

**To: Council**  
**Date: 24 November 2025**  
**Report of: Director of Law, Governance and Strategy**  
**Title of Report: Questions on Notice from members of Council and responses from the Cabinet Members and Leader**

## **Introduction**

Questions submitted by members of Council to the Cabinet members and Leader of the Council, by the deadline in the Constitution are listed below in the order they will be taken at the meeting.

Responses are included where available.

Questioners can ask one supplementary question of the Cllr answering the original question.

This report will be republished after the Council meeting to include supplementary questions and responses as part of the minutes pack.

Unfamiliar terms may be briefly explained in footnotes.

## Questions and responses

**Cabinet Member for Partnership Working and Inclusive Economic Growth; Leader of the Council**

### SB1: From Cllr Mundy to Cllr Brown

#### Question

Why does the "Media Roundup" email not include stats on Twitter/ X? Is the Council getting meaningful engagement on X, and is a review of the use of the platform being considered?

#### Written Response

The Media Roundup is an internal document shared with managers and councillors at Oxford City Council. Through the weekly social media data, the Communications Team aims to provide insight into what is working on our channels. Due to capacity, the data currently focuses on our main platforms: Facebook, Instagram and TikTok. We could also provide data for LinkedIn, YouTube and NextDoor.

We continually review our use of social media, including through consultations with Oxford residents via the Residents' Panel and engagement on the platforms themselves. Recent consultations show a preference among younger residents for short-form video, so over the past year we have prioritised Instagram, TikTok and YouTube. Mainly due to capacity, we have deprioritised more text-based platforms like X, Bluesky and NextDoor. This may change in the future.

#### Supplementary Question

#### Verbal Response

None.	
-------	--

<b>SB2: From Cllr Rehman to Cllr Brown</b>	
<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>Should the congestion charge show no reduction in the cities overall air quality would you commit to oppose traffic filters?</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b></p> <p>There needs to be a thorough review of the impact of the county's various traffic schemes, including their interaction with each other. The priorities should be reducing congestion, making public transport flow more freely, improving air quality and improving the experiences of cyclists and pedestrians. We also need to rebuild confidence in our communities in an overall transport plan which means engagement with residents and businesses.</p>
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p> <p>None.</p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p>

5

<b>SB3: From Cllr Rehman to Cllr Brown</b>	
<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>Congestion charged routes are essentially traffic filters. I value your principal on the charge which discriminates against the least well off in our city. Given the burden and fines of the filters will essentially be felt by oxford residents. Do you have any proposals you are pushing for which will at least allow the city to benefit financially from filter fines, especially as we have seen with the congestion charge free park and ride buses which on the whole have no benefit to oxford residents? For example, free bus travel for school children</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b></p> <p>We specifically asked the County Council if they insisted on going ahead with the congestion charge to use some of the money they raised to subsidise bus fares for those in our city. They have chosen to do that only for residents outside the city and then only for a few months.</p>

<b>Supplementary Question</b> None.	<b>Verbal Response</b>
--	------------------------

**SB4: From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Brown**

<b>Question</b> Have the usual processes of sending decisions made by the General Purposes Licensing Committee (GPL) and the Licensing and Gambling Acts Committee (LGA) to Full Council for approval, recently changed - and if so how and why?	<p>LGA: We have had advice which confirms that there is a distinction between policy that needs to come to Full Council and the saturation / cumulative impact assessment and policy. The latter is a decision to be taken by Committee but has previously been sent to Full Council for approval due to an ambiguity in the Licensing Act 2003 as to what constitutes licensing policy. Amendments to the Constitution to reflect this are part of the agenda for this Council meeting.</p> <p>GPL: Advice to the Council is that there needs to be a clear decision of full Council to keep taxi licensing as a responsibility of Full Council as a result of case law. This has never been done and advice is approval of the provisions as part of the constitution is insufficient. This has led to a report on the Council agenda to reaffirm this but, in the meantime, a report went to Cabinet to ensure that a decision on Taxi Licensing was ratified, following recommendation of the GPL to Council which had to be withdrawn from the last Council agenda. This is a belt and braces approach to ensure that the original intention of both our constitution and the licensing committee's decision are respected.</p>
---	--

<b>Supplementary Question</b> Councillor Muddiman queried whether the Leader of the Council had been aware of any whipping ahead of the latest Licensing and Gambling Acts Committee meeting.	<b>Verbal Response</b> Councillor Brown referred Councillor Muddiman to the legal advice already provided regarding whipping and policy decisions.
--	---

<b>SB5: From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Brown</b>	
<b>Question</b> Can the portfolio holder give full details of the interim scheme which Thames Water will introduce in 2027 to provide wastewater capacity which was agreed by Oxford City Council, the Environment Agency and Thames Water in March?	<b>Written Response</b> Thames Water publish a quarterly report on their website detailing their progress so far, as well as holding regular updates with the Local Planning Authorities and developers. Works are reported by Thames Water to be on track to deliver both the short term and long-term improvements needed. The full report can be found here: <a href="#">Performance and annual results   About us   Thames Water</a>
<b>Supplementary Question</b> None.	<b>Verbal Response</b>

<b>SB6: From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Brown</b>	
<b>Question</b> Can the portfolio holder provide full details of the latest advice from the Environment Agency regarding the capacity of the Oxford Sewage Treatment works, following the scheme agreed in March 2025?	<b>Written Response</b> No further advice has been issued to us by the EA since they wrote to the LPA providing revised guidance on this matter.
<b>Supplementary Question</b> None.	<b>Verbal Response</b>

**Cabinet Member for Finance and Asset Management; Deputy Leader of the Council (Statutory)**

<b>ET1: From Cllr Fouweather to Cllr Turner</b>
---

<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>The “Greater Oxford” Proposal for Local Government Reorganisation has been prepared by the Cabinet and Council Officers. Can the Cabinet Member inform the Council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What funding has been provided by national Government?</li> <li>2. How much has been spent from Council funds and from which budget?</li> </ol> <p>How much has been spent in total (including officer time, all forms of advertising, and consultancy) from all sources of funding?</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b></p> <p>Government provided £90,000 in funding to support the development of LGR proposals. It has been clear that the main costs of implementation of proposals should be borne by existing and new councils themselves and recouped through the delivery of efficiencies from the creation of new unitary structures.</p> <p>In the period since April 2025 the Council has spent £288,000 on the LGR work, from its General Fund budget.</p> <p>Subject to Cabinet decision, Oxford City Council will consult on a proposed £2m provision in its 2026/27 Budget as its contribution towards the costs of LGR and devolution. Oxfordshire County Council has already made a provision of £10m to contribute towards these costs, and the other district councils are expected similarly to make Budget provisions.</p>
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p> <p>Councillor Fouweather asked the Cabinet Member to confirm that the decision to spend £288,000 was agreed in accordance with the constitution and reported to Council, noting that it was not included within the budget.</p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p> <p>Councillor Turner offered to write to Councillor Fouweather on the matter, noting that he was not aware of any relevant issues with the process.</p> <p><b>Written Response</b></p> <p>Budgeted resources by the Council for 2025-26 total £200k. In addition to this the Council have been given a £95k grant from the Government. The total spend to date on consultancy advice and other resources to prepare the LGR 3 Councils proposal, publicise the MHCLG consultation – as requested by Government - and progress the preparatory phase of collaborative working with the other Oxfordshire and West Berkshire Councils is £295,000. This is in line with the Budget allocation and because the Council budget spend is under £250k decisions could be taken by officers in line with the scheme of delegation in the Constitution.</p>

∞

**ET2: From Cllr R Smith to Cllr Turner**

<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>Regarding the BDO audit report given at the Audit &amp; Governance meeting on 21st October, which evaluated the quality of Fire Risk Assessments conducted by contractors: BDO reported the contractor BrightHeat subcontracted 217 fire risk assessments to Guardian Consultancy Services, who further subcontracted to Hawk Fire Safety Services and VM Fire Safety Services. Is the practice of multi-layer subcontracting common in City Council contracts, and are you satisfied that we have sufficient accountability from our direct contractor?</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b></p> <p>In terms of the contract with BrightHeat, I can confirm that all contracts relating to Fire Risk Assessments have been terminated, and the activity has been brought in-house via a specialist fire safety team. This gives the Council the necessary control and assurance required. More broadly, all specifications should stipulate that there should be no sub-contracting of work without the explicit consent of the client.</p>
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p> <p>None.</p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p>

6

<p><b>ET3: From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Turner</b></p>	
<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>Can the portfolio holder give details as to how the £16,000 assigned to flowers in Frideswide Square in the 2024 budget has been spent?</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b></p> <p>Due to the construction works currently taking place to replace the Botley Road Bridge, works to improve the planters at Frideswide Square has been deferred. There are however discussions taking place around improvements to the planters and responsibility for long term maintenance so they are improved for when the works in the area are complete.</p>
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p> <p>None.</p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p>

**Cabinet Member for a Zero Carbon Oxford; Deputy Leader of the Council**

<b>AR1: From Cllr Sandelson to Cllr Railton</b>	
<b>Question</b> Is the Council willing to provide a bench for visitors to the Jewish section of the Wolvercote cemetery?	<b>Written Response</b> We are often asked for benches in all the cemeteries, including the Jewish section at Wolvercote, but haven't installed any for several years due to the intense pressure on the limited remaining burial space.  The Jewish section at Wolvercote is the only area in all the cemeteries with any significant burial space left, so a bench could be installed there if someone was prepared to fund it.  However, we are already having to remove existing benches from other areas of the cemetery to make space for burials (a bench is about the size of a grave), so installing a bench in one area at a time of removing them from other areas doesn't seem sensible.
<b>Supplementary Question</b> None.	<b>Verbal Response</b>
<b>AR2: From Cllr Gant to Cllr Railton</b>	
<b>Question</b> Does the administration of this city council support the traffic filters policy agreed by the county council in November 2022?	<b>Written Response</b> Does the administration of the County Council support the traffic filters policy THEY agreed in 2022? They have just implemented a different policy that wasn't advertised in the Lib Dem manifesto and nor were the residents, businesses nor even the City Council consulted on it.
<b>Supplementary Question</b> Councillor Gant asked the Cabinet Member whether the administration supports the policy or not, noting that it has done in the past.	<b>Verbal Response</b> Councillor Railton encouraged future conversation regarding the matter.

**AR3: From Cllr Gant to Cllr Railton****Question**

When the administration of this council chose to oppose the congestion charge, what account did you take of the well-publicised synergies between congestion reduction and the deployment of 159 zero-emission buses, as set out in the Bus Service Improvement Plan's accompanying delivery plan?

**Written Response**

We have been asking the County Council for several years now to take measures to reduce congestion and improve bus times during the period that the Botley Road has remained closed. We have suggested a number of different measures from more school streets, working with Oxford's many private schools to reduce traffic to schools, other bus priority measures and subsidising bus travel.

The county council chose instead to introduce a measure without even discussing it with the City Council.

**Supplementary Question**

Councillor Gant asked the Cabinet Member what matters were taken into consideration when choosing not to support the congestion charge.

**Verbal Response**

Councillor Railton noted that it is not a decision for Oxford City Council to make.

11

**AR4: From Cllr Gant to Cllr Railton****Question**

Do you welcome the significant gains in bus services delivered by the newly-implemented congestion charge, including those from rural parts of the county into Oxford? Similarly, do you welcome the delivery of free bus travel from the Park and Rides for three months?

**Written Response**

When we responded to the county council's surprise announcement of a congestion charge, we specifically said that revenue from the scheme should be used in the city to subsidise bus services. That is the opposite of the decision you took as cabinet member on the county council, which is to use some of the money raised to subsidise people from outside the city.

I am not aware that any data has yet been published on the impact of the congestion charge. While increased use of bus services would be one measure to look at, air quality across the whole city, congestion moving and the impact on different communities would also be important to look at too.

**Supplementary Question**

Councillor Gant asked the Cabinet Member whether or not she agreed that it is positive for park and ride buses to be free of charge to those who live outside of Oxford and travel in.

**Verbal Response**

Councillor Railton noted that this can advantage those living outside the city ahead of local Oxford City residents.

**AR5: From Cllr Gant to Cllr Railton****Question**

Does this administration stand by its previously-expressed belief that traffic filters, a Zero Emission Zone and a Workplace Parking Levy contribute towards improving air quality, as set out on the 2025 Air Quality Annual Status Report's Table 3, "Progress on Measures to Improve Air Quality"? Does this extend to your welcoming overall improvements to air quality predicted to be delivered by the congestion charge?

**Written Response**

The question misunderstands the Air Quality Annual Report. The measures are in the report because they are the solutions offered by the County Council as the transport authority and we have a statutory duty to measure air quality.

This council would welcome an opportunity for the residents of this city to have an input into transport policy that impacts them.

**Supplementary Question:**

Councillor Gant asked the Cabinet Member whether the administration continues to support improving air quality in the city via the measures listed in the original question.

**Verbal Response**

Councillor Railton noted that the question related to matters of transport policy which are under the control of Oxfordshire County Council.

**AR6: From Cllr Gant to Cllr Railton**

<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>Oxford City Council will receive additional revenue from increased parking at the Park and Ride sites after bus services were made free of charge following introduction of the congestion charge, if this change results in enhanced uptake. The administration obviously considered this when deciding to oppose the charge, and concluded that it neither wanted nor needed this income. What, therefore, will happen to it?</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b></p> <p>I am not aware of any data yet that shows the impact of the congestion charge on car park income at the Park &amp; Ride sites, nor our city centre car parks. If there is increased income at the park and ride car parks that may well offset loss of income from city centre car parks.</p>
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p> <p>Councillor Gant asked the Cabinet Member what the income listed in the original response is used for.</p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p> <p>Councillor Railton explained that as there is no data yet, and therefore the impact on the city centre car parks is currently unknown.</p>

13

<p><b>AR7: From Cllr Djafari-Marbini to Cllr Railton</b></p>	
<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>Are there any plans being looked into for an East Oxford Park and Ride?</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b></p> <p>Any new Park &amp; Ride provision is for the County Council to consider as part of its wider transport strategy. The site allocation for land south of Grenoble Road within South Oxfordshire's Local Plan currently includes an area safeguarded for a Park &amp; Ride on this site.</p> <p>There are no plans for a new park and ride within the current city boundary.</p>
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p> <p>None.</p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p>

<p><b>AR8: From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Railton</b></p>	
<p><b>Question</b></p>	<p><b>Written Response</b></p>

<p>If the Cabinet decides to give Hackney Carriage drivers an indefinite extension to the date by which they must make the switch to electric vehicles, does the portfolio holder believe that the Council would be becoming less ambitious in its drive to reduce CO2 emissions in the city?"</p>	<p>No. The main CO2 emissions sector for the City is buildings emissions. The cost of requiring all Hackney carriages to migrate to electric would be a minimum of £2.5M investment for the trade (assuming second hand outright purchase, higher if leased or new), for a saving of a fraction of a percentage in carbon emissions.</p>
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b> None.</p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p>

<p><b>AR9: From Cllr Rehman to Cllr Railton</b></p>	
<p><b>Question</b> Are we monitoring the impact of the congestion charge on air quality on the roads with the congestion charge and the roads where traffic been displaced to?</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b> The city council has a statutory duty to measure air pollution annually. Currently, it measures NO<sub>2</sub> at three locations using automatic continuous monitors and at 77 locations using passive diffusion tubes. Since 2023, an additional 44 diffusion tubes have been installed to strengthen the network and help assess (at the time) the impacts of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) and also to establish the baseline air quality levels for the future traffic filter trials.  These locations were chosen based on specific air quality modelling commissioned by County, targeting areas with the greatest potential for impact and traffic displacement. The selection process was the result of a collaborative effort between the City's air quality officer and the County's traffic filter planning team.  Because the congestion charge has been introduced in the same areas where traffic filter trials are expected, the expanded monitoring network is currently well positioned to evaluate its effects, and no extra monitoring is required. However, analysing changes in air quality is complex, as many factors influence pollutant concentrations. Since the congestion charge was</p>

	<p>only recently implemented, a minimum of one year of monitoring is required to accurately assess the magnitude of any changes.</p> <p>There will only be two months of data covering the introduction of the congestion charge in the 2025 air quality report that will come out in June 2026; the rest will be in June 2027.</p>
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p> <p>None.</p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p>

<b>AR10: From Cllr Rehman to Cllr Railton</b>	
<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>An update on the burial site at Horspath Village adjacent to the athletics club please</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b></p> <p>City officers are working to find resolution to a county highways objection to the scheme. It will then go to South Oxfordshire planning committee.</p>
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p> <p>Councillor Rehman requested information from the Cabinet Member on the timescale for the resolution of the issue.</p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p> <p>Councillor Railton agreed with Councillor Rehman's comments, noting that the previous imprecision in the timescales was concerning. It was explained that the matter is out of the Council's hands as the decision will be taken by South Oxfordshire District Council.</p>

<b>AR11: From Cllr Powell to Cllr Railton</b>	
<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>Recently, and repeatedly, a number of works vehicles have been parked on the grass at Manzil Way Gardens causing damage to the grass. Can the portfolio holder</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b></p> <p>These were contractor's vehicles connected to works at the St Hilda's College Annex. No permission was sought or given for them to bring vehicles onto the site. The college has been contacted and concerns</p>

<p>please confirm whether any permission has been given for this?</p>	<p>raised, and they have offered to undertake restoration of the grass area disturbed.</p>
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p> <p>Councillor Powell noted the damage to the area by contractors and requested information from the Cabinet Member on the timescale for restoration.</p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p> <p>Councillor Railton committed to update Councillor Powell via email.</p> <p><b>Written Response</b></p> <p>St Hilda's College has been chased on this issue, but the last response was disappointingly dismissive of the need to rectify the damaged caused by its contractor's vehicles, despite the previous offer to undertake ground restoration works. This matter will be further progressed with the college.</p>

**Cabinet Member for Citizen Focused Services and Council Companies**

16

<p><b>NC1: From Cllr Sandelson to Cllr Chapman</b></p>	
<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>Given the uneven and poor quality of pavement repairs in parts of Oxford by Oxford Direct Services, (notably in the Cutteslowe part of Wolvercote Ward), as well as their generally high and unchallenged costs, can the city council in future put similar works out to tender to other contractors?</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b></p> <p>ODS on behalf of the City Council undertakes a range of works of repair and maintenance on minor streets in the city under an arrangement under S42 of the Highways Act. The type of works and the location of the works to be undertaken are agreed at the beginning of the year with Oxfordshire County Council, who provide funding for them.</p> <p>In Wolvercote Ward, some slurry surfacing has been undertaken. This is designed to prolong the life of existing surfacing rather than a full resurfacing arrangement and therefore a different finish is achieved.</p> <p>If there are any areas of concern, it would be helpful if they could be reported on Fix My Street so they can be inspected by ODS and addressed as appropriate.</p>

	<p>The cost of the works to be undertaken by ODS is agreed by the County Council when they confirm the schedule of works. ODS engage the same specialist sub-contractor as the County Council for works of this nature, ensuring significant economies of scale and delivering best value alongside consistent quality standards. Furthermore, all costs are subject to rigorous review by the County Council, providing assurance that ODS and the City Council are securing the most competitive and fair pricing available.</p> <p>If works were to be tendered separately, additional resource would be required within the City Council to undertake the procurement and supervise the work. Given the benchmarking that has taken place it is considered that ODS are delivering value for money for the City Council.</p>
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p> <p>None.</p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p>

17

<p><b>NC2: From Cllr Smowton to Cllr Chapman</b></p>	
<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>I note the recent submission of updated plans for the Bertie Park development's bridge connecting sites A and B following a pause of over a year in that application's progress. Do you have an estimate of the cost increase due to raising the standard of the bridge proposed, or due to above-inflation construction cost increases in the interim? What lessons are taken from this in terms of feedback to government regarding statutory consultees, or how this council and its companies deliver housing sites?</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b></p> <p>There is currently no proposed increase in the overall cost of this scheme to the Council over the past year, with any cost implications expected from proposed changes all currently contained with scheme contingencies.</p> <p>As this is still a live planning application, no lessons learned have been developed at this time with a view to sharing with the Government.</p>
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p> <p>Councillor Smowton asked the Cabinet Member to comment on why the objection to the initial designs for</p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p>

Bertie Park bridge was not anticipated, and asked whether the Environment Agency provide guidance on how these objections and delays could be avoided.

Councillor Chapman could not comment on the choices of the Environment Agency, however explained that ongoing work is seeking to find an updated and appropriate proposal.

### NC3: From Cllr Djafari-Marbini to Cllr Chapman

#### Question

Since the regeneration plans, the area that used to be called Spindelberry Nature Park has been neglected with lots of overgrown areas. When will the Park be tended to?

#### Written Response

There are currently some works connected with the new development to be undertaken in the area. These were delayed whilst the drainage strategy was revised but this development is nearing completion with occupations due to take place next year. The remainder of the Nature Park is being maintained to the normal schedule but if there are specific concerns can they be raised directly with the Parks team so they can be investigated and allayed.

#### Supplementary Question

None.

#### Verbal Response

18

### NC4: From Cllr Powell to Cllr Chapman

#### Question

Can the portfolio holder please outline what work is being undertaken to improve response rates on the members enquiry form in light of members experiencing some enquiries receiving no responses and others enduring lengthy delays?

#### Written Response

I agree that response times are not where we would want them to be. Interestingly, this is not linked directly to volume, as high volume areas are often doing well. It is low volume and niche technical areas, which seem to be struggling on response times, and plans are being developed for these teams to improve.

Officers responsible for answering enquiries receive reminders to respond by the correct dates.

	<p>Directors also now receive a weekly update email showing outstanding cases for their areas of responsibility. This is also discussed at the Corporate Leadership Team weekly meeting. We are looking at introducing a simple way for Members to be able to follow-up on late enquiries, as well as introducing a clearer drop down set of options to choose from.</p> <p>I shall be monitoring the data at my portfolio meetings, in addition to updates on performance coming to the Leaders Meeting.</p> <p>I would add this is the first time we have been able to record, and monitor Members Enquiries where as before, we had no collective knowledge of them. The system also offers less experienced members a way to submit their case work rather than expecting them to know how to do this on a one-to-one basis with officers.</p>
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p> <p>Councillor Powell thanked the Cabinet Member for the detail provided in the original response and asked if an indication of the number of enquiries flagged as nonresponsive could be given.</p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p> <p>Councillor Chapman committed to updating Councillor Powell on this when possible.</p>

<p><b>NC5: From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Chapman</b></p>	
<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>Can the portfolio holder list all of the different herbicides used by Oxford City Council, ODS or any contractors and give the amounts of each used in each of the past three years; and in which types of locations, each of the different herbicides is used?</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b></p> <p>Volumes have not changed significantly for the last few years and therefore you can assume that these volumes are consistent from year to year:</p> <p>Treatment to Pavements, garage areas, HRA areas, car parks</p> <p>Trustee Amenity, 3 applications totalling 168 litres in all.</p> <p>Treatment to garden paths, patios etc for the HRA garden scheme (where residents are happy for us to apply)</p> <p>Nomix Duel 5 litres per year total</p>

	<p>To Sheltered schemes, paths and paved areas          Nomix Dual approx. 20 litres per year total          To ODS depot hardstandings          Nomix Dual 5L per year          Treatment at schools (for private contracts) and around pavilion buildings          Nomix Dual 15L per year          Playground hardstandings          Nomix Dual 15L per year          Treatment of Japanese Knotweed on Countryside sites          Roundup Bioactive 1L          Treatment of fine turf areas (sports pitches)          Football pitches Depitox 500 45L, T2 Green Pro 135L          Bowls greens/ tennis Roundup Pro 5L</p>
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b>          None.</p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p>

<p><b>NC6: From Cllr Robinson to Cllr Chapman</b></p>	
<p><b>Question</b>          Can the portfolio holder set out how the council ensures human rights and environmental standards are upheld in the supply chain of textile recycling undertaken by and on behalf of the council?</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b>          We request suppliers to provide details of their downstream supply chains and the end market of the materials when we set up our textile recycling service. They must evidence TRUST (Trader Recycling Universal Standard) Certification and/or ISO 9001.          TRUST accreditation standard requires independent auditors to verify recyclers meet high standards in health and safety, business practices,</p>

	<p>labour, environment, and transport. This gives charities confidence when selling their goods to certified traders.</p> <p>ISO 9001 accreditation incorporates sustainability, ethics and corporate responsibility into business operations.</p> <p>The contractor had to go through audits as part of the accreditations for TRUST and are working towards ISO 9001 (TRUST not renewed for 2025) which looks at the supply chain.</p> <p>The contractor also has commitments with Charity Partners that is contractual and subsequent membership with the Fundraising Regulator.</p> <p>They also have contracts with sorting partners (copies provided as part of the tender process) which states our expectations and are validated during audits. (last audit Nov 2025 on site in the Ukraine)</p> <p>The ODS Procurement and waste team met with the contractor before awarding the contract to discuss the exportation of textiles as we were unable to get information on the international customers from desk research and wanted assurance and commitment before establishing the service.</p> <p>References were also sought from other councils working with the Contractor to ask what due diligence they had done on the end destination and customers.</p>
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p> <p>None.</p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p>

<p><b>NC7: From Cllr Robinson to Cllr Chapman</b></p>	
<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>Can the portfolio holder provide the data for the most recent month on where each category of textiles is going – especially unusable ‘rag’ textiles?</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b></p> <p>We do not collect unusable RAG’s.</p> <p>The contractor dealing with textile collections has confirmed the following supply chain for materials they do collect:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Usable clothing from this contract is sent to our Ukrainian customer. The stock is retained in the country of shipment and resold in a network of second hand and vintage clothing shops</li> <li>• Duvets and Pillows are sent to Pakistan for sorting and reforming into stuffings and industrial textile products.</li> <li>• Those 'End of life' garments that maybe collected are recycled into industrial wipers and cloths, mattress filling, insulation and new fibres.</li> </ul> <p>The Contractor's systems provide records of end market data, recycling and reuse rates and all associated documentation.</p> <p>More information on the company can be found here <a href="#">About us   Recycling Solutions North West</a> they are members of the Textile recycling association</p> <p><b>Collections from Oxford City households and donation banks for Oct 2025</b></p> <p>-Duvet/pillows- 5,213kg -Textiles from doorstep collection and banks – 27,404kg</p>
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p> <p>None.</p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p>

## Cabinet Member for Planning and Culture

<p><b>AH1: From Cllr Smowton to Cllr Hollingsworth</b></p>	
<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>Re: plans to begin charging for Museum entry: do you know the proportion of Oxford vs. Oxfordshire vs. further-afield visitors? Will you consider City or County</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b></p> <p>No.</p>

<p>residents retaining free or discounted entry, and if so what are the relative financial impacts of these options?</p>	<p>Under the previous system no data about visitors was formally collected, so information isn't available. One of the purposes of ticketed entry is to enable us to collect the relevant data.</p> <p>Data will be monitored to assist with financial planning and enable access. This data would allow the financial impacts of future plans to be accurately predicted rather than estimated.</p> <p>City and County residents will be able to access the museum for free for at least 12 days per year under the new system, more so for residents with particular circumstances.</p>
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p> <p>Councillor Smowton asked the Cabinet Member whether a scheme could be operated which ensures entry is free for those living in the city, and a charge is only applied to those visiting from outside the city for an initial period of time.</p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p> <p>Councillor Hollingsworth clarified that this is already being done.</p>

<p><b>AH2: From Cllr Mundy to Cllr Hollingsworth</b></p>	
<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>Oxford has a competitive market for free museums or galleries. EG: The Ashmolean, Pitt Rivers, MAO and The History of Science Museum. Is there a risk that introducing the MOX entry fee will reduce footfall and fail to make a big enough difference to the budget spend on the museum?</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b></p> <p>These museums have collections of historic or current materials with a specific national and international attraction, as well paid for exhibitions and events. These materials and events drew in visitors from across the UK and beyond.</p> <p>The offer in MOX is different. MOX is the only museum in Oxford which tells the story of Oxford not just as a collection of historic buildings but of the people who have made this city what it is. Marketing this across the city, in partnership with other attractions where relevant, will attract those who want to learn more about the city and its people.</p>

	Evidence suggests that where people have paid to get in – such as the events in MOX which are already subject to a charge – visitors are both more likely to attend and are also more likely to spend more time engaging with the museum and are therefore more likely to spend money at the museum shop.
<b>Supplementary Question</b> None.	<b>Verbal Response</b>

<b>AH3: From Cllr Mundy to Cllr Hollingsworth</b>	
<b>Question</b> Could the cabinet member explain why "the free entry [at MOX] may have had a negative impact on visitor's perception of the potential quality of the offer" (point 7. Cabinet Agenda item 9.) When point 6. above names 2 "world renowned" museums; The Ashmolean and Natural History Museum Oxford which are both free and presumably don't have a negative perception due to being free.	<b>Written Response</b> Evidence from MOX and from museums more widely confirms that if entry is free then visitors are less likely to perceive the offer as positive, less likely to make a visit even after accepting an invitation to an event and less likely to spend time in the location and therefore money in the museum shop. This was confirmed by the impact of introducing charging for events at MOX, where attendance rates increased, not decreased.  The offer at both the Ashmolean and the Natural History Museum is significantly larger than that at MOX, which makes them not comparable. The Ashmolean does charge entry for exhibitions, which are some of its most significant attractions. The standard ticket entry for the current exhibition for example is £16.20.
<b>Supplementary Question</b> None.	<b>Verbal Response</b>

<b>AH4: From Cllr Djafari-Marbini to Cllr Hollingsworth</b>	
---	--

<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>Planning application for the Ozone: when will the application go before the planning committee to be decided and considering the target date for the determination date was 23/09/25, what has caused the delay in it going to committee?</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b></p> <p>All live planning applications are subject to a range of issues that impact on the decision-making process, such as requirements for evidence from the applicant, third parties with a statutory consultation right such as the Environment Agency, or where planning officers need to seek clarification on a particular element of that evidence. It is not possible to answer about a specific live planning application.</p> <p>There is currently no fixed proposed date for the application to reach the Planning Committee.</p>
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p> <p>Councillor Djafari-Marbini noted the level of interest from residents in the matter and asked the Cabinet Member whether an indication of timelines could be provided to support the vulnerable groups who use the area.</p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p> <p>Councillor Hollingsworth noted that the Council is the planning authority but cannot make progress until third parties provide clarification. Once this happens, the decision will be taken.</p>

<p><b>AH5: From Cllr Djafari-Marbini to Cllr Hollingsworth</b></p>	
<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>The following questions relate to the Ozone area planning which is of much concern to many residents. There are currently two applications: Planning Ref No: 25/01588/FUL but also another for the Bingo Hall (AKA Unit 1) Planning Ref No: 23/01198/FUL (for demolishing the Bingo Hall and replacement with life sciences labs etc). Why are there 2 applications when it would appear more logical to have only one which covers the entire site that will be developed? And why isn't The Bingo Hall application listed under related cases on the planning portal for 25/01588/FUL?</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b></p> <p>It is up to an applicant to decide how and when to submit planning applications, and it is up the Local Planning Authority to meet their legal requirement to decide on the applications it has received.</p> <p>In this case one application is for the whole site, and one is for part of the site. As they have both been submitted by the applicant the law requires the City Council as the planning authority to consider both applications and arrive at a decision on both.</p> <p>The planning portal is software outside the control of the Council, but related applications are linked by having an identical address/site definition, which these do not, as one only applies to part of the site.</p>

<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p> <p>Councillor Djafari-Marbini asked the Cabinet Member whether the applications will be taken as a whole, or separately.</p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p> <p>Councillor Hollingsworth appreciated the difficulty with the online presentation of the applications but explained that due to the functions of the software used, the applications are displayed separately. Councillor Hollingsworth also explained that applications can be submitted in parts, or as a whole, and must be treated distinctly where necessary in line with legal requirements.</p>
---	--

<p><b>AH6: From Cllr Djafari-Marbini to Cllr Hollingsworth</b></p>	
<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>What has delayed the decision on The Bingo Hall application more than 2 years?</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b></p> <p>The applicant has not completed the s106 agreement, and therefore the decision cannot be issued by the City Council</p>
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p> <p>None.</p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p>

<p><b>AH7: From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Hollingsworth</b></p>	
<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>Can the Portfolio holder explain whether Oxford City Council supports the inclusion of a multi-modal transport hub in the new masterplan for Oxford Train Station?</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b></p> <p>The West End and Osney SPD was approved by this Council as part of the Development Plan was adopted by the City Council in November 2022. This document provides additional guidance to the existing Local Plan 2036, which has specific policies covering Oxford Station.</p> <p>The West End and Osney SPD makes clear that one of the four core objectives for the Station Gateway site is “To provide a multi-modal hub”. This is based on the language used in paragraph 128 of the SPD which says that a critical outcome is “Establishing Oxford Station as a world-class multi-modal transport hub”.</p>

<b>Supplementary Question</b> None.	<b>Verbal Response</b>
--	------------------------

<b>AH8: From Cllr Rawle to Cllr Hollingsworth</b>	
<b>Question</b> The council is about to embark on a new pitch strategy, which will outline the current need for sports pitches across the city. The current pitch strategy draws on data from 2018-19 and is therefore likely to be largely out of date. Can the portfolio holder confirm whether the design of a new pitch strategy will conclude prior to the final draft of the local plan? If it will not, can the portfolio holder explain how the new local plan, relevant site allocations and policies, might be developed in a way that makes it possible for the changing demand for sports pitches to be taken into account? Is it possible for the plan to ensure that planning officers and committees are able to take into account new data on demand when reviewing applications?	<b>Written Response</b> The current Play Pitch Strategy covers the period from 2022 to 2036, so it is sufficient for sport and physical activity operations. However, it was considered sensible, given the work being carried out on a new Local Plan, to begin work on a new Playing Pitch Strategy. While the Strategy will not be fully completed by the time the Local Plan is submitted for Inspection, the work on the evidence base required for the new Strategy will be largely complete, and this evidence base will be used to inform the policies in the new Local Plan as they are submitted to the Inspector. The intention is to publish this emerging evidence base alongside the Draft Local Plan. Officers in both Planning and Leisure are working alongside one another to ensure that both the Draft Local Plan and the emerging Strategy effectively incorporate the emerging evidence. When reviewing a planning application, decision makers, whether officers or the Planning Committee, have to give weight to the Local Plan that is extant at the time of the decision.
<b>Supplementary Question</b> None.	<b>Verbal Response</b>

<b>AH9: From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Hollingsworth</b>
--

<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>Does the portfolio holder agree that a multi-storey car-park should not be included in the plans for the new development at Oxford Train Station?</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b></p> <p>The new development at Oxford Station, which could include a new track and bridge on the east side of the station to match the new track on the west side, and then the new platform and entirely new station building that would be required as a result, is an exciting and transformational opportunity to deliver the kind of Oxford Station that we can be proud of. The vision of this new station “as a world-class multi-modal transport hub” is integral in the West End and Osney Mead SPD, which is part of this Council’s Development Plan along with the Local Plan 2036.</p> <p>All of this requires space, and it requires a very substantial amount of money to pay for it. This will only come from taking the site that is currently the Becket Street car park, and replacing it with developments that deliver the increase in capital values necessary to pay for the new railway bridge, new track, new platforms, and new station building</p> <p>The City Council has long expressed its desire for a no or low customer car parking solution as part of any redeveloped train station. We will continue to push for this as part of the development of the latest masterplan. It is proposed that the Network Rail-led masterplan about to start at the station will inform a planning application. This will need to be supported by a robust Transport Assessment and this, alongside all other planning and transport policies, will help inform the eventual application.</p>
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p> <p>Councillor Muddiman thanked the Cabinet Member for the original response and asked whether confirmation could be given that the masterplan for the new station would require Network Rail to seek planning permission.</p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p> <p>Councillor Hollingsworth confirmed that planning permission would be required.</p>

**AH10: From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Hollingsworth**

<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>Can the portfolio holder set out how many alcohol licences within the two Special Saturation areas of Cowley Road and the city centre have been refused in the past three years as a result of the Special Saturation Policy?</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b></p> <p>In the past three years, there has been one alcohol licence refusal within the Special Saturation areas of Cowley Road and the city centre, where an objection related to the Special Saturation Policy.</p>
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p> <p>None.</p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p>

<p><b>AH11: From Cllr Muddiman to Cllr Hollingsworth</b></p>	
<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>Can the portfolio holder set out how many new licensing applications there have been within the previously designated Special Saturation Policy areas since the Special Saturation Policy has not been in place; and how many new licensing applications, within these were there in the same time period the previous year?</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b></p> <p>Between April and November 2025, when the Special Saturation Policy was not in place, there were 17 new licensing applications within the previously designated SSP areas. During the same period in 2024, when the policy was in effect, there were 8 applications.</p>
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p> <p>None.</p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p>

<p><b>AH12: From Cllr Powell to Cllr Hollingsworth</b></p>	
<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>In light of the £10 billion proposed investment by Larry Ellison in research, science and development, can the portfolio holder please reaffirm that the central priority</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b></p> <p>The significant investment into Oxford by the Ellison Institute of Technology is testimony to the scientific and academic draw of the city. This investment</p>

<p>of this council will remain firmly focused on housing delivery over and above employment space?</p>	<p>will be focused on the Oxford Science Park, a site which is allocated employment land.</p> <p>As the Local Plan 2036 makes clear, every employment site in Oxford – including sites such as the major hospitals, academic institutes, BMW and the various science and business parks – can be used for housing development, as long as relevant national and local planning policies are met. No new employment sites were allocated in the Local Plan 2036.</p> <p>The City Council continues to leave no stone unturned to find sites suitable for housing, and as part of the Local Plan 2036 and the emerging new Local Plan has already reached out to neighbouring Councils regarding accommodating housing need that cannot be met in the city because sufficient sites are not available.</p>
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p> <p>None.</p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p>

**Cabinet Member for a Healthy, Fairer Oxford and Small Business Champion**

<p><b>CM1: From Cllr Fouweather to Cllr Munkonge</b></p>	
<p><b>Question</b></p> <p>Many basketball courts in Council run parks in Oxford still have damaged or missing nets on the basketball hoops. Can the Cabinet Member make sure that all sports nets in the Parks are checked on a regular basis and repaired or replaced when needed?</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b></p> <p>The ODS Parks teams undertake regular checks of parks facilities. New replacement basketball nets are on order and will be replaced shortly.</p>
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b></p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p> <p>Councillor Munkonge confirmed that the replacement process is ongoing.</p>

Councillor Fouweather asked the Cabinet Member why, since the last time this question was raised, nothing had been done.

**CM2: From Cllr Gant to Cllr Munkonge**

**Question**

Wolvercote Cricket Club has been waiting far too long for this council to sign off the lease on the cricket nets in Cutteslowe Park. Will the cabinet member please give me a binding guarantee of a date by which this will be done?

**Written Response**

The Council is sorry for any inconvenience caused whilst the lease is going through the necessary process. A new officer is in post and will pick up and make contact with the club to help progress this. The Council is only in control of 50% of the transaction and the timescale is dependent on the responses from both parties. However, in the meantime this does not impact the clubs' ability to use the site.

**Supplementary Question**

Councillor Gant thanked the Cabinet Member for the original response and queried whether the impact on the public's ability to use the site for insurance purposes is recognised.

**Verbal Response**

Councillor Munkonge acknowledged the impact noted by Councillor Gant and explained that as cross-party work is ongoing, but the dates cannot be guaranteed.

**CM3: From Cllr Djafari-Marbini to Cllr Munkonge**

**Question**

Where will the Sandy Lane replacement like for like pitches be located, and what is the timeline for their availability?

**Written Response**

Officers from OCC are currently working with officers from OxPlace to explore options for the relocation of pitches from Sandy Lane. At this stage we are not in a position to confirm exactly where the relocation sites will be. We will be working in collaboration with local members as well as the users of Sandy Lane to fully explore options for the relocation of the pitches and can provide a further update once sites have been confirmed.

The replacement sports pitches will be planned to be in place before any such operations at Sandy Lane cease. As such we do not anticipate there being any temporary loss of pitches.

**Supplementary Question**

Councillor Djafari-Marbini emphasised that it is hard for local residents to make plans without further information and therefore asked the Cabinet Member whether they could provide an update.

**Verbal Response**

Councillor Munkonge confirmed the Council will continue to pursue engagement with local residents.

**CM4: From Cllr Rehman to Cllr Munkonge**

**Question**

I am aware you have been engaging local businesses concerning the congestion charge which has been helpful and some hope that one council at least takes the time to listen.

Given local businesses have already stated loss of business due to congestion charges, what additional processes or plans have we in place to monitor trade and the ramifications of the congestion charge.

**Written Response**

We are always happy to engage with businesses and would encourage them to raise concerns with the relevant agencies.

There has not yet been sufficient time to draw any conclusions on the implications of the congestion charge on businesses, but we will work with them to ensure that where they have issues of concern we are helping direct them to the right place.

**Supplementary Question**

Councillor Rehman thanked the Cabinet Member for the response and asked whether he could reach out to local businesses to make them feel more secure.

**Verbal Response**

Councillor Munkonge confirmed that outreach is already ongoing in relation to wider issues.

**Cabinet Member for Housing and Communities**

**LS1: From Cllr Fouweather to Cllr L Smith**

**Question**

1. Can the Cabinet Member inform the Council how many complaints have been received this year from tenants of Housing Associations in the city?
2. Is this an increase over previous years?
3. Is any one Housing Association generating more complaints than expected?

**Written Response**

There were 12 complaints in 2024/25 and 10 so far in 2025/26 (to 17 November). GreenSquareAccord has the highest number this year with four. A detailed breakdown is provided below.

	24/25	25/26 to 17 Nov
A2 Dominion	2	1
GreenSquareAccord	3	4
Home Group	1	1
Legal and General Affordable Homes	1	1
Orbit	0	1
Peabody	4	2
Stonewater	1	0

**Supplementary Question**

None.

**Verbal Response**

**LS2: From Cllr Fouweather to Cllr L Smith**

<p><b>Question</b> Section 42 Social Housing (Regulation) Act 2023, often known as Awaab's Law, came into effect in England from 27 October 2025.</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member outline what steps the Council has taken to ensure that all Council housing properties are compliant with the provisions of this legislation?</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b> A new Damp and Mould Policy was approved by Cabinet in October which sets out the Council's full approach to ensuring compliance with Awaab's Law. Procedures are in place between ODS and OCC with additional capacity built into both organisations to support the delivery of the legislation, with dedicated damp and mould teams in both organisations.</p>
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b> None.</p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p>

<p><b>LS3: From Cllr Djafari-Marbini to Cllr L Smith</b></p>	
<p><b>Question</b> When will Knights Road re open for access to residents?</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b> The road is due to reopen before Christmas.</p>
<p><b>Supplementary Question</b> None.</p>	<p><b>Verbal Response</b></p>

<p><b>LS4: From Cllr Djafari-Marbini to Cllr L Smith</b></p>	
<p><b>Question</b> Regarding the residents in Windale House and Northbrook House - the letter to residents implied that legal action would be taken against elderly residents if they refused to leave their homes and the options offered to them. Could the cabinet member clarify whether legal action is a possibility if the residents turned down accommodation being offered to them by next spring?</p>	<p><b>Written Response</b> The Council has been actively working with tenants in Windale House and Northbrook House since the start of the year when we shared our plans for the future of both blocks, supporting them to move to alternative suitable accommodation. We have so far successfully rehoused 32 tenants and are working with the remaining 20 tenants to find them accommodation, 13 of</p>

	<p>which have offers of alternative accommodation and are waiting for a moving date.</p> <p>We continue to aim to rehouse all tenants into an alternative home of their choice, and are providing support with finding alternative accommodation, support with the moving process, and providing financial compensation.</p> <p>As with any programme of moving tenants ahead of future reuse and demolition of a building we have the ability to serve relevant legal orders, and as a last resort apply to court to ensure the building becomes vacant. We will only take this final step if all attempts to engage and support the final tenants are not successful, enabling us to ensure the wider plans to first reuse and then redevelop the sites can proceed without significant delay, helping us meet the housing needs of Oxford citizens.</p>
<b>Supplementary Question</b> None.	<b>Verbal Response</b>

This page is intentionally left blank