

## OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

**MINUTES** of the meeting held on Tuesday, 23 March 2021 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 3.20 pm.

### **Present:**

Councillor Les Sibley – in the Chair

### Councillors:

John Howson	Mike Fox-Davies	Charles Mathew
Sobia Afridi	Stefan Gawrysiak	Glynis Phillips
Jamila Begum Azad	Mark Gray	Susanna Pressel
Hannah Banfield	Carmen Griffiths	Laura Price
David Bartholomew	Pete Handley	Eddie Reeves
Dr Suzanne Bartington	Jane Hanna OBE	G.A. Reynolds
Tim Bearder	Jenny Hannaby	Judy Roberts
Maurice Billington	Neville F. Harris	Alison Rooke
Liz Brighouse OBE	Steve Harrod	Dan Sames
Paul Buckley	Damian Haywood	Gill Sanders
Kevin Bulmer	Mrs Judith Heathcoat	John Sanders
Nick Carter	Hilary Hibbert-Biles	Emily Smith
Mark Cherry	Ian Hudspeth	Roz Smith
Dr Simon Clarke	Tony Ilott	Lawrie Stratford
Yvonne Constance OBE	Bob Johnston	Dr Pete Sudbury
Ian Corkin	Liz Leffman	Alan Thompson
Arash Fatemian	Lorraine Lindsay-Gale	Emma Turnbull
Neil Fawcett	Mark Lygo	Michael Waine
Ted Fenton	D. McIlveen	Liam Walker
Nicholas Field-Johnson	Kieron Mallon	Richard Webber
Mrs Anda Fitzgerald-O'Connor	Jeannette Matelot	

*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.*

### **7/21 MINUTES**

(Agenda Item 1)

The minutes of the Meeting held on 9 February 2021 were approved and signed as an accurate record of the Meeting, subject to the following amendment:

Minute 90/21 – Councillors voting for the Motion ~~(60)~~ **(48)**.

## **8/21 OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS**

(Agenda Item 4)

Council thanked staff for their ongoing commitment and hard work throughout the pandemic.

Council paid tribute to those members that would no longer be standing in the next election.

The Council held a Minute's silence at 12.00 noon to mark the National Day of Reflection to pause and reflect on the past 12 months and to pay tribute to all those who had died from COVID.

Council paid tribute and held a minute's silence in memory of former County Councillor Ray Jelf, Member for the Deddington Division 2002 – 2003, 2005 – 2009.

## **9/21 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS**

(Agenda Item 6)

Council received the following Petitions and Public Address:

### **Petitions**

Mr Mark Hull, presented a petition asking the Leader of Oxfordshire County Council to write to the Chair of Thames Water asking Thames Water to:

1. notify all relevant authorities of the locations where untreated sewage was expected to be released, in time for them to warn river users of the possible presence of human waste in the river.
2. commit to installing before 2030 sufficient treatment capacity for the needs expected then in all waters receiving Thames Water's wastewaters, so that all untreated sewage discharges cease by 2030.
3. support Oxford City Council's request that a location on the river Thames in Oxford receive Designated Bathing Water Status.

Mr Ruff presented a Petition requesting that Oxfordshire County Council give urgent and independent consideration to the following schemes to improve residents' parking, reduce traffic speeds, and make roads safer for residents, pedestrians, and cyclists. For the avoidance of doubt, there should be proper public consultation with residents on the design and timing of all schemes and Council officers should proceed with them as quickly as possible:

### Residents' parking schemes:

1. Residents' parking schemes introduced – urgently – for the following roads (in alphabetical order) where properties do not already benefit from off-road parking: Beargarden Road Berrymoor Road Broughton Road Crouch Street Gilkes Yard Hornbeam Close Westbeech Court West Bar Street.

No cut-throughs, traffic calming, and active travel alternatives:

2. Safety measures at the Broughton-Bath Road junction to slow traffic and improve visibility, together with improved pedestrian crossings on West Bar Street for students and staff at Banbury College, and visitors to our GPs' and vets' surgeries;
3. The introduction of safer, segregated cycle ways across Banbury town centre with a view to better connecting residents to the town centre and train station; and
4. A 20 mph zone from Banbury Cross to Queensway including Bath Road, Beargarden Road, West Bar Street, Broughton Road, and Crouch Street to ensure greater safety for pedestrians and cyclists;
5. Re-routing bus services to avoid Bath Road given the easy access of bus stops on the Broughton and Warwick Roads already;
6. No cut-through restrictions and/or a properly planned one-way system on Bath Road and Crouch Street to end rat-running without disadvantaging residents;
7. Consideration of relocating any new residents' parking spaces on Beargarden Road to the opposite side to improve visibility for pedestrians and motorists.

Ms Lidia Arciszewska presented a petition of some 400 signatures requesting to reduce the speed limit, exclude aggregate lorry traffic and facilitate cycling on Lower Road, Long Hanborough.

Mr Charlie Maynard presented a Petition requesting that the Council commits to a feasibility study to define and protect a rail route along the A40 from Wolvercote junction to Witney, for this work to be completed by 2021 year-end and be included in the fifth Local Transport Plan. Additionally, if the application for a £50,000 grant from the DFT's Restoring Your Railways Ideas Fund was successful, they requested that the Council committed to providing £8,000 of the £16,667 of match-funding required to fund preparation of a Strategic Outline Business Case.

**Public Address**

Mr Jamie Hartzell spoke in support of the Motion by Councillor Susanna Pressel. He urged the Council to introduce the workplace parking levy in Jericho and Walton Manor, in order that there was the money to pay for the transport system that they needed and wanted – a system that reduced the attractiveness of commuting by car, and brought less congestion; less carbon emissions, less air pollution; safer streets; and an adequate, affordable public transport system so people could still easily get around - by bus, train, foot and bicycle.

He believed that the main employers in the area, Oxford University and Oxford University Press were already sympathetic to the workplace parking levy, and therefore should not prove hard to introduce.

Mr David Dickie spoke on behalf of 'Clean Air for Henley' in support of the Motion by Councillor Stefan Gawrysiak. He explained that Henley had become an Air Quality Management Area in 2003, and that 18 years later, it still suffered from Nitrogen Dioxide exceedances of the 40 micrograms per cubic metre legal limit. The latest severe example of this was the limit was exceeded 18 days out of the first 22 in December 2020 despite being in Covid times.

In August 2020 Henley had installed a particulate monitor to measure carbon particles mainly given off by diesel engines. New emerging medical research in many areas of the body showed that, as carbon particulates could not dissolve in the body, they were capable of inflicting even more damage to our health than NOx. The unreviewed particulate results indicated Henley was not meeting WHO guidelines. It had been acknowledged since 2003 that Henley's air pollution was almost entirely down to traffic. They were therefore very dependent on Oxfordshire County Council making decisions on traffic control. The 20-mph zone in Henley was a step in the right direction. Announcements in Bath and Oxford on eliminating high polluting vehicle were more substantial and welcome. For the sake of the lungs of the young children of Henley, he urged Council to pass the HGV restriction motion.

Ms Amanda Chumas spoke in support of the Motion by Councillor Stefan Gawrysiak. She referred to the substantial increase in the number of commercial vehicles using the road and particularly a dramatic increase in the number of HGVs. Because of their length, 13.6m (excluding the cab), the 44 tonners could not turn into New Street without swinging wide into the lane of oncoming traffic before turning – thereby bringing everything to a standstill.

The aggregate trucks, although not as long are very heavy when laden. They invariably flout the 20-mph speed limit and take the corner at speed, often with wheels clipping or riding over the pavement. As a consequence, the tarmac surface of the road on that corner is literally rutted with grooves that successive HGV wheels have made and the kerbstones and pavement are gouged and broken making it dangerous for pedestrians who cross at this point as it was a blind corner. The narrow pavements outside the Bull and Toy shop in Bell Street and in Thameside and the narrow foot path (strictly single file only) over the bridge were all equally dangerous.

motivated by section 1 (1) Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, she started a Campaign to prevent HGVs using Henley purely as a river crossing. Such trucks should be mandated to stay on the SRN. The Campaign's petition had attracted 2375 signatures online and another 390 had signed a hardcopy. In addition, they had built up a body of enthusiastic volunteers and a Campaign Organisation and were committed to see this through. She urged Council to support the resolution, so that they could start the necessary studies and initiate the TRO.

Mr Jamie Clarke, Parent at St Ebbes School, Oxford spoke in support of the Motion by Councillor Damian Haywood. He welcomed that Oxfordshire

County Council had embraced the idea of School Streets and encouraged a modal shift amongst school kids to walk and cycle to school. However, with just six schemes planned for the County as a whole (far less than the of the 48 schemes planned in Hackney, 12 in Birmingham and 14 in Calderdale) it was clear that without a clear time based plan with appropriate personnel capacity and budget to roll out further schemes, most children in Oxfordshire would continue to go without the benefits of a school street. They would instead continue to be subjected to dirty congested streets outside their school and having to dodge cars doing dangerous manoeuvres on a daily basis. He felt that Councillor Haywood's motion would change this by ensuring council officers had the time and resourcing to deliver a much needed second wave of Schools Streets. As the County Council itself recognised, the implementation of School Streets had never been more relevant, as it was known that School Streets worked and were popular. Their success had been independently verified by academic research by Edinburgh Napier University, which found in a 16 school study that School Streets resulted in a reduction in the number of motor vehicles, an increased use of active travel and improved road safety in areas with a school street.

Also, significantly, parents wanted them. In South Oxford where he lived the problems were acute. In a survey of local parents at St Ebbe's Primary School, 63% of parents supported a School Street with only 20% opposed. A similar survey at New Hinksey Primary School saw 86% support for the introduction of a scheme. They had however struggled to get a School Streets scheme set up over the last year, there simply hadn't been the staffing or resources to make it happen despite lots of school and parent willingness to support the schemes rollout. He urged Council to support the motion to turn the positive words into amazing actions for the children of Oxfordshire.

Ms April Jones, Parent at New Hinksey School spoke in support of the Motion by Councillor Damian Haywood. She had children at New Hinksey Primary School for 6 years. In that time, the school had been constantly trying to persuade parents not to drive right up to the school at drop off and pick up times. The school was on a narrow no through road, where manoeuvring was difficult and dangerous. Requests came regularly in the school newsletter, and governors had on occasion resorted to standing in the street in hi vis jackets and turning cars back.

Most parents who felt they had to drive complied cheerfully, and parked in the neighbourhood, walking the rest of the way. But even now, when social distancing requirements made cars around school even more dangerous, there were some people who continued to drive right up to the gates. She was unable to see them changing their behaviour without the formal structure of an official School Streets scheme. This was what the school needed to achieve safe surrounding streets - staff and governors did not have the time or resources to continually enforce it themselves.

She urged the Council to support the motion so that they could move away from being a car-based society to ensure the safety of children and protect them from dangerous traffic, air pollution, and from unhealthy inactive lifestyles.

Mr Tony Fox, local resident spoke in support of the Motion by Councillor Stefan Gawrysiak. He referred to the volume of HGV traffic and the noise, pollution and infrastructure-damaging vibration that emanated from the juggernauts in Henley, and the danger and inconvenience that pedestrians were subjected to. He further referred to the narrow pavements which made pedestrians feel vulnerable walking along with trucks passing within inches. He had sent more than 150 photographs to OCC over the last couple of months) which indicated how trucks had to mount pavements in order to negotiate streets that were totally unsuited to this form of transport. He had also included a map obtained from the OCC's own Freight Quality Partnership Lorry Route Map (produced in 2005 in collaboration with Halcrow) which clearly showed Henley as a town, .."unsuitable for through lorry traffic". On the same map "Lorry Routes for Through Traffic Movements" (A40, M40, M4, A34 and A404) were clearly marked along with "Routes for Local Access only" (including A4130 and A4074).

Comparisons had been drawn between Henley and the problems experienced by towns such as Burford where vehicle weight limits had led to increases in traffic in other villages by what is referred to as 'displacement'. This would not be the case if a similar ban were introduced for Henley. In fact, the smaller villages on the routes around Henley would benefit because the only reason for many of the HGVs to pass through them is to get to the Thames crossing. 44 Tonne long distance freight trucks and heavy aggregate trucks should be mandated to stay on the SRN which was built to take them. He urged the Council to support the Motion.

## **10/21 QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

(Agenda Item 7)

Mr Andrew Siantonas had given written notice of the following question to Councillor Yvonne Constance

Following the withdrawal of subsidy for the 17 bus in 2016, many people in the Wolvercote and Summertown division of Oxfordshire County Council have lost their ability to independently access facilities across the county. This is because these people find it difficult to walk from, for example, Kendall Crescent shops or Wren Road up to Banbury Road along which the buses run. They have to rely on relatives or friends or pay for expensive taxis. Even though we are looking forward to coming out of lockdown thanks to the success of the vaccination programme, these people will effectively remain in enforced lockdown because of their lack of access to public transport.

Given the recent government announcement of £3 billion to invest on buses in England, what plans does the County Council have to ensure these people

again have access to public transport either by restoring the 17 bus or by providing other acceptable services.

Councillor Constance replied:

The County Council welcomes the publication of the National Bus Strategy and its ambition in relation to providing high quality public transport for the whole community. However, we are at a very early stage in the process and nothing is yet clear, therefore no commitments can be made at this stage to any particular changes or improvements that may be made.

The Council is required to enter into a statutory Enhanced Partnership with bus operators, and to commit to do so by the end of June. This is followed by the production of a Bus Service Improvement Plan which must be finalised by the end of October. These are exceptionally challenging timescales for a comprehensive plan which covers a broad range of areas such as bus priority, vehicles, information, ticketing and branding as well as service provision.

Therefore, at this point the County Council cannot be specific about the improvements that could potentially be delivered by the strategy. We await further details about the £275m funds for the recovery period (covering the next financial year), during which period we expect there to be minimal changes made. Any changes arising from the Partnership and Improvement Plan are not likely to take place before April 2022.

Most people in the Jericho and Cutteslowe areas live within 800 metres of a bus stop served by an exceptionally high number of buses. For those who are unable to access these, community transport options which offer a more door-to-door service may be more suitable. The Comet community bus is available on weekdays between 10am and 2pm and can be used for a wide variety of purposes. Further details are available on the Council's website at [www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/comet](http://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/comet) or by telephoning 01865 323201 (9am – 12pm Monday to Friday).

The following Supplementary Question was asked at the Meeting:

Thank you for your reply. I agree that Banbury Road is very well served with buses. However, many of the people who live 800 metres from the bus routes are in bungalows and flats designed for older people and people with physical difficulties which is why the 17 was so useful for them.

I recognise the challenging timetable in which to produce a comprehensive plan and that it is still early to make specific commitments, but can I ask if urban areas like Wolvercote and Summertown will be considered for enhanced service provision or will the focus be on rural areas?

Councillor Constance replied:

Thank you for your question. You draw attention to a very important problem, mostly in rural areas. There is a significant recognition by Government that funding is needed to be able to restore frequent and reliable transport systems. I cannot answer your question, but we are required to deliver the enhanced partnership by the end of June, and the fully developed plan on how we would spend our allocation from the National Bus Strategy money by October. However, your question is noted, and I will ensure that you are informed about the programme by October.

Mr Gregory O’Broin had given written notice of the following question to Councillor Yvonne Constance:

When OCC Cabinet approved Scheme C (Didcot to Culham River crossing) in July 2020 was it aware of the following impediments to the road alignment:

-

(a) The imminent proposed enlargement of the private Appleford rail sidings that would require a much larger & costlier road bridge to cross over the curving rail tracks?

(b) The absence of any investigation of the degree of damage to Appleford residents (& their wellbeing), from noise, air quality, & visual impact caused by elevating the road above adjacent roof levels?

(c) The absence of any detailed cost or feasibility studies of other technically viable road alignments within the same land corridor that would reduce the impact on the local community?

Councillor Constance replied:

(a) *The imminent proposed enlargement of the private Appleford rail sidings that would require a much larger & costlier road bridge to cross over the curving rail tracks?*

Hanson received planning permission for the two additional rail sidings on 27<sup>th</sup> October 2020. The Cabinet report detailed the alignments based on a feasibility design consulted on in March/April 2020. As preliminary designed has progressed, OCC has worked with stakeholders to further define design parameters across all four schemes, not just the Didcot to Culham River Crossing.

(b) *The absence of any investigation of the degree of damage to Appleford residents (& their wellbeing), from noise, air quality, & visual impact caused by elevating the road above adjacent roof levels?*

High level assessments are conducted to define the preferred options which consider a whole multitude of factors. The detailed assessment of noise, air quality and visual impact is undertaken as part of a planning application. It is not possible or feasible to conduct detailed analysis on all options considered. Detailed mitigation requirements, including noise and visual screening, are determined through the Environmental Impact Assessment process as part of the planning application.

(c) *The absence of any detailed cost or feasibility studies of other technically viable road alignments within the same land corridor that would reduce the impact on the local community?*

Early scheme sifting takes into account many constraints including Scheduled Ancient Monuments, environment, topography, land use etc. In response to the consultation in 2018, OCC realigned the Didcot to Culham River crossing route, north of Hanson's private railway sidings, further away from Appleford. Officers do not believe that moving the alignment further west, south of the railway sidings, is possible due to the reasons already highlighted in the response to Appleford Parish Council on 4<sup>th</sup> March 2021.

The following Supplementary Question was asked at the Meeting:

We note the answers that have been provided and do not believe they fully address the matters raised. However, we will take our supplementary questions forward to a meeting with OCC officials later this week and therefore, we will not present them at this forum. Thank you for the opportunity.”

## **11/21 QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL**

(Agenda Item 8)

37 questions with Notice were asked. Details of the questions and answers and supplementary questions and answers will be set out in the Annex to the minutes.

In relation to Question 6, Councillor Constance undertook to notify parish and town councils in advance of the works starting.

In relation to Question 7, Councillor Lindsay-Gale undertook to send Councillor Fenton a full list of schools which were significantly under roll for next year.

In relation to Question 12, Councillor Constance undertook to provide Councillor Bartington with a written answer in relation to point 5 of the written response and in particular what quality control was in place in terms of audit and implementation.

In relation to Question 13, Councillor Constance undertook to provide Councillor Bartington with a written answer as to whether there was any possibility of extending the timescale for Witney.

In relation to Question 21, Councillor Reeves gave an assurance (as far as he was able) to Councillor Fatemian that works would start on 10 May 2021 as planned.

## **12/21 REPORT OF THE CABINET**

(Agenda Item 9)

Council received the report of the Cabinet.

In relation to paragraph 3 of the report (Question from Councillor Webber to Councillor Lindsay-Gale) Councillor Lindsay-Gale undertook to provide Councillor Webber with a written response with specific details about what

discussions Oxfordshire had to produce a settlement to remove the High Needs Block deficit.

In relation to paragraph 4 of the report (Question from Councillor Webber to Councillor Constance) Councillor Constance undertook to raise the issue of prioritising actions to address the Climate Emergency, by ensuring that the quantifying by best estimate all carbon generating activities as well as any ameliorating measures were given high prominence in the vision document, rather than in Appendix 2.

In relation to paragraph 8 of the report (Question from Councillor Hanna to Councillor Bartholomew) Councillor Bartholomew undertook to provide Councillor Hanna with a written response regarding the new Grove School and whether there was any risk that the Department of Education intervention would have a detrimental impact on the agreed timeline and delivery of the Grove Airfield School by 2023.

In relation to paragraph 8 of the report (Question from Councillor Phillips to Councillor Bartholomew) Councillor Bartholomew undertook to provide Councillor Phillips with a written response in relation to the Capital Programme Monitoring Report on the number of projects that had received an early warning notice which had incurred additional costs and whether they had exceeded the contingency budget.

## **13/21 GOVERNANCE REVIEW**

(Agenda Item 10)

Under the Constitution, the Monitoring Officer was required to monitor and review the operation of the Constitution to ensure that its aims, principles and requirements were given full effect. This included making recommendations to Council on any necessary amendments. The Council had before it a report which sought the approval of one change. It further sought approval for a proposed way forward for reviewing the Constitution.

**RESOLVED:** (on a Motion from Councillor Nick Carter, seconded by Councillor Tony Ilot and carried nem con) to approve:

- (a) the proposed amendment (at paragraph 8) to bring the definition of a Key Decision into the main body of the text with the addition of consultation arrangements for Key Decisions taken by officers;
- (b) the proposal that the Monitoring Officer should bring forward proposals to the Audit & Governance Committee, after the May 2021 County Council elections, in the 4th cycle of the meetings for that Committee, for achieving a full review of the structure and content of the Constitution.

## **14/21 CHANGES TO CONSTITUTION OF THE PENSION FUND COMMITTEE**

(Agenda Item 11)

As part of an Independent Governance Review of the Pension Fund, Hymans Robertson recommended changes to the constitution of the Pension Fund Committee. The main driver for the recommended changes was to improve the representation of Scheme Employers on the Fund, whilst maintaining the majority position of the County Council as the Administering Authority. This was consistent with best practice guidance from the LGPS Scheme Advisory Board. The changes also resulted in a reduction of 2 in the total membership which should facilitate ensuring all Committee members had the requisite skills and knowledge to undertake their responsibilities on the Committee and improve the effectiveness of the Committee. The Pension Fund Committee at its meeting supported the proposals and recommended that these should be in place before the formation of the new Pension Fund committee following the May elections. Council had before it a report which sought approval to the changes outlined above.

Councillor Kevin Bulmer moved and Councillor Nick File-Johnson seconded that the recommendations set out in the report and on the face of the agenda be adopted.

Following debate, the Motion was put to the vote and was carried by 46 votes to 14, with 2 abstentions.

**RESOLVED:** (by 46 votes to 14, with 2 abstentions) to agree the changes to the constitution of the Pension Fund Committee as follows:

- 5 County Council Representatives selected in accordance with the political balance of the Council. These would form the only voting members of the new Committee
- 2 Academy School Representatives – non-voting
- 1 Oxford Brookes University Representative – non-voting
- 1 District Council Representative – non-voting
- 1 Scheme Member Representative – non-voting.

## **15/21 HEALTH SCRUTINY ARRANGEMENTS FOR OXFORDSHIRE**

(Agenda Item 12)

In 2020 both Oxfordshire Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Oxfordshire's Council approved in principle Terms of Reference for a new health overview scrutiny committee which would scrutinise system-wide health issues across the Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West (BOB) area.

Council had before it a report which sought approval of revisions to those Terms of Reference, which were proposed jointly at a meeting of HOSC Chairs and scrutiny officers in the relevant 5 BOB local authorities on 5

February 2021. The revised Terms of Reference were approved by the Oxfordshire Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 12 March 2021.

Councillor Arash Fatemian moved and Councillor Ian Hudspeth seconded that the recommendations set out in the report and on the face of the Agenda be adopted.

Following debate, the Motion was put to the vote and was carried by 48 votes to 13, with 2 abstentions.

**RESOLVED:** (by 48 votes to 13, with 2 abstentions) to approve:

- (a) the revisions to the draft Terms of Reference for a health scrutiny committee for health system-wide issues across the Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West (BOB) area;
- (b) a delegation from Council to enable the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Oxfordshire Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to make minor changes to the Terms of Reference after 23 March 2021 should other BOB councils request them as part of their own approval process.

## **16/21 INTERIM ARRANGEMENTS FOR TAKING EMERGENCY DECISIONS IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING THE COUNTY COUNCIL ELECTIONS**

(Agenda Item 13)

Council had before it a report which sought approval to a temporary variation to the delegated powers of the Chief Executive to aid effective decision making in the period between the retirement of councillors following the elections in May and the Annual Council meeting on 18 May 2021.

**RESOLVED:** (on a Motion by Councillor Les Sibley, seconded by Councillor John Howson and carried nem con) to agree a temporary variation to Part 7.1 of the Constitution Specific Powers and Functions of Particular Officers with effect that from 10 May to 18 May 2021 paragraph 6.3 (c) is to be read as follows:-

“(c) Any function of the Cabinet or of a Council committee or sub-committee, after consultation with the appropriate Director and thereafter with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Council and the Leader, as appropriate.”

## **17/21 MEMBERS CODE OF CONDUCT - DECISION NOTICE**

(Agenda Item 14)

Council had before it a report which notified Full Council of a decision by the then Interim Monitoring Officer on the outcome of a Member Code of Conduct complaint, following the meeting of a Members' Advisory Panel in December last year.

**RESOLVED:** (on a Motion by Councillor Les Sibley, seconded by Councillor John Howson and carried nem con) to note the decision of the Interim Monitoring Officer with regard to a Members' Code of Conduct Complaint concerning Cllr Liam Walker.

**18/21 MOTION BY COUNCILLOR DEBORAH MCILVEEN**

(Agenda Item 15)

Councillor Deborah McIlveen moved and Councillor Mark Cherry seconded the following Motion:

“This Council notes that the National Domestic Abuse Helpline received over 40,000 calls and contacts during the first three months of the Covid-19 lockdown [BBC July 2020].

Domestic Violence is common and overwhelmingly impacts women and girls globally, nationally and in Oxford as well as children and men. Domestic violence impacts on workplaces and communities and is a significant cost to the public purse.

This Council recognises that:

- The Covid pandemic, lockdowns and restrictions make it more difficult for survivors to seek help;
- Local authorities have a duty of safety to their employees and residents using services and are working to stop domestic violence.

This Council resolves to:

- Review the Corporate Domestic Violence Policy that applies to service delivery and employment for Oxfordshire County Council, support implementation with training and monitor and review annually.
- Work with partner agencies, communities and trade unions to promote measures to increase the safety of those experiencing domestic violence.
- Provide information on how to help friends, family and colleagues experiencing domestic abuse.
- Campaign and lobby for increased sustainable funding from central government for organisations working with victims and survivors, especially services for BAME communities that are underfunded.”

During debate, in which several members gave emotional personal testimonies, seven members, by standing in their places requested that the vote be recorded in the Minutes (Council Procedure Rule 17.4.1). Accordingly, the Motion was put to the vote. Voting was as follows:

Councillors voting for the Motion (63):

Afridi, Azad, Banfield, Bartholomew, Bartington, Bearder, Billington, Brighthouse, Buckley, Bulmer, Carter, Cherry, Clarke, Constance, Corkin, Fawcett, Fatemian, Fenton, Field-Johnson, Fitzgerald O'Connor, Fox-

Davies, Gawrysiak, Gray, Griffiths, Handley, Hanna, Hannaby, Harris, Harrod, Haywood, Heathcoat, Hibbert-Biles, Howson, Hudspeth, Ilot, Johnston, Leffman, Lindsay-Gale, Lygo, Mallon, Matelot, Mathew, McIlveen, Phillips, Pressel, Price, Reeves, Reynolds, Roberts, Rooke, Sames, Gill Sanders, John Sanders, Sibley, Emily Smith, Roz Smith, Stratford, Sudbury, Thompson, Turnbull, Waine, Walker and Webber.

Councillors voting against the motion (0), Councillors abstaining (0).

**RESOLVED:** (unanimously):

This Council notes that the National Domestic Abuse Helpline received over 40,000 calls and contacts during the first three months of the Covid-19 lockdown [BBC July 2020].

Domestic Violence is common and overwhelmingly impacts women and girls globally, nationally and in Oxford as well as children and men. Domestic violence impacts on workplaces and communities and is a significant cost to the public purse.

This Council recognises that:

- The Covid pandemic, lockdowns and restrictions make it more difficult for survivors to seek help;
- Local authorities have a duty of safety to their employees and residents using services and are working to stop domestic violence.

This Council resolves to:

- Review the Corporate Domestic Violence Policy that applies to service delivery and employment for Oxfordshire County Council, support implementation with training and monitor and review annually.
- Work with partner agencies, communities and trade unions to promote measures to increase the safety of those experiencing domestic violence.
- Provide information on how to help friends, family and colleagues experiencing domestic abuse.
- Campaign and lobby for increased sustainable funding from central government for organisations working with victims and survivors, especially services for BAME communities that are underfunded.

## **19/21 MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE**

(Agenda Item )

Following the Vote on the preceding item, Councillor Eddie Reeves indicated that he wished to move a procedural Motion (Council Procedure Rule 14.1.) to enable the Meeting to finish.

The Council adjourned for 10 minutes to allow the Chairman to seek advice from the Monitoring Officer. Following the adjournment, the Monitoring officer advised that to end the meeting Council Procedural Rule 14.1(x) (to suspend a specified Council Procedure Rule or part thereof) to suspend and

therefore alter the specified cut off time by which the meeting should conclude (i.e. by 3.30 p.m.) referred to in Council Procedure Rule (CPR) 5.1.(iii) would need to be moved, which would then in effect end the meeting and mean that the remaining business on the Agenda would be considered dropped in accordance with Council Procedural Rule 13.5.8.

Accordingly, Councillor Eddie Reeves moved and Councillor Damian Haywood seconded Council Procedural Rule 14.1(x) (to suspend a specified Council Procedure Rule or part thereof) to suspend and therefore alter the specified cut off time by which the meeting should conclude (i.e. by 3.30 p.m.) of the Meeting at Council Procedural Rule 5.1(iii).

The Motion was put to the vote and was agreed by 59 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

**RESOLVED:** (by 59 votes to 2, with 1 abstention) Council Procedural Rule 14.1(x) (to suspend a specified Council Procedure Rule or part thereof) to suspend and therefore alter the specified cut off time by which the meeting should conclude (i.e. by 3.30 p.m.) of the Meeting at Council Procedural Rule 5.1(iii).

**20/21 MOTIONS BY COUNCILLORS: RICHARD WEBBER, EDDIE REEVES, STEFAN GAWRYSIAK, SUSANNA PRESSEL, DAMIAN HAYWOOD AND ARASH FATEMIAN**  
(Agenda Item 16)

Following the Motion without Notice, these Motions were considered dropped in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13.5.8.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing .....