To: Planning at Oxford City Council

From: Steve Dawe, Cowley Area Transport Group – [www.catg.org.uk](http://www.catg.org.uk)

53 Bulan Road Oxford OX3 7HU – July 2021

**SUBMISSION TO OXFORD LOCAL PLAN 2040 ISSUES PAPER CONSULTATION: PART ONE, RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE**

**[PART TWO, on Adaptation to the Climate Emergency with particular reference to Transport challenges and the importance of Green space will be submitted separately. Part Two will make reference to the topic papers which accompany this Issues Paper consultation]**

***Q1 In your opinion have we raised the right issues about how Covid-19 has impacted Oxford?***

Section 1, the introduction, covers far more than Covid 19. Unfortunately, this includes questionable assumptions which undermine the credibility of the Issues Paper. First:

There is an emphasis throughout the whole Paper (beginning in clause 1.2 p.2) on ‘new housing.' In order to minimise the complete carbon impacts of new housing and to retain key resources, the main source of additional homes should be the existing built environment. The City Council should buy homes for council housing throughout the City; and it should be buying homes for part rent/part buy shared ownership homes for keyworkers. We do not support new commuter housing outside Oxford in principle as district councils have many other needs for such land and should be free to determine their own use of brownfield land and the built environment for homes. We also reject the idea that Oxford’s commuter car burden should be increased by such policies. We cannot see how Oxford can hope to attain Climate targets by 2030, 2040 or 2050 if the proposed levels of new home building actually take place in Oxford and Oxfordshire. Additional homes in Oxford should be car free, not just new developments, and should make use of buildings and land in industrial estates/science parks and empty shops and offices.

Secondly, we reject the use of the term ‘affordable housing’ since there is very little addition of very low-cost housing each year in Oxford. No private rental or market housing can be considered affordable given housing costs in Oxford.

Concerning working from home (clause 2.1.12 p.4), we feel the City and County Councils, and other district councils in Oxfordshire, should lead strongly on maintaining working from home at the highest possible levels to reduce emissions from traffic since transport is the major source of carbon emissions in the UK. This section stresses reductions in cars, a feature of the first lockdown, but avoidance of public transport means that vehicle use use is observably up in Oxford. In fact, 4 UK regions have recorded traffic above pre-pandemic levels.[[1]](#footnote-1) Delivery vehicles have also increased.[[2]](#footnote-2)

The assumption (clause 2.1.4 p. 4) that catch up for schools and universities will be possible assumes an availability of Government funds not currently evident. The Government is insisting on maintaining a small overall tax base and very high levels of debt instead of increasing taxes to address the long-term needs of the country.[[3]](#footnote-3) Without additional Government funds, the idea that stressed and overworked teachers[[4]](#footnote-4) and lecturers should work more hours cannot be considered. Without keyworker housing for teachers, it is likely that Oxford’s high housing costs will continue to add to the exodus of teachers from the City for cheaper places to live.

Clause 2.1.10 misses the point. The impact upon NHS and care workers of the pandemic has been severe and appears to be threatening the continuation of staff in the NHS and in care work. The UK was short of 50,000 nurses pre-pandemic.[[5]](#footnote-5) There are currently about 36,000 nursing vacancies.[[6]](#footnote-6) If Oxford is to retain nurses, they need both keyworker housing and more on-site nurses’ hostels/accommodation at very low cost. Concerning care work, the care industry expects vacancies for care workers to reach 100,000 during 2021.[[7]](#footnote-7)

Clause 2.1.13 introduces the idea of the 15-20 minute neighbourhoods but fails to mention the key problem of community severance by the busiest roads. We judge that Oxford needs to be a Low Traffic City to make active travel journeys easier and much more pleasant than currently. This means more crossings over busy roads and/or pedestrian/cycle bridges or tunnels.

Clause 2.1.14 Does not recognise the importance of ensuring additional council homes purchased by the Council via its affiliate Oxford City Housing need to be adequate for working from home. Newly-built homes will generally not meet this need since they do not meet the Parker-Morris space standards which applied in the UK 1961-1980, nor are they comparable in space to many of the semi-detached and detached homes built in the 1920s and 1930s. The UK is distinguished by having the smallest amounts of space in new homes of any country in Europe.[[8]](#footnote-8) New build or retrofitted building for homes should ensure spaces standards conform, as a minimum, to the Parker-Morris standards.

***Q2 What changes in your life do you feel may be long lasting that may be relevant to the Local Plan?***

The primary authors of this submission are cyclists and walkers, and occasional bus users. Increased road traffic higher than pre-pandemic due to avoidance of public transport by residents and people commuting into Oxford for work impacts upon us and other users of Active Travel. Bus users are hit by periodic delays due to high levels of car use, only abated by the summer holiday period. Failure of local councils to promote public transport use is coupled with a lack of Government support to halve bus and train fares. Delivery vehicles are continuing to increase and it is impossible to undertake a short cycle journey and not see such vehicles. As walkers and cyclists, we note: increased aggressive driver behaviour at all times of day towards other drivers, pedestrians and cyclists due to congested conditions. Clearly, routine road and utility repairs are causing bigger tailbacks due to increased traffic levels, which may well decrease in the winter.

***Q3 In your opinion have we raised the right issues about how climate change needs to be taken into account in Oxford?***

No. In our considered opinion, based on over 30 years of observation of and teaching about Climate Change,[[9]](#footnote-9) official mitigation targets for greenhouse gases do not appear to take into account all likely factors speeding up emissions and temperatures. In general, the IPCC is subject to political interference and the lowest common denominator approach to evidence available. In consequence, circumstances tend to overtake the content of IPCC reports. We therefore assert that a Zero Carbon Oxford should be achieved by 2030, at the latest. We particularly base this on the IPCC 1.5 degrees C report concerns. We note:

“This Special Report confirms that climate change is already affecting people, ecosystems and livelihoods all around the world. It shows that limiting warming to 1.5ºC is possible within the laws of chemistry and physics but would require unprecedented transitions in all aspects of society. It finds that there are clear benefits to keeping warming to 1.5ºC rather than 2ºC or higher. Every bit of warming matters. And it shows that limiting warming to 1.5ºC can go hand in hand with achieving other global goals such as the Sustainable Development Agenda. Every year matters and every choice matters. This Special Report also shows that recent trends in emissions and the level of international ambition indicated by nationally determined contributions, within the Paris Agreement, deviate from a track consistent with limiting warming to well below 2°C. Without increased and urgent mitigation ambition in the coming years, leading to a sharp decline in greenhouse gas emissions by 2030, global warming will surpass 1.5°C in the following decades, leading to irreversible loss of the most fragile ecosystems, and crisis after crisis for the most vulnerable people and societies.”[[10]](#footnote-10)

This perspective sadly needs no updating since it was printed in 2018, indicating that a general failure to move away from ‘business as usual’ emissions is not taking place. There is simply no urgency – locally, nationally or globally.

The IPCC 1.5 degree C report indicated that *any* reduction in overall emissions would save lives; global emissions continue on an upward trend. Worse, the International Energy Agency has recently been pleading for a ‘green recovery’ from Covid 19 which is not happening at present, as this is threatening a spike in carbon emissions over the next couple of years in their assessment – essentially a ‘grey’ recovery.[[11]](#footnote-11) In consequence, Climate targets for local authorities and the Government in the UK should be brought forward to 2030 in recognition of the global situation, as well as the extremely serious critiques of UK Government policy recently issued by the Committee on Climate Change.

No, on the planning system. Decisions emerge from Oxford City Council that undermine confidence in its planning function. Examples include proposed housing at Warren Crescent on infill land which may well be unsuitable; allocation of funding to speculative commercial development in a time of uncertainty due to Brexit and Covid 19; extending the Seacourt Park and Ride in an area known to be flood prone; dumping housing on other local authorities and on Oxford’s greenfield sites instead of using the existing built environment for housing within Oxford to help minimise traffic movements; failure to re-purpose car parks – to build homes at the edges of them, above surface level and right over them in City Centre sites in particular, etc.

No on planning, if it permits any greenfield site building in the City. This land has many other uses than development and a City with a rising population should not have planners or a Planning Committee contemplating reductions in greenfield sites.

Clause 2.2.9 does not raise the important issue of encouraging electric car hire instead of car ownership in future. Cooperative promotion by the City, other districts and County should attempt to establish a trend of increasing the proportion of households that do not have access to an owned vehicle.

Clause 2.2.11 Net Zero Carbon is a worthy goal, ahead of creating carbon negative communities. Offsetting of any type is unreliable, inconsistently assessed and has no framework of international regulations to make it meaningful.[[12]](#footnote-12) There is no substitute for cutting emissions.

Clause 2.2.13 Refers to the ‘urban heat island’ effect, but not to the City Council’s role in making conditions in Oxford worse by permitting building on greenfield sites.

***Q4 In your opinion have we raised the right issues about overcoming inequalities in Oxford in this paper and/or the accompanying topic papers? Yes/No***

No. With about half of the City’s housing in the hands of private landlords, and market housing inaccessible to most residents, market housing is a ‘market failure’ in Oxford and the City Council has yet to recognise this. Only very low-cost housing using the existing built environment will serve to change the balance of tenures towards what a lot more of Oxford’s households can actually afford. By very low cost, we mean below 30% of average net household income. This means council homes; housing association homes; more secure moorings for narrow boats and similar; more housing cooperatives; co-housing. No new homes should be built in the City except where empty spaces are utilised by re-purposing car parks and long-term empty industrial estate/science park buildings and spaces. Both the City Council and Housing Associations should purchase homes on sale to meet very low cost housing demand. Low cost housing as outlined, served by public transport and good cycling and walking networks, should be car free – which allows more of the space available to be used for homes.

Clause 2.3.8 Student accommodation need not impact upon local housing if both undergraduates and postgraduates living in ordinary homes are all counted, and a cap is set one the number of homes they can occupy. The cap should be set at the current level of UGs and PGs in ordinary houses and should be cut back each year, pushing the University and Brookes to either build on their own existing land holdings in the City or to make use of land already brownfield elsewhere. The City should refuse further use of land for student accommodation outside that already in use by the University and Brookes for students. The intention would be to ensure student accommodation growth is possible at Wheatley and Cumnor, rather than exclusively within Oxford’s restricted spaces.

No, as the City has not attempted to stage a Universal Basic Income trial to counter the many problems created by Universal Credit and the lowest pensions in Europe.

***Q5 In your opinion have we raised the right issues or our neighbourhoods in this paper and/or the accompanying topic papers? Yes/No (if no, what have we missed?)***

No. Local neighbourhood and City Centre diversification is going to need an acceptance of the permanent decline of some retail activities due to online shopping; a decline in some service activities due to low and probably declining discretionary incomes due to ever higher housing costs in Oxford, e.g. impact on the City’s many takeaways and restaurants. In short, non-market occupation of premises needs to be increased, beginning with council and housing association housing; more charity shops in more places; pursuit of cooperative development in neighbourhood centres to get empty shops into use if possible e.g. for selling food and for ‘community larders’; more post offices; multi-agency community partnerships to offer welfare advice through new centres to specific groups or more generally, bringing together statutory bodies with local charities and campaigning groups. We therefore welcome the emphasis on food and health care in clause 2.4.3.

Absolute protection to existing greenfield sites and green spaces is not promised in the City Council’s 2036 version of this Plan, in this Issues Paper or associated documentation. So, clause 2.4.4 gives a false impression of valuing such spaces which the City Council and its planners do not demonstrate in practice.

Clause 2.4.10 raises the key issue of how people move in the City. After decades of under-investment in the UK in walking and cycling, we now have some Government interest in Active Travel, but little extra funding. Bus and train fares need to be halved to encourage use. Running cars is too cheap after years of Government failure to increase fuel duties, since 2011, which could have led to earlier adoption of electric vehicles. If there is no Government initiative shortly to get people back on to buses and trains, we face a major social risk of decreases in services – not mentioned in the Council’s accompanying papers. Traffic conditions are bad enough now in the City, but they could become far worse. City and County must vigorously promote walking, cycling and public transport use whilst lobbying for extra funds to support all of these low impact transport modes.

Clause 2.4.13 Does not mention Electronic Road Pricing. See our report on ERP for Oxford under REPORTS at [www.catg.org.uk](http://www.catg.org.uk) We advocate a UK trial of this, based on the Singapore model operating since 1998, for the Oxford City Region – as a major way to cut traffic levels.

**Q6 In your opinion have we raised the right issues about our natural environment in this paper and/or the accompanying topic papers? Yes/No**

No. Planning is not part of a joined-up protection of our environment in the City, which needs very long-term protection instead of attrition by bad planning decisions. The 2036 iteration of the Local Plan included building on greenfield sites and allotments. Building on a greenfield site in Warren Crescent, and at Meadow Lane and on the ‘Redbridge Meadow’ are all examples of failure to protect the natural environment for its many benefits. We reject dumping of Oxford’s inflated and inaccurate housing requirements upon neighbouring districts and commend groups challenging the creation of yet more little box new housing with inadequate facilities.[[13]](#footnote-13)

Clause 2.5.3 Green space is under threat constantly from bad planning decisions.

Clause 2.5.6 This clause takes at face value the Government’s Environment Bill. Since the Environment Agency has lost 75% of its funding since 2010, and neither it nor Natural England have adequate powers or staffing to protect the environment, then the Bill can only be taken as an example of the Government’s general inadequacy in environmental protection. We also reject the idea of development which gives rise to a perceived need for a ‘mandatory net gain’ in biodiversity. We cannot envisage how long it may take, for example, to replace the 108 ancient woodlands and associated ecosystems proposed to be wrecked by HS2.

Clauses 2.5.6-2.5.7 refer to ‘recovery’ which need not be taking place if it were not for planning failures of the past. We need to see Oxford City Council follow the Precautionary Principle, and the Polluter Pays Principle, and to behave as if it has a duty to future generations. These are fundamental principles for Planning, and should severely constrain any Planning Committee dalliance with the idea of damaging the environment and calling it ‘development.’

Concerning flood risk, Clauses 2.5.8-2.5.12 make no mention of SUDs or the general failure to ensure they are maintained. We suggest a new Special Planning Guidance document for Oxford as a whole which requires new build and sustainable retrofitting to be accompanied with a ‘BATNEEC’[[14]](#footnote-14) approach to SUDs so that drainage is gradually improved throughout the City. This would need to include that frontages can no longer be buried in concrete or tarmac.[[15]](#footnote-15)

**Q7 In your opinion have we raised the right issues about the other policy influencers we have highlighted in the paper?**

Clause 2.6.3 suggests the Council surrender all thinking about Oxford’s future to national policy. Since areas are different, this is imprudent and should be removed from any future versions of the City Plan. Clearly, we have no wish to see lowered standards, but localities are different and national policies – for example – imprudently encourage new build and using greenfield sites. In short, localisation should apply to maximise the best possible options which can be followed for our City.

Clauses 2.6.12-2.6.14 suggest we should accept the Government’s development plans for the Oxford-Cambridge Arc. There are many reasons to reject this scheme.[[16]](#footnote-16) We are advised that building 1 million homes across the Arc by 2050, bearing in mind the total carbon impacts of doing so, would make Government carbon targets for 2050 unattainable.[[17]](#footnote-17) Since the Government also seeks 1 million homes for the ‘Thames Gateway’ in SE Essex, NW Kent and London – also by 2050 – any acceptance of such a route to providing housing is in conflict with meeting Climate goals which need to be attained by 2030 for our common well-being. We note that Travel to Work Areas in the Arc show distinct patterns of travel to Cambridge, Milton Keynes and Oxford and no need for road infrastructure across the Arc. The City Council needs to decide whether it accepts the Arc ideas, or recognises the Climate Emergency. We do not, currently, have either the construction workers, or the HGV drivers, or the teachers and nurses, or the care workers, to contribute to creating and sustaining the grandiose Arc schemes. Nor does the ‘hostile environment’ towards refugees and migrant workers help. We urge that the City Council reject the Arc ideas on infrastructure and wild housing estimates in principle.

Concerning the Oxfordshire Plan 2050, much that is bad about it to date is open to similar critiques directed at the Oxford-Cambridge Arc. We do not accept the transport or emissions implications of housing and infrastructure growth suggested for Oxfordshire. Oxford City Council would have more Council Tax income from making best use of the built environment in Oxford for meeting very low-cost housing demand, rather than pushing off responsibility towards other local authorities. Given the current state of Council finances and reserves, such an approach is much to be recommended. Full use of the edges of car parks, public and private, and building above or over car parks, could add considerably to the very low-cost housing in Oxford which is the major social need not met by building market housing or the sale of such housing to private landlords.

It is questionable that the new 3 party County administration will want to repeat the mistakes of its predecessor, so the opportunity to stop unsustainable development should be taken by the City Council.

**Q8 In your opinion have we correctly summarised the issues and priorities?**

No, there is a lack of a sense of urgency in this section. Some examples:

Covid 19 has taken thousands of lives in the UK and placed intolerable burdens on the NHS. The existing burden of excessive housing costs promotes loss of NHS staff from the City. It is therefore a priority to provide keyworker and other very low-cost housing for NHS workers in order to maintain our hospitals and GP practices, without delay and in cooperation with the NHS. The City must buy more homes through its associated housing company to achieve progress, stopping further purchase of commercial development to do so.

There is no sense of urgency in the response/references to the Climate and ecological emergencies in Council documentation. We need action now to cut emissions.

Schemes to provide air source heat pumps to replace gas heating and to create access to solid wall insulation would be welcome but need to be developed on a large enough scale to tackle the Climate burden of Oxford’s built environment, ideally by 2030. Perhaps some of the partnership efforts of the City Council will contribute to this, but the LGA should be pressing for more council funds e.g. Adding additional layers of council tax at the top of the scale and permitting local authorities to retain all business rates they collect. The ecological emergency requires a wholly different approach to planning, and probably the recruitment of new local government officers to upgrade the City’s capacity to engage in environmental protection and enforcement.

With regard to social priorities, clause 3.1.4, Oxford is an expensive place to live with an existing tier of impoverished households. This year, such households include 11,000 people likely to be hit by the planned cut to Universal Credit[[18]](#footnote-18), all those at risk of eviction if private landlords pursue this option offered by Government relaxation of pandemic conditions, all those being paid below a Living Wage as the current minimum wage is derisory, all those who will lose jobs at the end of furlough in September, etc.

The existence of vacancies in areas like the hospitality sector or in care work does not mean people will necessarily choose these low paid areas of work. There is no simple connection between the level of unemployment and whether people can find work acceptable to them.[[19]](#footnote-19) The City Council, in cooperation with other statutory bodies, charities and campaigning groups needs to plan to resist the further impoverishment of the poorest. We cannot see how this is being attempted at present.

With regard to environmental priorities, clause 3.14, neither green infrastructure nor biodiversity is wholly protected from bad planning decisions. Flood risk protection that does not include fully maintained SUDs does not seem to be urgent appropriate action to us. A Zero carbon City needs early cuts in emissions from the built environment and transport. Failure to act on this in the past suggests cuts in UK emissions of 10-14% are needed each year to 2030, if not more. We cannot see determined political leadership that will protect our future, and future generations, at present.

With regard to economic priorities, clause 3.1.14, no mention is made of a Green New Deal or the lead offered by a number of initiatives to expand the Green economy and its employment.[[20]](#footnote-20) We want to see more higher paid employment for a wide variety of skilled groups in Oxford, although this will be blocked unless far more very low-cost housing is made available.

We are concerned by suggestions of spreading activity between day and night. Night work is known to cause stress and psychological problems.[[21]](#footnote-21) The City Council should commit itself to campaign for reducing the number of night shift jobs in Oxford, as a contribution to health and well-being.

**Q9 It is important for us to understand what the community see as the priorities for the city up to 2040. What three issues do you consider to be priorities?**

1. The Climate Emergency and achieving a carbon neutral City no later than 2030, with Net Zero Carbon and Carbon Negative status as soon as possible and certainly before 2040. This includes a Low Traffic City, Electronic Road Pricing and efforts to achieve trial roll outs of air source heat pumps to radically cut gas use for domestic/non-domestic heating;
2. The Ecological Emergency, incorporating protecting and enhancing the natural environment without offsetting, biodiversity and its restoration, peatlands protection and restoration, greenfield site absolute protection, and also how our food supplies are localised, made organic and sold more often through farmers and artisan markets in Oxford;
3. Very low-cost housing to be increased as a proportion of homes on Oxford year on year: Council housing and keyworker part-rent, part buy homes; more secure moorings for vessels on our waterways; more support for housing cooperatives, co-housing and housing association acquisition of property. Zoning of private and public car parks for homes around, above surface level and in some cases right over car parks to better use this space. Zoning of longest disused plots in industrial estates/science parks for very low-cost housing. Major employers to be encouraged to increase on site accommodation for key low income personnel e.g. care home sites for care workers; for nurses; for early career lecturers etc.

**Q10 In your opinion have we suggested an appropriate vision and themes for the new Local Plan? Yes/No (if no, what have we missed?)**

See comments on all questions, especially Q9. More generally, there is little sense of urgency throughout the Issues Paper or the supporting documents we have examined. The City Council has missed that spending money on additional commercial development and Park and Rides are non-priorities. Very low-cost housing acquisition gives the Council long-term housing income; a national trial of Electronic Road Pricing for the Oxford City Region could add to funds for reducing bus fares, more electric buses, achieving a Low Traffic City through supporting Active Travel and repairing pavements and roads. With regard to the private sector, the formation of new enterprises is obstructed by issues of access to capital for start-ups and high rents, amongst other factors including – now – skills shortages. In general, we believe that the City should emphasise the formation of workers cooperatives to reduce the individual financial contribution to new business formation. This may be assisted by reference to the best local authorities for cooperative development. We note the number of food related cooperatives in the top 10 cooperatives by turnover.[[22]](#footnote-22) There are about 400 cooperatives in the UK.[[23]](#footnote-23) There are a variety of options for cooperative formation.[[24]](#footnote-24) This can include worker takeover of existing businesses.

**Q11 In your opinion have we selected the right objectives for the new Local Plan?**

Concerning 3.2.2. – 3.2.4, we cannot judge the six themes listed without action plans, projected funding, timescales and how the concerns we have expressed in our answer to question 9 are respected throughout the practical delivery of these themes. We are, bluntly, not interested in ‘public relations’ versions of what might be done.

**Q12 It is important for us to understand which objectives the community feels we should focus on for the city up to 2040. What 3 objectives do you consider to be most important?**

See our answer to Question 9.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

1. See: <https://inews.co.uk/news/environment/traffic-car-communte-london-up-30-per-cent-since-before-covid-pandemic-929784> & <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-06-02/u-k-road-traffic-tops-pre-covid-levels-as-reopening-accelerates> & <https://news.siemens.co.uk/news/traffic-surpasses-pre-pandemic-levels-in-scotland> & <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-wales-56283514> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <https://aboutmanchester.co.uk/traffic-higher-than-pre-pandemic-levels-and-its-due-to-home-deliveries/> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Taxation options not taken include: Land Value Taxation to replace council tax; salt and sugar taxation; increasing alcohol, cigarettes and fuel duties; raising the highest levels of income tax; introducing a financial transaction tax for the UK and its overseas dependent territories. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. UK teacher shortages: See: <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/teachers-leaving-job-tory-neglect-b1852446.html> & note that secondary school pupils will increase by 15% by 2027: <https://teachertapp.co.uk/teacher-shortages-why-teachers-more-in-demand-than-others/> & <https://www.tes.com/news/european-teachers-awarded-qts-down-35> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. <https://www.nursingtimes.net/clinical-archive/healthcare-it/the-uk-nursing-crisis-2021-and-beyond-28-04-2021/> And is still at least 6000 short of GPs. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. <https://www.nurses.co.uk/blog/stats-and-facts-uk-nursing-social-care-and-healthcare-2021/> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. <https://chmonline.co.uk/care-staff-shortages-expected-to-reach-100000-in-2021/> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. See: <https://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/england-smallest-homes-europe-canada-largest-hong-kong-smallest-world-find-me-floor-a7597636.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. In the case of Steve Dawe, in a wide variety of interdisciplinary social science courses including UK public policy, European Studies, Development Studies and Environmental Policy. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. ppV-VI, IPCC, 2018: Global Warming of 1.5°C.An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change, sustainable development, and efforts to eradicate poverty [Masson-Delmotte, V., P. Zhai, H.-O. Pörtner, D. Roberts, J. Skea, P.R.Shukla, A.Pirani, W. Moufouma-Okia, C. Péan, R. Pidcock, S. Connors, J.B.R. Matthews, Y. Chen, X. Zhou, M.I. Gomis, E. Lonnoy, T. Maycock, M.Tignor, and T. Waterfield (eds.)]. In Press. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. See: <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/jul/20/emissions-record-high-by-2023-if-green-recovery-fails-says-iea?fbclid=IwAR3EwTfPoPWt4PmNC95K_keY1ifiSD0xKZPXLll7mt9SI7tgN0Tg5_7xl-4> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. See: <https://www.nature.com/news/polopoly_fs/1.10373!/menu/main/topColumns/topLeftColumn/pdf/484007a.pdf> & <https://friendsoftheearth.uk/climate/does-carbon-offsetting-work> & <https://www.vox.com/2020/2/27/20994118/carbon-offset-climate-change-net-zero-neutral-emissions> & <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-08-15/why-carbon-offsets-don-t-do-all-that-they-promise-quicktake> [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. See CPRE Oxfordshire and Need No Greed Coalition materials on this topic. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. ‘Best available technology not entailing excessive cost.’ Assuming new technologies will come available to correct past mistakes under-estimates the time it takes for many technologies to be scaled up. Solar panels on Apollo space craft in the 1960s have yet to produce solar PV throughout the built environment in the UK in 2021. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. It should be noted that the Friends of Lye Valley have lodged a proposal for a Special Planning Guidance for the Lye Valley water catchment with the City Council and are awaiting a decision at present. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. See the Stop the Arc Group website at <https://www.noexpressway.org/> [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Confidential advice from a consultant. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Oxford Mail, 22nd July 2021. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. During the Thatcher years, with 28 alterations to how unemployment was counted and a probable real peak unemployment of 4 million, it took the combination of the Community Programme for the long-term unemployed based in local authorities and un-capping of University places to begin to significantly cut unemployment. Unemployment declined very slowly into the Blair period of Government. Observations based on direct involvement: Steve Dawe, Assistant Community Programme Manager, Canterbury City Council 1984-1985. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. We refer to initiatives like the One Million Climate Jobs proposals of the Campaign Against Climate Change; reports from the Zero Carbon Britain group, the New Economics Foundation [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. See: <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20171208-what-working-through-the-dead-of-night-does-to-your-body> & <https://www.apa.org/monitor/2011/01/night-work> & <http://blog.policy.manchester.ac.uk/posts/2020/07/addressing-the-health-impacts-of-night-shift-work/> [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. <https://www.edinburghbicycle.com/blog/top-uk-co-ops-list> [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. <https://www.mutualinterest.coop/2021/03/why-has-the-number-of-worker-co-ops-increased-20-fold-in-the-uk-since-1970> [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. <https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/practical-guidance-counci-a3f.pdf> & <https://neweconomics.org/uploads/files/co-ops-unleashed.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-24)