

### South Oxfordshire Council Motions – May 2019 to Present

Date	Motion	Substantive Actions Required	Progress
18 July 2019	<p>Council notes the economic and environmental importance of rail transport in this area and asks the leader of the council to write to the Secretary of State for Transport to request the acceleration of the delivery of rail projects of importance to South Oxfordshire. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvements necessary to Oxford City Station</li> <li>• Reopening of Grove Station</li> <li>• Upgrading of the route between Didcot and Oxford</li> <li>• Reopening of the Cowley Branch line</li> <li>• And any other initiatives which come forward in the current Oxfordshire Rail Connectivity Study</li> </ul>	Letter from the Leader of the Council to the Secretary of State for Transport	Letters sent and relevant officers advised and updated via team meetings and one to ones, to ensure that engagement with partners reflects this position.
18 July 2019	<p>Council notes that, increasingly, the only type of housing in our area that is genuinely affordable to young families, key workers, and the under-40s in general is social rent housing.</p> <p>Council asks officers to prepare a report for Cabinet on ways to use council powers and resources to deliver more high-quality, environmentally sustainable, and genuinely affordable housing, at social rent or similar cost. This should include ways to keep such properties genuinely affordable in the long term and ways to release and access low-cost suitable land for projects such as – but not limited to - self-build and community land trusts, as well as projects owned, let or operated by the council itself.</p>	A report for Cabinet on ways to use council powers and resources to deliver more high-quality, environmentally sustainable, and genuinely affordable housing, at social rent or similar cost	Report to Cabinet 25th October 2019. Work is ongoing within finance to consider funding options and how this have been impacted by subsequent clarifications to the PWLB terms and CIPFA Code.
18 July 2019	<p>Council notes that the UK Government, in tandem with the National Infrastructure Commission, has proposed the construction of a motorway-style expressway between Oxford and Cambridge. This new road will have significant adverse impacts on Oxfordshire: it will create a major source of air and noise pollution, destroy farmland and habitats, increase CO2 emissions - incompatible with the recent Climate Emergency declared by this council in April 2019- and bring more traffic onto the county's existing roads.</p> <p>Actual and proposed consultation on the Expressway, and indeed on the Ox-Cam Arc proposal and associated major housing growth across the region, has been wholly inadequate and a proper Strategic Environmental Assessment should have taken place before this project left the drawing board. Instead, it has become the basis for regional planning with little democratic legitimacy.</p> <p>Whilst this council supports partnership working and strategic planning and practical links with authorities across the region, it does not support the addition of a major road such as the Expressway in a time of climate emergency – as declared by this council on 11 April 2019.</p> <p>Highways England's own analysis of the Expressway shows a benefit:cost ratio (BCR) in the range of 1.1 – 1.3, far lower than most other road schemes analysed by the Department for Transport in 2015, (2:1).</p>	<p>All Council documents refer to the new position on the Expressway</p> <p>Letter from the Leader of the Council to the Secretary of State, Local MPs and Highways England</p>	Letters sent and relevant officers advised and updated via team meetings and one to ones, to ensure that engagement with partners reflects this position.

The Oxford 2050 plan process has thus far welcomed the perceived benefits of the Oxford-Cambridge Expressway. It is also mentioned as a factor in a wide range of council documents and plans, including LP2034. This council asks that its new position on the Expressway is taken into account in all council documents that refer to it.

The Expressway would cause major harm to the quality of life of residents if it passes through the district; this council wishes to withdraw any assumed consent, including any possibility that roads such as the HIF-funded Thames crossing, or the Stadhampton or Watlington bypasses, could later be used or expanded to form part of the Expressway or act as feeder roads for it.

This council fully supports an upgrade in the East-West rail route, with full electrification, as part of the Ox-Cam arc discussions. Such an upgrade must include inter-modal centres, along it and at both ends, to enable maximum use of rail for freight. Any road upgrades necessary to support the East-West rail route should connect to that route and be proportionate to the primacy of rail freight.

Council therefore resolves to:

- Oppose the Expressway project in all forms, including expansion of existing or new roads in the district to form part of it.
- Support fully-electrified East-West Rail, including freight capacity and connections, and better public transport and active travel connections.
- Update all council documents to reflect this new position on the Expressway and related Arc development proposals.
- Continue to support partnership working, especially with regard to landscape-scale conservation and nature recovery networks.

Communicate its opposition to Government, MPs and Highways England

<p>18 July 2019</p>	<p>Council notes that the Oxfordshire Pension Fund, of which it is an employer, has more than £132m of workers' money – around 6% of its portfolio funds - invested in fossil fuel companies. These companies – which the London Stock Exchange now terms “non-renewables,” are the primary drivers of the climate crisis threatening our planet.</p> <p>The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change last year warned that to avoid the most catastrophic consequences of warming, carbon emissions must fall to zero by 2050. Last month, the UK Parliament imposed a binding target of net zero by 2050 and in April, this Council declared a Climate Emergency.</p> <p>Lloyds of London and Bank of England Governor Mark Carney have both warned that legislation necessary to limit warming combined with the development of renewables would likely result in the rapid “stranding” of fossil fuel assets, requiring large-scale asset write-downs. Fossil fuel companies face the additional peril of a potential wave of third-party liability claims brought by the victims of climate change including sovereign states.</p> <p>A growing number of pension and investment funds have already announced plans to fully or partially divest from fossil fuels. Southwark Council, Islington Council, SOAS, the United Reform Church, The Church of England and the National Trust have already made significant divestment moves. Globally, the divestment movement has seen more than £6.3trillion leave the fossil fuel industry.</p> <p>As a result, the fossil fuel industry is facing unprecedented financial, legal and regulatory headwinds.</p> <p>The Oxfordshire Pension Fund has defended its continued investment in fossil fuels, arguing that to divest would mean losing its influence. This position is untenable. The very raison d'être of fossil fuel companies is the extraction and sale of carbon intensive energy. To the extent these companies are being stewarded towards renewable energy, this transition is happening too slowly. Research by Transition Pathway Initiative, an industry body, found that none of the ten largest publicly listed oil and gas producers are on track to achieve net zero emissions by 2050. None are on track to be aligned with 2 degrees or less of warming by 2050.</p> <p>The message of divestment is not that fossil fuel companies are evil. But their business threatens our planet and its most vulnerable inhabitants through droughts, heat waves, crop failures, floods, and rising sea levels.</p> <p>As one of the Oxfordshire LGPS employers, South Oxfordshire District Council calls on the Oxfordshire Pension Fund Committee to act in line with South Oxfordshire and the UK's declaration of Climate Emergency and in prudent exercise of its fiduciary duties by divesting its investment in an industry whose long-term risk profile in the current political and environmental climate is unacceptably high.</p> <p>Council:</p> <p>1) calls on the Oxfordshire Pension Fund to follow the lead of Councils, sovereign wealth funds and</p>	<p>Letter from the Leader of the Council to the Oxfordshire Pension Fund</p>	<p>Letter sent and relevant officers who engage with the Pension Fund briefed.</p>
---------------------	---	--	--

	<p>other pension and investment funds around the world to divest from non-renewable energy companies whose main purpose is the exploration and/or extraction of fossil fuels;</p> <p>2) calls on the Oxfordshire Pension Fund to explore reinvestment of its funds into appropriate renewable energy companies at the earliest opportunity;</p> <p>3) asks the Oxfordshire Pension Fund to acknowledge that shareholder engagement has failed to bring about the pace of change required to limit catastrophic global warming.</p>		
<p>10 October 2019</p>	<p>Council notes that EU nationals are part of our shared communities. They are our husbands, wives, parents, friends and colleagues. They are an integral part of a vibrant and thriving South Oxfordshire.</p> <p>Since 2016 EU nationals were promised again and again that "there will be no change for EU citizens already lawfully resident in the UK and [...] will be treated no less favourably as they are at present".</p> <p>After three years of living in limbo, their homes and livelihoods are in danger of being threatened by the further uncertainty brought about by the prospect of an even more chaotic no-deal Brexit.</p> <p>According to the Home Office's July statistics, only a third of EU nationals have applied for the Settled Status and 42% of them have been granted the inferior Pre-Settled status leading them to reapply for the Settled status later on. There is no possibility of knowing how many EU nationals need to apply, leaving vulnerable and unaware EU nationals left at risk of becoming unlawful residents the mercy of the Home Office's "Hostile Environment". Lack of clarity regarding differentiating between EU citizens arriving before and after the UK's exit from the EU could lead to discrimination in the labour market and may prevent many from accessing the services that they are entitled to.</p> <p>Another Windrush-like scandal could be unfolding right before the eyes of this Council and we mustn't be passive observers to it.</p> <p>Therefore, the Council asks that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Officers report on how the Council can mitigate adverse impacts on the rights of EU nationals (including but not limited to advising on what the Council can do to help landlords and employers to be better informed about immigration status and therefore avoid potential discrimination against EU nationals)</li> <li>2. The Leader of the Council writes to EU citizens resident in the district giving advice on applying for Settled Status (within the constraints of GDPR). This notice shall direct EU citizens to resources, including the Council's website, providing up-to-date information on the application process and the potential risks of not applying to the EU Settlement Scheme.</li> <li>3. The Leader of the Council writes to the Home Secretary seeking clarification and suggesting</li> </ol>	<p>Letter to the Secretary of State</p> <p>Report to the Leader of the Council</p> <p>Leader of the Council writes to EU citizens resident in the district</p>	<p>An open letter from the Leader of the Council to EU residents was published on the South Oxfordshire website and sent to all EU citizens in the district giving them advice on how to apply for settled status. There were 2676 letters sent.</p> <p>An officer group is in place to monitor Brexit activity and discuss any additional mitigating actions that may arise from service area risk registers.</p> <p>There is a dedicated website page for the EU Settlement Scheme - <a href="http://www.southoxon.gov.uk/services-and-advice/community-advice-and-support/brexit/brexit-advice-eu-nationals">http://www.southoxon.gov.uk/services-and-advice/community-advice-and-support/brexit/brexit-advice-eu-nationals</a></p> <p>Promotional materials were displayed within reception area, signposting to local ID verification services and national guidance for EU citizens.</p> <p>A briefing note was circulated to members In January 2020 to provide an overview of both national, Oxfordshire and council Brexit activity.</p>

	<p>improvements for the European Settlement scheme, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing physical proof of Settled status that can be used to access services</li> <li>• Confirming that there will be no changes to the rights of settled EU citizens that they currently have by ratifying the Immigration Bill as primary legislation before the exit day</li> <li>• Replacing the current European Settlement scheme with a registration scheme without a deadline where EU citizens are considered lawful by default and can request a proof of immigration status only when they are asked to demonstrate it.</li> </ul>		
10 October 2019	<p>Reading Borough Council is proposing to build a vast new bridge over the Thames at Caversham to alleviate Reading's traffic problems. It is included in their Draft Local Plan as a top transport priority. The bridge would take off at the Thames Valley business park near Reading and land near the Playhatch roundabout in Oxfordshire. The only onwards option for traffic would be through the congested streets of Henley or along the narrow B481 country road through Oxfordshire villages.</p> <p>To date, Reading and other Berkshire councils that are supporting the scheme have focused almost entirely on the costs of building the bridge and the benefits it will bring to Reading. While they recognise that the bridge would have a substantial impact on the Oxfordshire road network, the Berkshire councils blithely state these will be dealt with by unspecified and uncosted 'mitigation measures'.</p> <p>This council calls on the Leader to write to the leaders of Reading Borough Council, Wokingham Borough Council and Bracknell Forest Council, together with MPs John Howell, John Redwood, Matt Rodda and Theresa May, stating that:</p> <p>a) In the context of the Climate Emergency a car-based solution to a car-based problem that would pour thousands of cars and HGVs into Oxfordshire is totally inappropriate and should a new bridge be built it should be restricted to public transport, cyclists and pedestrians;</p> <p>b) Notwithstanding the above, if a car-based solution is pursued, the proposed bridge and necessary mitigation measures (i.e. improvements to the Oxfordshire road network) are not considered as two separate projects, but as one single project in order that the benefits, disadvantages and costs of the complete scheme can be holistically assessed.</p>	<p>Letters to the Leaders of Reading, Wokingham and Bracknell Forest</p> <p>Letters to John Howell, John Redwood, Matt Rodda, Theresa May</p>	<p>Letters sent and relevant officers advised and updated via team meetings and one to ones, to ensure that engagement with partners reflects this position.</p>
10 October 2019	<p>On 11 April 2019, South Oxfordshire District Council declared a Climate Emergency, noting that the 2018 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report states that we had just 12 years to act. Council resolved that it needs to commit to aggressive reduction targets and carbon neutrality as quickly as possible.</p> <p>Since then, there has been a continual onslaught of extreme weather events that further highlight the climate emergency. In July, the European heat wave killed 868 in France, and set a new temperature high for the UK of 38.5°C. There were unprecedented wildfires in the Arctic. In September, Hurricane Dorian killed 50 in the Bahamas and left 70,000 homeless. More generally, we have severe ice melting at the poles, and sea level rise at the upper end of forecasts.</p>		<p>CEAC in progress and Climate Change Programme will be developed and launched in 2020.</p>

	<p>In September, Professor Sir David King, former Chief Scientist for the UK, said the world had changed faster than predicted by the IPCC. Whereas mean global temperature rises have matched predictions, individual extreme weather events have accelerated in intensity and frequency. In this grave situation, he says, the UK should aim to cut greenhouse gas emissions to almost zero, by 2040 rather than 2050.</p> <p>South Oxfordshire District Council (SODC) has set up a Climate Emergency Advisory Committee (CEAC). At its first official meeting on the 19th September it recommended the very challenging targets proposed here. It should be noted that other councils have set targets for their districts and cities to reach net zero-carbon by 2030, some even earlier. The Labour Party at its recent conference has also set a 2030 net zero-carbon target for the country.</p> <p>Officers prepared options for CEAC to consider, including a focus only on Council operations; extending this to taking action on net zero-carbon over district-actives where Council has responsibilities, whilst responding reactively wherever possible to new initiatives for the district; and finally, for full net zero-carbon for the whole district. The cross-party committee unanimously agreed to a fully net zero-carbon district by 2030, with Council, in its own operations, to be net zero-carbon by 2025.</p> <p>These targets are premised on the fact that SODC should be in a new building by 2025, and that it can influence outsourced contractors to provide us with a net zero-carbon supply chain. The aim for a net-zero carbon total district is to ensure that Council has a true target in the sense that it knows what it is that it is aiming to get to zero-carbon, and to ensure that its actions are more than purely reactive; rather, Council shall set up an ambitious new programme working with other actors to achieve its target.</p> <p>Council resolves to:</p> <p>Agree the unanimous recommendations of its cross-party Climate Emergency Advisory Committee to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aim to reach net-zero carbon emissions across all of the operations of South Oxfordshire District Council by the target year of 2025</li> <li>• Aim to reach net-zero carbon emissions for the whole District of South Oxfordshire by 2030</li> </ul>		
<p>19 December 2019</p> <p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 31</p>	<p>Council notes that South Oxfordshire District Council's current position is support for an Oxfordshire County Unitary; in March 2017 this council voted to support 'Better Oxfordshire', a proposal to create a unitary authority.</p> <p>The approach of 'Better Oxfordshire' was for a single unitary authority based on the current County</p>	<p>Officers explore alternative governance approaches that protect, and</p>	<p>An SMT briefing paper was reviewed on 5 December 2019. It outlined the process and considerations for a merger proposal and provided some case studies from other Councils.</p>

<p>Page 32</p>	<p>Council boundary. Oxfordshire County Council and Vale of the White Horse District Council also took formal decisions to support the proposal.</p> <p>The proposal was submitted to the Secretary of State for approval under legislative provisions containing a sunset clause, which expired in March of 2019, meaning that at this time the proposal is not under active consideration.</p> <p>Government's current stated intention, according to recent statements by Robert Jenrick, in his role as Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, is to move away from smaller district councils and towards Unitary and/or Combined Authority models of Governance.</p> <p>Council recognises that:</p> <p>Democratic institutions should be responsive and accountable to their electorate as well as being efficient and achieving value for money for their services. South Oxfordshire District Council's status enables a close connection to residents and communities, especially with regard to planning, and it is a democratically accountable body with the powers and resources to work with other organisations and deliver services in ways that more distant organisations cannot.</p> <p>Therefore, any future move towards Unitary status should be on the basis of the smallest viable geography that enables a similarly close link to communities and should not prevent independent candidates and smaller political parties competing for seats alongside the major political parties.</p> <p>Should such structural change occur in the future, in addition to securing increased value for money in service delivery, it must also aim to increase, not reduce, localised accountability for service provision and resource allocation, and should support the devolution of power to the lowest sustainable level.</p> <p>Council therefore confirms that:</p> <p>A. It recognises that much of the financial and economic data and analysis that underpinned the 'Better Oxfordshire' submission is now out of date; and</p> <p>B. Due to an absence of up to date analysis, South Oxfordshire District Council can no longer support a view that a County-wide single Unitary currently represents the best governance model for Oxfordshire: and proposes that:</p> <p>i. Officers explore alternative governance approaches that protect, and enhance, the democratic link to local communities, to assist council in taking a new, updated view;</p> <p>ii. As part of this, officers should make contact with the MHCLG to explore the approach the</p>	<p>enhance, the democratic link to local communities</p> <p>Officers should make contact with the MHCLG to explore the approach the new Secretary of State will take to any proposals for unitary based re-organisation</p> <p>A report on this matter is brought to full Council, by the Chief Executive and Leader, outlining their understanding of the new Government's intentions and possible approaches available to this council, by Summer 2020.</p> <p>A cross party 'governance model' working group is formed to support the Council's review of this area</p>	<p>MHCLG officials indicate that these criteria may change in the forthcoming White Paper.</p> <p>Visits to East Suffolk and Babergh and Mid Suffolk Councils were also made by the Acting Deputy Chief Executive – Partnerships, in January 2020 to discuss experiences of merging and attempting to merge.</p> <p>MHCLG officials have been contacted and a meeting between all Oxfordshire Leaders, CEs and officials held.</p> <p>A joint letter is to be sent by all Oxfordshire Leaders and OxLEP Chair to the SoSs MHCLG and BEIS requesting a meeting regarding options that may be possible within the forthcoming Local Recovery and Devolution White Paper.</p> <p>Outside of this process, MHCLG officials advise that individual requests or suggestions for structural change will not be considered at this time.</p> <p>A paper and report will be brought forward as soon as possible following any meeting that is held with the SoS or MoS and/or once the Local Recovery and Devolution White Paper is published, whichever is the sooner.</p> <p>Relevant officers are briefed on the Councils position and are engaging with partners and Government to make them aware of South's views regarding some of the outcomes any</p>
----------------	---	--	---

	<p>new Secretary of State will take to any proposals for unitary based re-organisation; and asks that</p> <p>iii. A report on this matter is brought to full Council, by the Chief Executive and Leader, outlining their understanding of the new Government's intentions and possible approaches available to this council, by Summer 2020.</p> <p>iv. A cross party 'governance model' working group is formed to support the Council's review of this area; and notes that</p> <p>v. Should any revised unitary proposal be developed in future, the Constitutional Review Group will be asked to recommend appropriate constitutional models for consideration by Council.</p>		Unitary proposal should achieve.
19 December 2019	<p>Council notes the continuing development of the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 – a joint statutory spatial plan based on the boundary of the County.</p> <p>Council sees merit in regional - and county - scale planning for biodiversity and environmental sustainability matters, such as "nature recovery networks", as well as for public transport infrastructure, but considers that all housing and employment allocations (including strategic sites), planning policies and other related matters continue to be best dealt with at the local district planning authority level, and should not form part of the Oxfordshire 2050 plan.</p> <p>Council therefore asks:</p> <p>That officers and any councillor representing the council ensure this position is reflected in all engagement with, and contributions to, the Oxfordshire 2050 plan making process, and that the Council's position is made known, and emphasised, to key partners and Government.</p>		Relevant officers advised and updated via team meetings and one to ones, to ensure that engagement with partners reflects this position.
19 December 2019	<p>Recognising the financial position of the Council, and the need to ensure that residents are represented by a robust and sustainable council, officers are asked to bring forward proposals for South Oxfordshire District Council to consider whether or not a formal merger with the Vale of White Horse District Council, with the same total number of district councillors, creating a single district council based on their combined geography with increased financial resilience would be beneficial. This work should also consider the options for the development of area committees within this model, to ensure that decision making is devolved to the lowest appropriate level.</p> <p>Should any formal merger proposal be developed in future, the Constitutional Review Group will be asked to recommend appropriate constitutional models for consideration by Council.</p>	Officers are asked to bring forward proposals for South Oxfordshire District Council to consider whether or not a formal merger with the Vale of White Horse District Council would be beneficial	<p>An SMT briefing paper was reviewed on 5 December 2019. It outlined the process and considerations for a merger proposal and provided some case studies from other Councils.</p> <p>Visits to East Suffolk and Babergh and Mid Suffolk Councils were also made by the Acting Deputy Chief Executive – Partnerships, in January 2020 to discuss experiences of merging and attempting to merge.</p> <p>MHCLG officials have been contacted and a meeting between all Oxfordshire Leaders, CEs and officials</p>



			<p>held.</p> <p>A joint letter is to be sent by all Oxfordshire Leaders and OxLEP Chair to the SoSs MHCLG and BEIS requesting a meeting regarding options that may be possible within the forthcoming Local Recovery and Devolution White Paper.</p> <p>Outside of this process, MHCLG officials advise that individual requests or suggestions for structural change will not be considered at this time.</p>
--	--	--	--

<p>19 December 2019</p>	<p>Council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Believes that young people should be allowed a say over their future.</li> <li>2. Recognises that 16 and 17 year olds are knowledgeable and passionate about the world in which they live and are as capable of engaging in the democratic system as any other citizen.</li> <li>3. Notes that there is currently an unequal situation across the United Kingdom, with 16 and 17 year olds having voting rights in Scotland and Wales that are not available to them in England and Northern Ireland.</li> <li>4. Supports the need for greater engagement with young people, leading to greater involvement of young people in the decisions that affect their community.</li> <li>5. Believes that lowering the voting age to 16, combined with strong citizenship education, would empower young people to better engage in society and influence decisions that will define their future.</li> <li>6. Believes that people aged 16 and 17, who can consent to medical treatment, work full-time, pay taxes, get married or enter a civil partnership and join the armed forces, should also have the right to vote.</li> <li>7. Recognises and supports the ongoing 'Votes at 16' campaign by the British Youth Council, the UK Youth Parliament and other youth organisations, supported by thousands of young people across the UK.</li> <li>8. Calls for 16 and 17 year olds to have the right in all elections and referendums across the UK.</li> </ol> <p>Council therefore:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Requests that the Leader write to relevant Ministers and local MPs: expressing this Council's support for the Votes at 16 campaign; calling for the extension of the franchise to 16 and 17 year olds in all elections and referendums across the UK</li> <li>2. Requests that the Leader write to the local MYPs and the British Youth Council expressing this Council's support for the Votes at 16 campaign</li> <li>3. Asks the ERO/ RO to consider participating in any pilot scheme.</li> </ol>	<p>The Leader write to relevant Ministers and local MPs: expressing this Council's support for the Votes at 16 campaign; calling for the extension of the franchise to 16 and 17 year olds in all elections and referendums across the UK</p> <p>The Leader write to the local MYPs and the British Youth Council expressing this Council's support for the Votes at 16 campaign</p> <p>Asks the ERO/ RO to consider participating in any pilot scheme</p>	<p>Letters sent and relevant officers advised and updated via team meetings and one to ones, to ensure that engagement with partners reflects this position.</p>
<p>19 December 2019</p>	<p>Council notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Oxfordshire District Council (SODC) will be undertaking a constitutional review beginning in January 2020. A working group, with representation from all political groups, has been set up to conduct this review.</li> <li>• Other motions tonight relate to consideration of whether the council should consider a merger with Vale of White Horse with whom SODC shares an officer-core, and wider unitary related decisions.</li> <li>• It should be ensured that the Constitutional Review Working Group gets sufficient training to enable it to make informed decisions. Training might be required from external experts, and information may be required through visits to or from other councils.</li> </ul>	<p>The Constitutional Review Working Group will include the following topics in its considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether there would be a benefit to residents in terms of decision-making, representation, and transparency were</li> </ul>	<p>The Constitution Review Group met on 4 March 2020 prior to the Covid-19 Lockdown. Officers will arrange further meetings during the summer and report to Council in October 2020.</p>

	<p>This Council agrees that the Constitutional Review Working Group will include the following topics in its considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether there would be a benefit to residents in terms of decision-making, representation, and transparency were South Oxfordshire District Council to move to a committee-based structure:</li> <li>• Whether the Climate Change Advisory Committee should become a Committee of Council and what, if any, amendments should be made to its terms of reference; and that</li> <li>• Training should be made available to the Constitutional Review Working Group and to all members on the matters referred to herein. Council asks Cabinet to reflect the cost of this in any budget proposals they bring forward.</li> </ul>	<p>South Oxfordshire District Council to move to a committee-based structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the Climate Change Advisory Committee should become a Committee of Council and what, if any, amendments should be made to its terms of reference</li> <li>• Training should be made available to the Constitutional Review Working Group and to all members on the matters referred to herein</li> </ul>	
<p>19 December 2019</p>	<p>The Council notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cycling and walking are healthy, climate-friendly modes of transport</li> <li>• In 2018, of fatalities on the road caused by vehicles crashes, 31% were people walking or on pedal cycles</li> <li>• Many people are put off cycling because of perceived and actual dangers</li> <li>• Electric bicycles could be a revolution in bringing more people to cycling and cycling further</li> <li>• In a rural District many roads are narrow, winding and without pavements for walking</li> <li>• A number of the towns in the District suffer from poor air quality that have major health impacts, particularly for children</li> <li>• Physical inactivity is a contributor to diseases such as diabetes, heart disease, osteoporosis, depression and dementia</li> <li>• The Council has a goal to achieve a carbon-neutral District by 2030</li> <li>• Infrastructure needs to be developed rapidly to support more active travel, including for electric bicycles, to achieve national and local climate and health goals</li> </ul>	<p>Develop a prioritised plan of where new and improved cycle and walking infrastructure is needed in the District to contribute to a SATN (Strategic Active Travel Network)</p> <p>Update planning</p>	<p>Working in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council to upgrade Oxfordshire cycling infrastructure, including new cycle parking in market towns, improved signage and enhanced maintenance for footpaths and cycleways.</p> <p>Opportunity to encourage active travel outcomes through the joint design guide project.</p> <p>Relevant officers advised and updated via team meetings and one to ones, to</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>travel habits need changing urgently and that cycling and active travel need be easy and safe to be chosen over alternatives</li> <li>the Council already has a walking and cycling policy: T7</li> </ul> <p>This Council therefore calls upon the relevant Cabinet members to:</p> <p>i) develop a prioritised plan of where new and improved cycle and walking infrastructure is needed in the District to contribute to a SATN (Strategic Active Travel Network) and actively seek, and support the County to actively seek, capital and revenue funding for delivery of it through local and national sources</p> <p>ii) update planning policy to better achieve active travel outcomes across the district and with greater urgency, noting such further policy development is currently unfunded (and is subject to Council having planning powers to do this).</p> <p>iii) work to prioritise active travel in planning policy and use walking and cycling as an improvement to urban and rural communities in terms of community cohesion, wellbeing, and tackling inequalities</p> <p>iv) engage in active travel promotion with relevant partners to encourage travel behaviour change</p> <p>v) urge the County Council to prioritise quality control of all active travel infrastructure in accordance with the Oxfordshire Cycling Design Standards, ensuring all proposals are audited for safety and encouragement of active travel</p>	<p>policy to better achieve active travel outcomes across the district</p> <p>Work to prioritise active travel in planning policy</p> <p>Engage in active travel promotion with relevant partners to encourage travel behaviour change</p> <p>Urge the County Council to prioritise quality control of all active travel infrastructure in accordance with the Oxfordshire Cycling Design Standards</p>	<p>ensure that engagement with partners reflects this position.</p>
<p>20 February 2020</p> <p>Page 37</p>	<p>That Council notes the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) definition of Antisemitism is the most widely accepted and recognized definition of anti-Jewish racism. It states that: Antisemitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of Antisemitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities.</p> <p>Council notes the All Party Parliamentary Group on British Muslims (APPG) definition of Islamophobia: Islamophobia is rooted in racism and is a type of racism that targets expressions of Muslimness or perceived Muslimness.</p> <p>Council notes that, by using these definitions, it helps to understand, identify, and tackle Antisemitism and Islamophobia.</p> <p>Council holds the right to freedom of speech and freedom of religion as fundamentals but freedom of speech is not an unlimited right, and should not be used to advocate racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence.</p>	<p>Adopt the IHRA definition of antisemitism in full and without amendment</p> <p>Adopt the APPG definition of Islamophobia in full and without amendment.</p> <p>Ask officers to update this council's equality policies to this</p>	<p>Motion forwarded to the Council's Equality Officer.</p> <p>Council policies being reviewed and updated.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Agenda Item 8</p>

	<p>Council resolves to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. condemn all hate crimes and deplore the rise in hate crimes against members of the Jewish and Muslim communities in Britain;</li> <li>2. condemn inflammatory rhetoric in political discourse that is antisemitic or Islamophobic;</li> <li>3. adopt the IHRA definition of Antisemitism in full and without amendment;</li> <li>4. adopt the APPG definition of Islamophobia in full and without amendment;</li> <li>5. ask officers to update this council's equality policies to this effect.</li> </ol>	effect	
20 February 2020	<p>Council notes the risks associated with modern life are significantly different from those of 1847 when the Town Police Clauses Act was passed, and even from those of the 1970s when the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 came into force. Clearly, the legislation has not kept pace with developments, in particular with the way we use technology, apps, and mobile phones. It is difficult to facilitate a regulatory system when the legislation is based on the use of horse-drawn carriages and landline phones.</p> <p>There is also a lack of consistency across the legislation. For example, the law requires a person who takes bookings for private hire vehicles to be licensed but there is no similar requirement for someone who does the same for hackney carriages. This lack, apart from the potential for sensitive personal information to fall into the wrong hands, can make it very difficult to investigate allegations of improper conduct by drivers of hackney carriages. This could undermine public confidence in the licensing regime. In addition, it provides a mechanism for private hire operators who have lost their licence to continue in business. They simply move to only "operating" hackney carriages, and no controls can be placed on them at all.</p> <p>Examples of recent local issues include hackney carriage 'operators' who have pressured drivers to work excessively long hours with no proper breaks, and those who do not maintain their vehicles properly and continually present vehicles to testing stations which fail the test. The overriding aim of any licensing authority when carrying out its functions relating to the licensing of hackney or private hire drivers, vehicle proprietors, and operators is the protection of the public.</p> <p>The Oxfordshire district councils and the county council share information under a Joint Operating Framework, and there is a national register of revoked and refused licences operated by the National Anti-Fraud Network. However, this does not address situations where drivers have allowed their licence to lapse pending enforcement action at one local authority and apply to another authority without declaring that enforcement action or the previous licences held. Local authority prosecutions are not currently detailed on enhanced DBS disclosures and there are recent local examples of the</p>	Letters from the Leader of the Council to the Minister and the two local MPs	Letters sent and relevant officers advised and updated via team meetings and one to ones, to ensure that engagement with partners reflects this position.

	<p>councils only finding out about such prosecutions by chance and after the licence has been granted.</p> <p>Council therefore requests that the Leader of the council write to the district's two Members of Parliament and to the Minister for Transport to request that the following action be taken:</p> <p>1. The Government should move forward without delay on the three key measures recommended to achieve a safe service for passengers in the Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Licensing Task and Finish Group report, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The introduction of a national taxi licensing database;</li> <li>- Some form of cross border enforcement for local authorities;</li> <li>- National minimum standards for licenses.</li> </ul> <p>2. The Government should provide an update in respect of how they propose to deal with cross-border working;</p> <p>3. The Government should legislate to require any person taking bookings for more than one vehicle to be licensed as an operator, with national standards for the information recorded by licensed operators in respect of bookings”.</p>		
20 February 2020	<p>That Council notes the views of the Local Government Association and the Royal Town Planning Institute, who recognise that problems have been caused by the 2013 deregulation of the Planning System which allows offices to be converted into homes without planning permission. Currently, developers do not have to contribute towards affordable Social Housing or local infrastructure and there is no ability to consider whether the development provides suitable levels of internal or external amenity space, privacy, sunlight, daylight or outlook.</p> <p>Council asks the leader of the council to write to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government to call for a review of the wide-ranging impacts of permitted development rights which allow change of use into residential homes.</p>	Letter from the Leader of the Council to the Secretary of State	Letter drafted and sent by planning policy. Government have subsequently moved to further increase permitted development and any response to consultation on this will reflect this motion.
20 February 2020	<p>That Council notes that paragraph 73 of the NPPF, on 'maintaining supply and delivery' requires planning authorities 'to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing against their housing requirement'. This deliverability rule is commonly known as the '5-year housing land supply'.</p> <p>Unfortunately, this phrase leads to the misconception that councils that cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply cannot do so because they have failed to allocate or approve sufficient sites. This is not the case for councils with adopted local plans consulted upon and found sound at examination, who are keeping up with changes to methodology which might require increased housing numbers. Such councils, provided they have gone on to approve sufficient applications, by definition would indeed have allocated sufficient land for housing.</p> <p>But lost 5-year housing land supply can result if developers fail to build out at the required rate on the</p>	Letter from the Leader of the Council to the Secretary of State	Letter drafted and sent by planning policy

sites allocated in the local plan. They then, themselves, have created strong planning grounds for granting of planning permissions on new sites that they apply for; sites that were specifically not in the local plan. This often results in appeals, which are time-consuming, extremely costly, and distressing for the council and residents alike.

George Freeman (Cons MP Mid Norfolk) summed this up in a House of Commons debate (Hansard, 4th July 2018): “developers are banking...permissions for later, because they know that they will get them, and using the five-year land supply to force the wrong development in the wrong places”. “Through the Localism Act 2011, we set out to [give] local communities the chance to shape their future. We are now in danger of looking like we are in favour of speculators, profiteers and out-of-town developers, who dump housing estates that we legislate for, with no responsibility being taken locally.”

Council therefore requests that the Leader write to the Minister for Housing Communities and Local Government requesting:

- That the Minister notes the severe problems that exist with the ‘5-year housing land supply’ rules in the National Planning Policy Framework as outlined above
- That the Minister considers revising the housing land supply rules (5-year or other durations) such that, provided the planning authority has allocated sufficient land to housing, and has not unreasonably withheld planning permissions, the authority shall have been deemed to have met its obligations and there would be no grounds for third parties to demand the release of further land for development
- That any other measures introduced to ensure appropriate delivery of homes should be actionable by the local authorities themselves on behalf of local people and not subject to external factors beyond their control, thus re-instating the primacy of residents and their elected representatives in ensuring that the right homes are built for the right people, in the right places, in a planned and organised manner”.

