OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting held on Tuesday, 30 June 2026 commencing at 10.30 am and finishing at Time Not Specified

Present:

Councillor Ted Fenton – in the Chair

Councillors:

Roz Smith (Vice-Chair)	Andrew Gant	Saj Malik
Thomas Ashby	Emma Garnett	Kieron Mallon
Brad Baines	Sean Gaul	Emma Markham
James Barlow	Laura Gordon	Gavin McLauchlan
Ron Batstone	Tom Greenaway	Lesley McLean
Tim Bearder	Kate Gregory	Ian Middleton
Chris Aramini-Brant	Jane Hanna OBE	Toyah Overton
Liz Brighouse OBE	David Henwood	Glynis Phillips
Mark Cherry	Georgina Heritage	James Plumb
Dr Izzy Creed	Ben Higgins	Susanna Pressel
Hao Du	David Hingley	Leigh Rawlins
Imade Edosomwan	Johnny Hope-Smith	Judy Roberts
Judith Edwards	Robin Jones	Paul-Austin Sargent
Gareth Epps	Emily Kerr	Geoff Saul
Lee Evans	Liz Leffman	John Shiri
Neil Fawcett	Dan Levy	Ian Snowdon
Maggie Filipova-Rivers	Dr Nathan Ley	Peter Stevens
Rebekah Fletcher	Diana Lugova	Bethia Thomas
James Fry	Mark Lygo	Tony Worgan

The Council considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting and decided as set out below. Except insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda and reports, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.

40/26 MINUTES
(Agenda Item 1)

RESOLVED:
That the minutes of the meetings held on 12 May 2026 and 20 May 2026 be approved and signed as an accurate record of the proceedings.

41/26 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
(Agenda Item 2)

Apologies were received from Councillors Coles, Cotter, Crichton, Field-Johnson, Gawrysiak, Graham, Robertshaw and Walker.

42/26 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST - SEE GUIDANCE NOTE
(Agenda Item 3)

There were no declarations of interest.

43/26 OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS
(Agenda Item 4)

The Chair congratulated two officers of the Council who had received awards in the King's Birthday Honours.

Jacqui Gitau, Family Help Practitioner in Children's Social Care, was awarded an MBE for services to migrant families in Oxfordshire. Jacqui founded African Families in the UK after witnessing how many families were falling through the gaps, sometimes due to systemic barriers, and sometimes simply because they lacked timely information about education, health, and social care.

The Council's Chief Executive, Dr Martin Reeves, was awarded an OBE in recognition of his outstanding service to local government. He was Chief Executive of Coventry City Council for over 14 years, during which time Coventry became the first Marmot City in the country. He was also instrumental in establishing the West Midlands Mayoral Combined Authority and was its first Chief Executive from March 2016 to September 2017.

A full list of Oxfordshire award recipients in the King's Birthday Honours was attached at Annex 1 to the Schedule of Business.

A list of the events attended by the Chair and Vice-Chair since the last Council meeting was in Annex 2.

The Chair noted that two former chairs of this Council had passed away recently. The death had occurred of a former chair of Oxfordshire County Council and of Cherwell District Council, Timothy Hallchurch MBE. Tim was elected Conversative Member for the division of Otmoor & Kidlington in 2005 and 2009 and for Otmoor Division in 2013.

Former Councillor Hallchurch was also a Member of Cherwell District Council from 2002 to 2022, including a year as Chair in 2011/2012. He chaired this Council in 2013/2014 and served on many committees including Audit, Corporate Governance, Oxfordshire Joint Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee (HOSC) and Planning and Regulation.

Councillors Mallon and Brighouse paid tribute to former Councillor Hallchurch's record of public service.

Former County Councillor John Jones was the Liberal Democrat Member for Grove Division from May 1989 until he stood down ahead of the May 1997 election. He had previously been a member of Shrewsbury Borough Council from 1964-1968, and a senior probation officer in Oxford.

Having been elected as Chair of Oxfordshire County Council in 1992, former Cllr Jones was then unusually re-elected for a second term of office, following the 1993 Oxfordshire County Council elections. He served on the Environmental Committee (1989-1992) and Education Committee from 1992.

Former Cllr Jones was extremely proud of his service as a member of Oxfordshire County Council and requested that his Former Chair's Badge of Office be placed on his coffin as it enters the church for his funeral.

Councillors Fawcett and Brighouse commended former Councillor Jones' memory to the Council.

Council observed a minute's silence.

44/26 APPOINTMENTS

(Agenda Item 5)

There were no appointments to note under this item. Committee appointments were dealt with under Item 14: Committees and Review of Political Balance.

45/26 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda Item 6)

Matthew Jerwood presented a petition on behalf of local residents calling for improvements to safety at the junction of Rose Hill, Henley Avenue and Church Cowley Road. He stated that residents, including people with mobility difficulties and families with young children, felt unsafe crossing the junction. He argued that changes in traffic patterns had led to greater congestion, speeding and other dangerous behaviour, and noted that residents had recorded nine accidents and incidents in recent months. On behalf of the 575 signatories to the petition, most of whom lived locally in OX4, he called for an urgent safety review, the installation of two pedestrian crossings, stronger speed and red-light enforcement measures, and a site visit by council representatives to work with residents on improving safety for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.

Councillor Epps, Cabinet Member for Transport, thanked the petitioners for highlighting residents' concerns and acknowledged that the junction at Rose Hill, Henley Avenue and Church Cowley Road presented longstanding safety concerns for pedestrians and cyclists. He explained that, while improvements to the junction would be desirable, there were significant challenges, including the need to reduce traffic volumes without creating wider transport or safety problems. He noted that previous changes made as part of the Quickways scheme had increased space for cycling but led to additional collisions, traffic issues and poorer bus reliability, resulting in the reinstatement of the former layout. He also highlighted the high potential cost of major alterations and the absence of an allocated budget, although he said design work on possible future improvements could still be explored. He clarified that speeding and red-light enforcement were matters for Thames Valley Police and concluded by offering to follow up with the petitioners and undertake a site visit to discuss the issues in more detail.

Emma Parker presented a petition signed by 384 people calling on the Council to improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists along the A40 London Road, particularly on the stretch between Thornhill Park and Ride and the Holton turn. She highlighted concerns that children travel to local primary and secondary schools along a shared footway and cycleway that runs close to fast-moving traffic and argued that the route is unsafe despite being promoted for active travel and "park and stride" journeys. While the petition originally proposed a vehicle restraint system or crash barrier, she noted that residents had also suggested measures such as speed reductions or alternative cycle routes. She urged the Council to investigate and implement the most effective safety improvements as a matter of priority, emphasising that doing so would support the Council's Active Travel Strategy and Vision Zero objectives by making walking and cycling safer and more attractive, particularly for school journeys.

Councillor Epps thanked Emma Parker for highlighting safety concerns along the A40 London Road route and acknowledged that it felt unsafe, particularly as it is used by school pupils. He outlined the Council's completed feasibility work, which proposes a range of improvements including widening and resurfacing the shared-use path, improving crossings and visibility, redesigning the Park Hill junction roundabout, closing the parking lay-by, and reducing the speed limit to 50 mph. He explained that the aim was to provide a safer, segregated cycling and walking route while complying with current Active Travel England guidance and incorporating input from local cycling groups. While barriers may be required at some locations, he noted that there were challenges to installing them along the entire route. He advised that funding was available to complete detailed design work this financial year, but that no construction budget had yet been identified. Once funding was secured, the Council would move forward with public consultation on the proposals.

Huw James, speaking on agenda item 9, Report of the Cabinet, urged the Council to support participation in the proposed Thames Valley Strategic Authority, arguing that Oxfordshire, Swindon and the wider Thames Valley form an interconnected economic area with strong transport links, integrated supply chains and complementary industries. He highlighted examples of collaboration between businesses and institutions across the region and contended that a stronger regional governance arrangement would help secure devolved powers and funding for transport, infrastructure, housing and skills. He stressed that businesses were interested not in devolution for its own sake but in the opportunities it could unlock for sustainable economic growth, improved productivity and a stronger voice with central government. He warned that delaying Thames Valley devolution could mean missing out on long-term funding settlements and growth opportunities, and urged councillors to back the Strategic Authority in order to support businesses, residents and the region's economic future.

46/26 QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

(Agenda Item 7)

Three questions were submitted. The questions and responses are recorded in an Annex below. No supplementary questions were asked.

47/26 QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

(Agenda Item 8)

Thirty nine questions were submitted. The questions, responses and supplementary questions are recorded in an Annex below.

48/26 REPORT OF THE CABINET

(Agenda Item 9)

Council received the Cabinet report covering the 17 March 2026, 21 April 2026 and 19 May 2026 Cabinet meetings.

On item 1 (Local Government Reorganisation in Oxfordshire: Statutory Consultation Response), Councillor Garnett asked if the response could be styled as from the Cabinet given that the Council had not voted on local government reorganisation. The Leader noted that the administration represented the whole Council and so it was appropriate for the response to be attributed to the Council.

Councillor Baines asked for assurances that responses to the Structural Changes Order would seek cross-party consensus and input from across the Council. The Leader responded that the government set arbitrary targets for the number of councillors in a single unitary authority, which was the Council's preferred option, but that it could hopefully be addressed in the future.

Councillor Mallon asked why the working group for dealing with electoral matters was not convened at an early stage and why, when it was convened at a late stage, its advice was not followed. The Leader welcomed the input from the working group but noted that Cabinet was not obliged to take every suggestion on board.

Councillor Evans questioned whether the Leader thought it was undemocratic for some divisions to have one councillor and other divisions to have two councillors in a potential one Oxfordshire unitary authority. The Leader agreed that it was undemocratic.

On item 2 (Devolution Update – Thames Valley Strategic Authority), Councillor Middleton asked why the Leader had vetoed plans for the County Council to join a foundational strategic authority. The Leader noted that the government had initially offered a Mayoral Strategic Authority for the Thames Valley region but that this had been watered down through the process and stated that the Council wanted to be much more ambitious in what it sought to benefit from in the devolution settlements.

Councillor Brighouse noted that a Foundational Strategic Authority was intended to be short-term before transitioning to a Mayoral Strategic Authority and asked if the Leader agreed that the administration had sought to scupper devolution proposals. The Leader disagreed and stated that no timeline had been provided by the government, noting that potential changes in government ministers might help deliver meaningful devolution in the Thames Valley.

Councillor Rawlins asked what deadlines could confidently be expected from the government on devolution and local government reorganisation. The Leader noted there were no firm deadlines but expected engagement with the government in the coming weeks.

Councillor Baines asked why the Leader opposed devolution settlements for Oxfordshire given that Cambridgeshire and Peterborough had experienced clear benefits from similar settlements. The Leader noted the complex local government arrangements in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough and that the Council wanted simpler structures that benefitted residents.

Councillor Pressel asked what discussions had taken place with the government since the decision to withdraw support from a Foundational Strategic Authority was taken. The Leader noted that the responsible Minister had previously resigned and that binary choices were not helpful in producing productive working relationships with the government on devolution.

Councillor Mallon asked about differing views between different Liberal Democrat leaders at national and local levels. Councillor Fawcett responded that the government proposals were a bad deal for Oxfordshire and that the Leader was correct to reject it to allow the government to come back with an improved devolution settlement offer.

Councillor Saul asked whether the Leader had discussed his decision to withdraw support from a Foundational Strategic Authority with District Council colleagues beforehand. Councillor Fawcett stated that District Councils and the County Council believed there was potential for a better devolution settlement, compared to the deal that was offered.

On item 3 (Improving our Fire and Rescue Service), Councillor Markham asked when a new proposal would be brought forward for decision on the future of the Fire and Rescue Service. Councillor Fawcett stated that collaborative discussions had begun with the Fire Brigades Union, which was independently chaired, to bring forward positive proposals which could hopefully be reported on to the Joint Consultative Committee for Uniformed Members of the Fire Service initially.

Councillor Saul asked if the Cabinet Member agreed that the centre of Oxford would be better served by the existing Rewley Road Fire Station compared to an edge of city location. Councillor Fawcett noted that proposals would always have trade-offs, with historic buildings in Oxford requiring faster response times due to their special value. Different plans were required in order to assess the necessary trade-offs with limited resources.

Councillor Smith asked if the process of finding positive solutions to the challenges faced by the Fire and Rescue Service had started. Councillor Fawcett stated that he was committed to finding positive solutions through a collaborative approach.

Councillor Cherry asked for reassurance that previous plans for the Fire and Rescue Service would not resurface over remaining years of the County Council. Councillor Fawcett stated there were no overall cuts proposed to the Fire and Rescue Service, but a movement of resources between facilities, with the aim of providing better services for residents and that some previous plans had been ruled out.

Councillor Phillips sought clarification on whether a decision had been made on the closure of Rewley Road or Kidlington Fire Stations. Councillor Fawcett stated that decisions on their closures had not been made, stating that the option would remain open with many factors to balance to ensure the right way forward.

Councillor Pressel asked what progress had been made on the recruitment practices for firefighters. Councillor Fawcett noted local and Oxfordshire-wide campaigns to support recruitment and stated one of the positive elements from the consultation was the strength of support from local communities for their local fire services.

On item 4 (Refresh of the Our People & Cultural Strategy 2026-2028), Councillor Barlow asked if expectations could be grounded in the current and future funding realities, acknowledging that the best chance to deliver outstanding services was by working with communities. Councillor Fawcett noted that the aim should be to deliver excellent services regardless of the financial constraints, acknowledging that the Council valued the work that employees undertake and as individuals.

Councillor Phillips asked the Cabinet Member to describe staff morale, faced with the closure of County Hall and other uncertainties, such as devolution plans for Oxfordshire. Councillor Fawcett noted that there were some factors outside of the County Council's control, such as local government reorganisation and devolution, but that it was important to listen and communicate with staff, which was evidenced by staff morale improving across Oxfordshire, noting that the proportion of staff who work in County Hall was small.

Councillor McLauchlan noted timing challenges with delivery of services and asked what the Council was doing over the last years in which it would be in operation to retain and recruit staff. Councillor Fawcett acknowledged the frustrations over delays, recommending that councillors raise concerns with Cabinet Members if required and that the Council was aware of the risk of staff retention moving forward into the transition towards new authorities.

On item 5 (Local Transport Consolidated Funding Settlement – Local Transport Delivery Plan), Councillor Kerr asked why costs were predominantly allocated to roads when the Council's targets were on active travel and buses and how they were trying to avoid value-engineering dropping active travel elements of schemes as costs rise. Councillor Epps noted the challenges in this area, stated that detailed discussions and reviews of future programmes should continue, highlighting new initiatives on active travel and public transport outlined in the report.

Councillor Fry asked what action was being taken to increase the coverage of PM2.5 monitoring which was harder to undertake than NOx. Councillor Epps noted the work being undertaken to address air quality challenges, reflecting that air quality was a function of the District Councils but that he would be happy to sit down and discuss it further.

Councillor Barlow asked how the Local Transport Delivery Plan was being integrated into major highways decisions being made so a wide range of options were available, rather than defaulting to road building such as was the case on the Watlington Relief Road. Councillor Epps noted that several items in the report related to planning decisions and stated he'd be happy to meet with the councillor to discuss how the Council will look to prioritise going forward.

Councillor Pressel asked why the item was only on the Forward Plan for 28 days, noting that this did not give scrutiny enough time to scrutinise it. Councillor Epps stated that he was happy to take that point on board going forward and would reply on the specific point in writing.

On item 6 (Movement and Place Plans), Councillor McLauchlan asked if there was a Movement and Place Plan for the Benson area to mitigate the potentially vast induced increase in traffic from various schemes. Councillor Epps responded that he would provide a timescale in writing.

Councillor Baines asked how the 2040 Bus Strategy would shift shorter journeys onto public transport and if future Movement and Place Plans (MPP) would be more ambitious on public transport modal share. Councillor Epps noted that there was a low starting base and that work needed to be undertaken in conjunction with Local Plans to hold developers to account, looking at improvements that could be made to buses across Oxfordshire.

Councillor Saul asked if proper weight could be given to consultation responses to the West Oxfordshire Lowlands MPP that object to the introduction of parking charges and if the proposal could be avoided in the West Oxfordshire Uplands MPP. Councillor Epps reiterated that there were no plans to introduce car parking charges in West Oxfordshire Lowlands MPP and that car parking was the responsibility of West Oxfordshire District Council, committing to working on challenges in the Uplands MPP with local councillors.

Councillor Brighouse asked how Marmot principles were taken into consideration when looking at Movement and Place Plans. Councillor Epps noted that these principles had to be embedded into plans and welcomed the valuable reminder which he would take back to officers.

On item 7 (Oxford Congestion Charge Investment Plan), Councillor Garnett asked how bus investment could be used to encourage less car use, particularly noting cheap Park & Ride options that were available per person rather than per car. Councillor Epps noted that the arrangements weren't entirely in the County Council's control but was happy to discuss that issue moving forward.

Councillor Baines asked what consideration had been given to including the Rose Hill/Church Cowley Road junction in the list of active travel upgrades funded by congestion charge income. Councillor Epps noted he was happy to meet with local councillors to explore safety concerns and funding possibilities.

Councillor Henwood asked about the increase of charges from £5 to £70 in the transition from the temporary congestion charge to the traffic filters scheme and how that would impact the poorest communities in Oxford. Councillor Epps advised that he would need to wait for future details on the traffic filter scheme but that he was acutely conscious of the need to ensure equity is entrenched in everything we do.

Councillor Creed asked how Marmot principles were taken into consideration when looking at the congestion charge investment plan, considering that it had moved traffic into some of the most deprived areas in Oxford. Councillor Epps noted he was not the Cabinet Member at the time of the decision but referenced equality impact assessments that were undertaken and noted the importance of the Marmot principles in this area of work.

Councillor Edosomwan asked which specific parts of the investment plan would improve transport accessibility and opportunities for residents in Oxford, rather than primarily benefitting those travelling into Oxford. Councillor Epps noted support for public sector workers in schools and health services as an example of supporting residents in Oxford and stated he would be happy to meet with the councillor to discuss further.

Councillor Malik noted that park and ride support did not benefit residents in Cowley and asked about measures to improve congestion on Oxford Road and Church Cowley Road. Councillor Epps noted that the Council continues to monitor the impacts, particularly with the scheduled reopening of the Botley Road, and look for ways to relieve congestion.

On item 8 (Updates to Parking Standards for New Developments), Councillor Garnett asked how the County Council was working with City and District Councils who were responsible for planning, and for making sure a new unitary authority/authorities enforced these plans moving forward. Councillor Epps stated he was seeking to improve partnership working with the City and District Councils.

Councillor Fry noted that the Council's initial provision for cycle parking on new developments had been double the national standard and now was in line with it, querying whether the Cabinet Member would be open to going halfway to improve cycling provision on new developments and provide safe parking spaces for electric bikes. Councillor Epps noted the importance of e-bikes and referenced examples of cycle parking provision seeming too high but would be happy to have a discussion with the councillor on the potential flexibility there could be, whilst noting different travel methods across Oxfordshire and cycling levels in Oxford.

49/26 SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT 2025/26

(Agenda Item 10)

Council was asked to note the Scrutiny Annual Report which documents the activities of the four overview and scrutiny committees for the 2025/26 Council year.

The report was proposed by Councillor Brighouse and seconded by Councillor Snowdon. Members thanked scrutiny officers for their work during the year. Following discussion, Council noted the report.

RESOLVED: that the Scrutiny Annual Report be noted.

50/26 JOINT HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (JHOSC) ANNUAL REPORT 2025/26

(Agenda Item 11)

Council had before it the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee Annual Report that documented the breadth and depth of the Committee's work over the 2025/26 Council year.

The report was proposed by Councillor Hanna and seconded by Councillor Edosomwan. Members thanked officers and partner organisations for their work on health scrutiny during the year. Following discussion, Council noted the report.

RESOLVED: that the Oxfordshire Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee's (JHOSC) Annual Report set out in Annex 1 be noted.

51/26 REPORT FROM AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE - PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

(Agenda Item 12)

Council considered the report setting out proposed changes to the Council's Constitution following the findings and conclusions of the Constitution Working Group and the Audit and Governance Committee.

The recommendations were moved by Councillor Smith and seconded by Councillor Shiri, Chair and Deputy Chair of the Audit and Governance Committee. Members thanked the members of the working group and the officers supporting it for their work.

Following discussion, an electronic vote was taken on the recommendations. They were approved with 53 votes in favour, none against and no abstentions.

RESOLVED that

a) **the proposed amendments to the Council's Constitution as recommended by the Constitution Working Group and Audit and Governance Committee, as set out Appendix 1, including amendment number 11, be approved;**

b) **the amendments undertaken by the Director of Law and Governance and Monitoring Officer, in accordance with Part 7.2 of the Constitution (Scheme of Delegation to Officers), paragraph 6.4 (t) and considered by the Constitution Working Group and Audit and Governance Committee; as set out in Appendix 2, be noted;**

c) **the Director of Law and Governance and Monitoring Officer be requested to ensure the necessary changes are made; and**

d) **a final edit of the Constitution covering layout and grammar be undertaken prior to publication.**

52/26 THE USE OF URGENCY PROVISIONS

(Agenda Item 13)

Council was asked to note a report on the use of an urgency provision in a Cabinet decision on SEND Reform.

The report was proposed by Councillor Gaul, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People, and seconded by Councillor Gregory, Cabinet Member for Public Health and Inequalities. Following discussion, Council noted the report.

RESOLVED:

- **That the exemption from Call-in of the following decision be noted:**
  - **a) Cabinet on 16 June 2026 – SEND Reform Plan.**

53/26 COMMITTEES AND REVIEW OF POLITICAL BALANCE

(Agenda Item 14)

Council was requested to approve committee appointments, in Annex 2 to the report, based on revised political balance calculations following Councillor Higgins joining the Liberal Democrat group.

Councillor Bearder proposed an amendment to the list of Liberal Democrat Group Members on the Performance and Corporate Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee with Councillor Roberts to replace Councillor Shiri.

The recommendations as amended were proposed by the Chair and seconded by the Vice-Chair. Following discussion, the recommendations were agreed with 56 in favour, none against and no abstentions.

RESOLVED that:

a) the review of political balance of committees to reflect the current formation of the political groups as detailed in Annex 1 be noted;

b) Members be appointed to the committees of the Council as listed in Annex 2 as amended.

54/26 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR LEE EVANS

(Agenda Item 15)

The motion was proposed by Councillor Evans and seconded by Councillor Brighouse. Councillor Evans proposed an amendment set out in Annex 5 to the Schedule of Business. Council agreed to receive the amendment so that the following amended motion was considered.

"This Council notes that many people in our county suffer from progressive and life-limiting conditions, such as Motor Neurone Disease (MND). As these diseases progress, symptoms worsen and people's needs increase, often unpredictably.

This Council believes that people living with progressive conditions deserve to live in safe and accessible homes, with as much independence and quality of life as possible. We commit to doing all we can to ensure this.

This Council notes that early interventions, as well as being good for individuals and their families, can save taxpayer's money by enabling people to manage their condition more effectively and reducing the need for critical interventions at a later stage.

This Council therefore resolves to ask the Cabinet Member for Adults to review the County Council's role in the Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG) and report to the People Overview & Scrutiny Committee with:

- How the Council currently delivers its role in the DFG;
- Timeliness over the past three years for the County Council fulfilling its role in the DFG, including assessments and referrals;
- How the Council's processes could be improved, including the timeliness of assessments and the working relationship with District Councils and other partners;
- Whether the County Council is acting quickly enough to ensure that target timeframes of 55 days for simple adaptations and 130 days for complex adaptations can be met for people living with MND and other progressive or terminal conditions."

Following discussion, an electronic vote was taken. The motion was carried with 56 votes in favour, no abstentions and none against.

The motion was referred to Cabinet.

55/26 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR JAMES BARLOW

(Agenda Item 16)

The motion was proposed by Councillor Barlow and seconded by Councillor Jones. An amendment, set out in Annex 5 of the Schedule of Business, was proposed by Councillor Henwood. The amendment was accepted by the proposer and seconder. Council agreed to accept the amendment so that the following amended motion was considered.

"Council notes:

1. Climate impact is the Council's highest strategic risk.

2. The Oxfordshire Climate Risk and Vulnerability Assessment (2024) identifies flooding and extreme heat as significant, growing climate risks; driven by warmer, wetter winters, more intense rainfall, prolonged summer heatwaves and increased built-up areas.

3. Impacts of climate and Nature collapse are acknowledged to be even greater than thought in 2024. They pose an existential threat to humanity and all ecosystems. Serious adaptation must become standard operating practice similar to the fiduciary duty to council tax-payers.

The assessment illustrates large-scale space for water storage and retention is vital, slowing water flow and decreasing flooding. Urban design is also key - to prevent localised surface-water flooding, and build temperature resilience, preventing human-made "heat islands" which drive excess residents' deaths, especially the most vulnerable.

Adaptation measures' success depends on multi-year, multi-stakeholder, community-based collaborations at impactful scale. Partners' (e.g. Environment Agency) 6-year funding cycles allow capacity to develop – starkly contrasting to the council's annual budget-setting process.

Council requests that cabinet considers:

- Significantly increased investment through the Council's remaining years' budget process to accelerate Oxfordshire's capacity and capability to convene and work at impactful scale, in multi-stakeholder action groups, embedding climate adaptation as standard operational procedure.
- Supporting multiple location-specific initiatives, working with councillors, officers, partner organisations and local communities, to build resilience through collaborative action to:
    - Reduce the risks associated with river, groundwater, surface water and flash flooding
    - Improve resilience to extreme heat and mitigate urban heat island effects."

Following discussion, an electronic vote was taken. The motion was carried with 55 votes in favour, none against and no abstentions.

The motion was referred to Cabinet.

56/26 MOTION FROM COUNCILLOR BETHIA THOMAS

(Agenda Item 17)

The motion was proposed by Councillor Thomas and seconded by Councillor Roberts. An amendment from Councillor Middleton, as set out in Annex 5 to the Schedule of Business, was accepted by the proposer and seconder. Council agreed to accept the amendment so that the amended motion considered was as follows.

"This Council:

- Recognises that dangerous parking, on pavements, paths and verges, in cycle lanes, around schools and in many other instances, causes significant danger and inconvenience to many people particularly those with limited mobility.
- Understands that this is a county wide issue, and many representative groups have worked tirelessly to highlight these issues.
- Recognises the findings from the Government's consultation, allowing the highway authority to enforce a ban on pavement, path and verge parking.
- Recognises that a ban on pavement parking needs to be accompanied by the consideration of parking as whole, and by extra budget from Government or else effective enforcement may not be possible.

Council therefore:

1. Fully endorses the objective to end pavement, path and verge parking and doing so in a way which suits local needs best.
2. Commits to supporting the use of civil enforcement powers in a way which enforces this policy effectively in a cost neutral way to the council.
3. Asks the Cabinet Member for Transport to:
    a. Oversee the introduction of an enforcement mechanism, recognising that different areas will require different solutions.
    b. Ensure that key stakeholders and representative groups of people with restricted mobility be consulted throughout.
    c. Ensure that the Council follows the progress of Government's latest research exercise into this issue, responding as appropriate."

Following discussion, an electronic vote was taken. The motion was carried with 50 votes in favour, one abstention and no votes against.

The motion was referred to Cabinet.

………………………………………………….. in the Chair

Date of signing ……………………………………………….