

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

CABINET

Record of decisions taken at the meeting of the **Cabinet** held
via video conferencing on **Wednesday 23 September, 2020** at 2.00pm.

PRESENT

Councillors: James Mills (Leader); Toby Morris (Deputy Leader); Jeff Haine, David Harvey, Norman MacRae MBE and Michele Mead.

Also in Attendance: Councillors Alaa Al-Yousuf, Richard Bishop, Jill Bull, Julian Cooper, Suzi Coul, Merilyn Davies, Harry Eaglestone, Duncan Enright, Hilary Fenton, Steve Good, Andy Graham, Gill Hill, Liz Leffman, Dan Levy, Martin McBride, Elizabeth Poskitt, Alex Postan and Carl Rylett.

Officers: Giles Hughes (Chief Executive); Elizabeth Griffiths (Chief Finance Officer); Frank Wilson (Executive Director, Finance); Chris Hargraves (Planning Policy Manager); Claire Hughes (Business Manager Corporate Responsibility); Keith Butler (Head of Democratic Services) and Amy Bridgewater-Carnall (Senior Strategic Support Officer).

37. NOTICE OF DECISIONS

RESOLVED: That the record of the decisions taken at the meeting held on Wednesday 26 August 2020, copies of which had been circulated, be approved and signed as a correct record.

38. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Rosa Bolger and Ted Fenton.

39. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest from Members or Officers relating to matters to be considered at the meeting.

40. PARTICIPATION OF THE PUBLIC

No submissions were received from the public in accordance with the Council's Rules of Procedure.

41. RECEIPT OF ANNOUNCEMENTS

41.1 Growth Board Update

Councillor Mills advised that he had attended the Oxfordshire Growth Board as a representative of the Council and next week he would attend the Oxfordshire LEP.

41.2 West Oxfordshire Business Awards

Councillor Morris advised that this event would be held via a virtual ceremony at 2pm this Friday 25 September, in contrast to the previously arranged gala dinner. He encouraged Members to watch and celebrate West Oxfordshire Business' by visiting the WOBA website. Thank you to WOBA team for their work over the last ten years for promoting business and entrepreneurship in the District.

The Leader reiterated the Councils' support for the WOBA's.

41.3 National Recycling Week

Councillor MacRae took the opportunity to remind everyone of the three 'R's' of waste 'Reduce, Re-use, Recycle' message and he paid tribute to the collection rews who had worked tremendously hard over the past six months. Councillor MacRae reported the very low 'missed collection' rates which were all below 1% for the month of August.

41.4 Track and Trace App

Councillor MacRae advised that posters displaying the QR codes for the Track and Trace App would be displayed in all pubs by the end of the week. He paid tribute to Ruth Levett and her team in Environmental Health for their hard work and reminded Members to report any instances via the 861000 telephone number or the website.

Councillor Graham raised a concern regarding the QR code information, as he felt that many residents would not be carrying or did not have the mobile technology to operate the App. In response, Councillor MacRae advised that he would find out and respond outside of the meeting.

41.5 CCTV

Councillor MacRae explained that a report would be submitted to Cabinet towards the end of the year. In addition, a deployable camera had been placed on The Leas – this was a wireless, mobile camera that operated via 4G and it was hoped that further technology of this type would be included in the forthcoming report.

42. FLOOD DEFENCE WORK FRAMEWORK OF CONTRACTORS

The Cabinet received and considered the report of the Principal Engineer, which provided validation of a completed procurement exercise to renew the shared flood defence work contractors' framework.

The original flood defence contractors framework ceased in 2019, at the same time that a procurement exercise was concluded to identify a list of the preferred contractors for the renewal of the framework. To ensure transparency and avoid any risk of challenge it was decided that the new framework required validation by Cabinet before being implemented.

The report explained that the framework consisted of five LOTS and all LOTS had attracted companies that met procurement requirements:

LOT 1 – Reactive work of any description requiring a 2 hour response to any site across the districts.

LOT 2 – Reactive work across any of the districts that requires a response within 48 hours.

LOT 3 – Planned works in the public highway or footway.

LOT 4 – Planned works in third party land.

LOT 5 – Technical consultant, including commenting on planning applications with regard to drainage and flood risk.

Section 2 of the report detailed the companies allocated to their respective LOTS and all companies stated had met the specifications set out by the Public Procurement Team, with several having previously completed flood defence works across the districts to a satisfactory standard.

An alternative option was that the Council could choose to source a contractor as and when required, however, this could cause delays in the delivery of work and may increase costs due to the potential of inflated 'call out' charges.

The Portfolio Holder for the Environment, Councillor MacRae introduced the report and explained that the system needed to be in place to allow the Council to respond promptly to issues of flooding. He therefore proposed the recommendations as laid out.

This was seconded by Councillor Harvey who felt this was a sensible proposal and a step in the right direction.

DECISION: That the renewal of the framework LOTS be approved, in accordance with the report.

REASONS: To assist with the delivery of a transparent procurement exercise, which would ensure value for money as well as ensuring only quality approved contractors were commissioned.

OPTIONS: The Council could choose to source contractors as and when required.

43. EQUALITY POLICY

The Cabinet received and considered the report of the Business Manager Corporate Responsibility, which provided detail on the legal obligations under the Equality Act 2010 and how we the organisation could comply as it continued to work in partnership. Adoption of an Equality Policy was a good foundation to facilitate this and the updated version was attached as Annex A to the report.

The Equality Act came into force in October 2010 and imposed a duty on public authorities. The duty required all public bodies and private bodies that delivered a public function, to consider the needs of protected groups when designing and delivering services. It ensured that public bodies considered the needs of all individuals in their day to day work, in shaping policy, in delivering services and in relation to their own employees.

The Equality Duty was also supported by specific duties, set out in regulations which came into force on 10 September 2011. The specific duties required public bodies to publish relevant, proportionate information demonstrating their compliance with the Equality Duty; and to set themselves specific, measurable equality objectives.

The report explained that the policy covered both the Council and Publica and provided a comprehensive overview and action plan (attached as Annex B to the report), needed to cover both the service provider and employer elements. As such the policy sought to clarify Publica and the Council's responsibilities in relation to the general Equality duty and the specific duty. In particular, the report signposted members to Publica's position on 'dignity in the workplace' and this was included at Annex C of the report.

In order to comply with legal obligations, a number of practices had been introduced or emphasised in the Policy, including the use of equality impact assessments which it stated should be used to inform decision making at all levels.

Cabinet was also advised that the proposed policy and action plan had been considered by the Economic and Social Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 17 September, and the Committee was supportive of their approval.

Councillor Morris introduced the report and reminded Members that the Council had a legal and moral duty to ensure the equality policy was in place. He also highlighted the impact

assessments to be used moving forwards the non-legally binding working definition of antisemitism which had been adopted and incorporated into the Policy and the gender pay gap data would be published by Publica in due course. Councillor Morris proposed the recommendations as laid out.

Councillor Mead seconded the recommendations and thanked the officers involved in maintaining and improving the Policy.

Councillor Graham thanked officers and queried how Equalities training would be delivered to Councillors moving forwards. He felt that ongoing training was necessary and should not be restricted to an induction session. Councillor Mills agreed that the training should be ongoing and was a sensible amendment to make.

Councillor Enright endorsed Councillor Graham's suggestion and welcomed the areas that dealt with reaching out to diverse groups.

As proposer of the recommendation, Councillor Morris advised that Member training was being looked at and would be rolled out later this year.

DECISIONS: That the Equality Policy 2020-2024 and the Action Plan, attached at Annexes A and B to the report, be approved.

REASONS: To ensure that all services delivered by the Council were delivered to the highest standard alongside helping residents, businesses and communities access the support they need to achieve their ambitions.

OPTIONS: Cabinet could choose not to implement the Policy but in doing so could put the Council at risk.

44. FINANCIAL AND SERVICE PERFORMANCE REPORT 2020-21 QUARTER ONE AND BUDGET REFORECAST

The Cabinet received and considered the report of the Chief Executive, which provided details of the Council's operational and financial performance at the end of 2020-21 Q1, and enabled Councillors to assess financial and operational performance.

Each quarter, the Council monitored its progress towards achieving its aim and priorities, service delivery and financial performance.

The report advised that the Finance team had undergone a reforecasting exercise which involved in-depth discussion and review of the current position and future forecast by all of the Publica Business Managers. The emphasis on the revenue budget was to identify areas of expenditure that could be saved, boost income where possible but also to create a more realistic estimate of the Council's final position this financial year.

A comparison of the Q1 budget to actuals and a revised 20/21 budget forecast was provided, by service, in Annex A to the report along with a table showing which Earmarked Reserves had been released. The service areas most heavily impacted were summarised at section 2.6 of the report, followed by an update on areas of the Council that had seen recovery through or had found savings to cover any shortfall.

Annex B to the report detailed the Capital spend in Quarter 1 with additional 19/20 slippage requests. It was explained in section 3.4 of the report that due to large capital spend in previous years, the Council would need to finance the year's capital work through external borrowing.

The Council Priorities Report for April 2020 to June 2020 was provided at Annex C to the report and reminded Members that during Q1, the Council's main priority was responding to the Covid-19 pandemic. However, progress had been made on the actions in the plan and full details were included in the annex.

With regard to the Service Performance Report, section 6 of the report highlighted that a significant number of staff had been redeployed when the nation went into lockdown in March 2020. Overall many services had performed well with no visible reduction in quality or standard and full details were in the Performance Indicator report, attached at Annex D to the report.

Councillor Morris introduced the report and thanked officers for the new style and layout which it was hoped was clearer for Members to navigate. He reiterated the points in the report relating to the Council's response to Covid-19 and thanked all staff involved in the response and recovery phases. He assured Members that all budget lines had been revised by Business Managers but reminded the meeting that there was still a lot of uncertainty around and a second lockdown would have serious implications. He encouraged Members to attend the All Member workshop on the Covid-19 Recovery programme.

With regard to the Performance report, Councillor Morris outlined the new key performance indicators which had been refreshed and categorised by scrutiny committee and he congratulated the Chairman of Environment Overview and Scrutiny on the 'amber' status of the Committee's indicators.

This was seconded by the Leader, Councillor Mills who highlighted section 2.7 of the report and the service areas which were showing signs of recovery. He thanked officers to providing the newly styled service performance and council priority reports. Councillor Mills concluded by reiterating his gratitude to all staff for their dedication during the Covid-19 response and signposted Members to section 4.6 of the report which gave a brief outline of the significant impact felt across the Council.

Councillor Postan commended the use of graphic images in the report which were much easier to understand and requested the process be extended to other departments.

DECISIONS:

- (a) That the 2020-21 Quarter One financial and service performance be noted; and
- (b) That Council be recommended to approve additional Capital Slippage from budget year 2019/20 in the amount of £843,108.

REASONS: To ensure the Council is operating in line with its' priorities, including Climate Action, Healthy Towns and Villages, Strong Local Communities, Meeting the Housing Needs of our Changing Population and ensuring Modern Council Services and Sustainable Finance.

OPTIONS: None appropriate.

45. WOODSTOCK INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY STRATEGY

The Cabinet received the report of the Planning Policy Manager, which asked them to consider whether or not Officers should proceed with the preparation of a Woodstock Infrastructure Delivery Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

The report reminded Members that a large number of new homes were planned at Woodstock including 300 units to the south-east of the town, 120 units at Hill Rise and 180 units to the north of Banbury Road.

Such level of growth required careful consideration in terms of future infrastructure requirements and, in support of the Local Plan 2031, a District-wide Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) was prepared to identify what infrastructure would be needed to support this.

In February 2019 the Blenheim Estate and Woodstock Town Council commissioned Community First Oxfordshire (CFO) to consult the community about the current and future infrastructure needs of the Town. As a result of the consultation there were a number of key local priorities identified and these were listed at section 1.8 of the report.

Following extensive consultation during 2019, the findings of the CFO work were launched at community events held in November 2019.

In light of the extensive community engagement carried out by CFO on behalf of Blenheim and the Town Council, in a subsequent update of its LDS in December 2019, the Council stated that it would seek to prepare a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in the form of a Woodstock Infrastructure Delivery Strategy and this was included in the Council's current LDS published in May 2020.

Given the extensive nature of the consultation carried out by CFO and in order to avoid duplicating effort, Officers had hoped to be able to effectively 'formalise' the CFO report by publishing and adopting it as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

However, it has become clear through recent discussions with the Blenheim Estate that they do not consider the CFO work can or should be given SPD status and that instead, it should remain in its current form and be used to feed into future discussions and negotiations on potential developer contributions as the two remaining Woodstock allocations come forward.

The report therefore outlined two options for Members to consider, along with the reasons behind each option and any potential risks associated with it.

The first option was to update the West Oxfordshire IDP to reflect the findings of the CFO work, as well as discussions with relevant infrastructure providers and statutory bodies including Oxfordshire County Council, OCCG, public transport providers, Thames Water etc.

The second option was to prepare a new SPD dealing with the issue of infrastructure provision at Woodstock. This would effectively be a similar exercise undertaken by CFO in 2019, inviting views from the local community about what they consider to be the main infrastructure needs of the Town to support future growth.

The report concluded with the officers preferred option and an explanation as to why this was the recommended way forward.

Councillor Haine introduced the report and gave an overview of the number of homes likely to be built in the area. He referred to the report produced by Community First Oxfordshire and explained how the results of the consultation had shaped the key local priorities identified at section 1.8 of the report. Councillor Haine therefore proposed that recommendation a) in the report be adopted, in line with officer recommendation.

This was seconded by Councillor MacRae.

In response to a question from Councillor Cooper, Councillor Haine stated that the report did not state that the Blenheim Estate thought the IDP was deficient but did not consider that it should be given SPD status.

Councillor Poskitt supported the claims that the residents of Woodstock would not welcome another questionnaire and felt that results were needed now. She described Woodstock as a

seaside town, with the Blenheim Estate being the coastal line with Woodstock. As a result, development was moving further away from the periphery. Councillor Poskitt requested that a piece of land to the centre of Woodstock, under joint ownership, be discussed as to its future use.

Councillor Haine confirmed that he would look at the land in question and get back to Councillor Poskitt. In response to a question from Councillor Graham, Councillor Haine confirmed that, if agreed at the meeting, option a) would be progressed over the next couple of months.

In response to comments made regarding the parking review, Councillor MacRae reiterated the reasons for the delay in this work which included the redeployment of staff in response to Covid-19 and the consequences of Mayor's decision to distribute the questionnaire in a hard copy rather than electronically.

DECISION: That a minor addendum to the West Oxfordshire Local Development Scheme (LDS) be published to confirm that the District Council no longer proposes to prepare a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on the topic of infrastructure provision at Woodstock.

REASONS: No reasons were detailed in the report.

OPTIONS: Cabinet could choose the alternative option detailed in the report.

46. GOVERNMENT WHITE PAPER "PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE"

The Cabinet received and considered the report of the Planning Policy Manager, which provided a brief overview of the Government's White Paper: Planning for the Future and outlined a potential Council response.

The White Paper set out a number of significant changes which were intended to streamline and modernise the planning system, improve outcomes on design and sustainability, reform developer contributions and ensure that more land was available for development where it was needed.

It also covered a number of issues including plan-making, development management, development contributions and other related policy proposals and was the subject of a 12 week public consultation which would close on 29 October 2020. The White Paper was split into three main pillars which included 22 specific proposals. These were covered in detail in section 2 of the report.

Annex A to the report contained a draft Council response to the White Paper, structured around the proposals and specific consultation questions contained therein. Officers had noted that whilst the proposals had some merit, they also raised a number of significant concerns and these had been separated to correspond to the relevant pillar.

Members noted that the Development Control Committee had considered the report at its meeting on 21 September, and its views would be incorporated into the response, along with any amendments from this meeting.

Prior to the Cabinet meeting a summary of the comments made by the Development Control Committee was circulated to Members. It was noted that a wide range of issues had been discussed and it was suggested that the Council's response to the White Paper should be accompanied by a more general covering letter, summarising the District Council's primary concerns with the proposals including a number of issues detailed in the summary.

The Development Control Committee suggested that the covering letter should be sent to Robert Courts MP and the Local Government Association (LGA) together with the Council's response. In addition a number of typographical errors had been identified and would be corrected prior to submission.

Councillor Haine introduced the report and noted his disappointment at the changes which resulted in local councillors being omitted from the planning process. He stated that the proposed response had been supported by the Development Control Committee and he thanked Mr Hargraves for responding to Members' queries quickly.

Councillor Haine explained that any minor amendments proposed at the meeting, or at the previously held Development Control Committee, would be agreed in consultation with the Planning Policy Manager and himself as Portfolio Holder, prior to the final version being published. He therefore, proposed the recommendation as laid out subject to the inclusion of the comments made by the Development Control Committee.

This was seconded by Councillor Mead who thanked officers for their input and stated that the White Paper was not a 'fit for all'.

Councillor Postan referred to the paper as the most significant change in the last six years and he reiterated the Development Control Committee's support. He felt that the proposals in the White Paper would be harmful and unwelcome and government should be looking at more stringent control, not less. Councillor Postan concluded by highlighting the importance of building more affordable homes and he thanked Mr Hargraves for his work on this.

Members agreed that the proposed response was supported and they shared the concerns of local residents regarding future developments, with particular concerns raised about the use of permitted development rights.

It was hoped that the Government would listen to the responses received. Councillor Mills described that the Planning System should be 'local and accountable' and what was set out would diminish this. He felt that the planning process benefitted hugely from community engagement and raised a number of concerns on the impact this paper would have on the planning system.

Having read the report, and having considered the comments made by the Development Control committee, Cabinet agreed that the recommendations be approved.

DECISION: That the content of the report be noted, and the proposed response to the White Paper attached at Annex A to the report be approved, subject to the inclusion of the comments made by the Development Control Committee and the grammatical amendments highlighted.

REASONS: No reasons were detailed in the report.

OPTIONS: The report and response set out the reasoning for the proposed comments, however, Cabinet could add to or vary those comments.

47. GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION "CHANGES TO THE CURRENT PLANNING SYSTEM"

The Cabinet received and considered the report of the Planning Policy Manager, which asked Members to agree a response to the Government's consultation on changes to the current planning system.

The Government had recently published a consultation paper which focused on four main topics of the planning system: the standard method for assessing housing need, delivering first

homes (the Government's latest form of affordable home ownership), raising the small sites threshold for affordable housing provision and extending the current system of 'permission in principle' to larger developments.

Each of the four topics was summarised in section 2 of the report along with the overall view of Officers. Members noted that the summary should be read in conjunction with the suggested consultation response.

The public consultation was due to run for eight weeks and would close on 1 October 2020. Officers had compiled a draft Council response to the consultation structured around the proposals and specific consultation questions contained therein and this was attached as Annex A to the report.

Members noted that the Development Control Committee had considered the report at its meeting on 21 September, and its views would be incorporated into the response, along with any amendments from this meeting.

Prior to the Cabinet meeting a summary of the comments made by the Development Control Committee was circulated to Members.

With specific regard to the proposed standard housing method, the Committee had suggested that the District Council's response should be augmented to emphasise the importance of taking into account the future impacts of COVID-19 on housing need. For example, in relation to new travel patterns and increased home-working, as well as highlighting more strongly the significant regional and local differences in housing need that were generated by the standard method including the potential impact this could have on adjoining local authorities.

Councillor Haine outlined the report and proposed the response as detailed at Annex A to the report. He explained that any minor amendments proposed at the meeting, or at the previously held Development Control Committee, would be agreed in consultation with the Planning Policy Manager and himself as Portfolio Holder, prior to the final version being published. He therefore, proposed the recommendation as laid out subject to the inclusion of the comments made by the Development Control Committee.

This was seconded by Councillor Harvey who agreed that this was a robust and measured response.

Councillor Postan raised a number of queries including the idea that incentives could be offered by lenders to those people wanting to buy carbon zero homes. In response, Councillor Harvey advised that the Wessex Building Society had a scheme to lend finances on favourable rates to those wanting to purchase carbon zero homes.

Councillor Mills raised a concern on Question 18, which considered appropriate levels for small sites threshold. He felt that having a set target enabled developers to circumnavigate the system by building just below the threshold of units required. He reiterated that central led targets did not work.

Having read the report, and having considered the comments made by the Development Control committee, Cabinet agreed that the recommendations be approved.

DECISION: That the content of the report be noted, and the proposed response to the consultation attached at Annex A to the report be approved, subject to the inclusion of the comments made by the Development Control Committee.

REASONS: No reasons were detailed in the report.

OPTIONS: The report and response set out the reasoning for the proposed comments, however, Cabinet could add to or vary those comments.

48. CONSULTATION BY ENGLAND'S ECONOMIC HEARTLAND ON A DRAFT TRANSPORT STRATEGY

The Cabinet received and considered the report of the Planning Policy Manager, which asked Members to agree a response to the England's Economic Heartland (EEH) Draft Transport Strategy.

England's Economic Heartland (EEH) brought together the region's Local Transport Authorities in a strategic partnership that worked with the region's local enterprise partnerships to provide leadership on strategic infrastructure.

It was a strategic partnership of political and business leaders, stretching from Swindon to Cambridgeshire and from Northamptonshire to Hertfordshire and included Oxfordshire County Council.

The area covered by EEH was detailed in a map included at section 1.2 of the report. Members noted that the area included the Oxford-Cambridge Arc which had been recognised as a national priority by Government.

EEH was the sub-national transport body for the region and a draft transport strategy had been prepared which aimed to set out a bold new approach to connectivity, enabling the region's transport system to support a green recovery from COVID-19 and sustain economic growth in the future, while reaching net zero carbon emissions no later than 2050.

The draft strategy had been published for public consultation, due to end at midnight on 6 October 2020. The strategy included a number of measures which were listed in detail at section 1.5 of the report and a brief overview of the strategy was provided in the report.

Officers had produced a draft response to the consultation, attached at Annex A to the report, and Members were asked to agree this as the Council's formal submission. The report highlighted that Oxfordshire County Council were proposing to submit a response to the consultation and there would also be a collective response dealing with strategic matters submitted through the Oxfordshire Growth Board.

Members noted that the Development Control Committee had considered the report at its meeting on 21 September, and its views would be incorporated into response, along with any amendments from this meeting.

Prior to the Cabinet meeting a summary of the comments made by the Development Control Committee was circulated to Members.

As a general observation, the Committee had suggested that the Council's draft response be augmented to ensure that greater recognition was given to the importance of personal transport in rural areas where public transport was often very limited, and the role of autonomous vehicles in creating additional capacity on existing roads should also be given stronger emphasis.

More specifically in relation to the importance of key corridors, it was suggested that the Council's draft response be amended to include reference to the importance of Carterton along the A40 corridor.

Councillor Haine introduced the report and felt that whilst it was a good report in principle, there was 'no meat on the bones'. He agreed with the officers' approach to the strategy and

proposed the recommendation as laid out. He explained that any minor amendments proposed at the meeting, or at the previously held Development Control Committee, would be agreed in consultation with the Planning Policy Manager and himself as Portfolio Holder, prior to the final version being published. He therefore, proposed the recommendation as laid out subject to the inclusion of the comments made by the Development Control Committee.

This was seconded by the Leader, Councillor Mills who highlighted the work that was ongoing with Council partners. He made reference to the transport infrastructure and in particular the emphasis on improving the railway network. He requested that any reference in the response to the Cotswold Line should be amended to read 'North Cotswold Line'.

Councillor Leffman agreed with the Leader's comments and felt that emphasis should be given to the areas to the West of Oxford. She highlighted the problems raised by the railway line still being single track beyond Hanborough, which she hoped could be mentioned in the response. She also felt that the comments made by Councillor Crossland at the Development Control Committee with regard to Carterton and its links to Swindon should be included.

In contrast, Councillor Postan reiterated the importance of the motor car to those living in rural areas and was passionate that infrastructure should be planned for the future and not to suit yesterday.

Councillor Graham felt that the digital infrastructure should be supported as it was a cleaner and more efficient process. He commended the use of pilots to trial different projects and raised concerns regarding the level of freight traffic on the roads, which damaged the roads and put cyclists at risk.

Councillor Levy supported the comments made by Councillor Graham and felt the report would be improved with the mention of rural bus services and their importance to the villages in West Oxfordshire. In response, Councillor Mills agreed with the importance of the issue but felt this would be better put forward to the Oxfordshire Local Transport and Connectivity Plan in order to get the appropriate attention it deserved.

Councillor Mills advised that there was work going on via the North Cotswold Line Taskforce and Oxfordshire County Council was the lead for the Oxfordshire section of that. In addition, a working party had been set up for the Hanborough Station which the Council had been invited to be part of.

Having read the report, and having considered the comments made by the Development Control Committee, and the amendments proposed at the meeting Cabinet agreed that the recommendations be approved.

DECISION: That the content of the report be noted, and the proposed response to the draft strategy attached at Annex A to the report be approved, subject to the inclusion of the comments made by the Development Control Committee.

REASONS: No reasons were detailed in the report.

OPTIONS: The report and response set out the reasoning for the proposed comments, however, Cabinet could add to or vary those comments.

The meeting closed at 3.17 pm

Leader of the Council