanted the Park destroyed.

Bertie Park is not judged surplus to requirements, but your 2040 local plan has simply dropped the requirement to move it.

It says the Park is suitable for residential housing because “there is potential ... to replace the function of the site partially within the site and partially elsewhere in the local area.”

It says there should be a playground (of some sort) within the new development. The Multi-Use-Games Area could become “an alternative type of facility,” or maybe you could “increase the capacity” of the small kick-about area on Fox Crescent. The recreation ground itself isn’t mentioned.

Your current consultation on local byelaws shows that Bertie will disappear from the map.

In compensation, you will improve access to what you now call the Cold Harbour Nature Area.

No-one is concerned about access. Parents don’t allow kids to go there alone because it’s scary. There’s no natural surveillance. You’ve never any idea who or what you could find there. Thames Valley Police have said it’s not safe for unaccompanied children.

We are not NIMBYs. If you wanted to build housing there, few would object. But we do object to you building on our recreation ground.

Government guidance states that recreational space should only be built on if “the loss resulting from the proposed development (is) replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location.”

Our research shows our community is of the overwhelming opinion that this would not be the case.

You have no intention of complying with government guidance. Yet you insist that new facilities will meet the needs of existing and future users.

After you have granted planning permission, you will ask us whether the fence posts should be blue or red and whether we want swings or roundabouts.

When Bertie Park has gone, you'll say "there's been extensive consultation" and "we are meeting the community's needs."

We all know that Oxford is a housing catastrophe; 3,000 people on the housing list; most ordinary working people can't afford to live here. You say that building on our 1.7-acre park will transform the lives of 31 families. "Don't we want somewhere for our children to live?"

Meanwhile, on the North Oxford Development, you have different priorities. The 64-acre site will provide one million square feet of labs and workspaces, 4,500 jobs, 3 public parks, but only 480 homes. This will super-charge the housing crisis. Advertised as a "model of sustainable living," few working people will afford to live there. If this site was used for housing, you could build 1,237 homes.

In this part of Oxford, you intend to build an additional 230 homes. UK children are getting less exercise than ever, but you want to destroy the only park we've got. Hinksey Park is over a kilometre away. For residents of your new development on Redbridge Meadow, it will be even further.

Will you use the 3 new parks in North Oxford for social housing too? It is clearly one rule for them, and another rule for us.

What makes this worse is that you are keeping us in the dark. Last time you gave us notice that Bertie Park would be discussed at cabinet, we leafletted our area to let everyone know. Many were disappointed when it was dropped from the agenda at the last minute. So now you keep quiet.

We've signed up for alerts. Each month we wait for cabinet and planning committee agendas to appear. Appropriation of Bertie Park has been on 3 forward plans. The latest says you'll decide in June. But we know you could cancel again. You're having us on.

We are Oxford residents. If you are determined to build on our only community facility, the least you could do is to keep us informed.

### **Response from Councillor Upton, Cabinet Member for Planning and Healthier Communities**

*Thank you for coming today. We have a number of concerns which we are well aware of. I will make sure you are informed well in advance of any planning events or committee meetings.*