

## WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the Economic and Social Overview & Scrutiny Committee held in Committee Room I, Council Offices, Woodgreen, Witney, at 6.30pm on Thursday 23 November 2017

### PRESENT

Councillors: P J Handley (Chairman), Mrs E H N Fenton (Vice-Chairman), M A Barrett, A C Beaney, Mrs L C Carter, J C Cooper H B Eaglestone, P D Kelland, G Saul and C J A Virgin

Also in Attendance: Mrs J C Baker and Mr P Emery

#### 47. MINUTES

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 28 September 2017 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

#### 48. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs L E C Little and T N Owen and from Mr T J Morris

#### 49. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

#### 50. UNIVERSAL CREDIT

The Committee received a presentation from Mr Jon Wood, Partnership Manager for Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Milton Keynes, Job Centre Plus, on the operation of Universal Credit. A copy of his presentation is attached to the original copy of these minutes as Appendix A.

Members noted that Universal Credit, which was a fully digitised system accessed on line only, was to become fully operational in West Oxfordshire the following week.

Mr Wood advised that there had been some amendments to the scheme announced in the Budget earlier in the week with regard to the claim and assessment period and arrangements for advanced payments for those in need.

The Business Services Manager, Revenues and Benefits advised that the Council had been working with the Department for Work and Pensions to prepare for the introduction of Universal Credit for the past year. ICT systems had been installed at the Council's offices at Elmfield and at the Town Centre Shop to enable residents to access the system.

In addition, Client Support Officers had been employed to assist people in making claims, job searches and budgeting. Information on the new arrangements had been sent to all local councils and made available on the Council's website. Customer Services staff had also received training to enable them to assist claimants and information had been provided to Members.

Mr Handley noted that some residents would have difficulty in accessing a fully digitised system and enquired whether assistance offered by the Council would be limited. In response, the Business Services Manager confirmed that Officers would continue to offer support to individual residents for as long as it was required. She advised that the Client Support Officers would also be able to carry out outreach work throughout the District, visiting to assist those unable to gain access to the system by other means.

Mr Handley expressed concern that this work represented an additional cost to the Council that should more properly be met by the DWP. The Business Services Manager advised that the Council received grant funding for the work from the DWP.

Mr Kelland asked whether alternative payment arrangements could be made if the claimant had difficulties in managing their finances. Mr Wood advised that it was possible to establish managed payments to a landlord and Councils or Registered Social Landlords could make such requests. However a landlord would have to seek recovery of any arrears from their tenant directly. The Business Services Manager advised that this had also been true of Housing Benefit as the contract was between the landlord and tenant, not the Council or the DWP. In general, direct payment arrangements would not be applied unless there were eight weeks arrears and Mr Wood advised that managed payments would only be applied if there was a reason.

Mr Handley expressed concern that the new system would make private landlords even less willing to rent to those receiving benefits.

Mr Cooper was concerned that those in need could be unable to access a digitised system for a variety of reasons including illiteracy and questioned whether Housing Associations had suffered a loss of income that could impact upon their ability to deliver their capital programmes. The Business Services Manager noted that the new scheme had yet to go live in West Oxfordshire and advised that Housing Associations would have direct contact with the DWP. Cottsway Housing had already carried out a lot of preparatory work to encourage tenants to get their rent accounts in credit and, whilst Oxford City Council had experienced difficulties as a pilot for the new arrangements, a lot had been learnt from their experience.

Mr Cooper indicated that the Council needed to be mindful of these issues as time went on. The Executive Director (Commissioning) advised that regular liaison meetings took place and that the Council worked together with Cottsway to identify and assist the most vulnerable. The position would be kept under review and, if problems were to arise, Members would be kept informed. Mr Cooper noted that there were other RSL's operating within the District.

Mrs Carter asked how many claims were expected to be received and, given the current number of Housing Benefit claims, the Business Services Manager estimated that around 22 new claims could be anticipated each month.

Mrs Carter also enquired whether the new arrangements enabled sanctions to be applied. Mr Wood confirmed that this was the case and that sanctions were more severe than in the past. Mrs Carter considered the scheme to be uncivilised as it had the greatest impact upon the most vulnerable in society. The introduction of a fully digitised scheme made false assumptions about universal access to information technology.

In response, Mr Wood advised that, in addition to the range of assistance available, the DWP had a flexible support fund that enabled equipment to be provided to those in real need. He acknowledged that Universal Credit asked more of the individual than the previous benefits regime but stressed that this was Government Policy. Mrs Carter suggested that the outcome would be detrimental to the community.

Mr Saul asked how long a claimant would have to respond to a message before sanctions were applied. Mr Wood indicated that the DWP had to give a week's notice of an appointment by text or email.

Mrs Carter sought clarification of the sanctions available and Mr Wood explained that, should an appointment be missed, benefits would be suspended until contact was made and an additional financial sanction would also be applied.

Mr Beaney asked whether any IT facilities were to be made available by the Council in Chipping Norton. In response, the Business Services Manager undertook to follow up the installation of an access point at the Guildhall in addition to the role played by the Client Support Officers.

Mr Handley expressed his disquiet over the new arrangements which he believed could be simplified. He noted that, in those areas that had piloted Universal Credit, use of foodbanks had increased by some 50% to 80%. Whilst he recognised the underlying intent was to encourage people back into the workplace, he was concerned that the new arrangements could penalise those who had difficulties in engaging with the system.

Mr Handley acknowledged that the DWP faced a difficult task in implementing the Government's wishes and thanked Mr Wood for his contribution to the meeting.

## 51. PARTICIPATION OF THE PUBLIC

In accordance with the Council's Rules of Procedure, Mrs Brenda Churchill, Mr Mark Churchill, Miss Jane Southworth and Ms Yvonne De Burgo addressed the meeting with regard to agenda item No. 8 (Committee Work Programme - Deer Park Medical Centre)

A copy of the submissions made by Mrs Churchill, Mr Churchill and Miss Southworth are attached to the original copy of these minutes as Appendix B to the original copy of these minutes. In her statement, which contained information of a personal nature, Ms De Burgo outlined her concerns over the adequacy of the treatment she had received since registering at an alternative practice following the closure of the Deer Park Medical Centre and the deterioration of her health conditions.

Mr Handley thanked those members of the public for their contribution to the meeting. He indicated that, whilst the Council had endeavoured to support the retention of the practice, regrettably, it had now closed and it was difficult to see what further action the Council could now take to reverse that position.

Mr Handley expressed concern that the local press continued to suggest that the practice was no longer financially viable as the renewal of the contract had been tendered at a lower figure than had been provided in the past.

Mr Cooper suggested that the representatives of the Clinical Commissioning Group present should be requested to provide a rebuttal of the charges levied against it by the public speakers.

47. MEETING WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF THE OXFORDSHIRE CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP AND SOUTH CENTRAL AMBULANCE SERVICE TRUST.

Ms Diane Hedges, Chief Operating Officer and Deputy Chief Executive and Ms Ally Green, Head of Communications & Engagement of the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group, attended the meeting to discuss current engagement in Witney and West Oxfordshire addressing sustainability in primary care.

The Committee received a presentation from Ms Hedges, a copy of which is attached to the original copy of these minutes as Appendix C. In response to the concerns raised by members of the public, Ms Hedges acknowledged that the issues raised were real but emphasised that the country was facing a crisis in primary care as it was becoming increasingly difficult to recruit General Practitioners. Whilst the situation in West Oxfordshire was difficult, Ms Hedges advised that the position was far worse elsewhere and GPs were discussing how to manage an increasing workload. In West Oxfordshire, 43% of GP's were over 55 and there was a need for appropriate succession planning.

With regard to the Deer Park Practice, Ms Hedges advised that the contract had been offered at a level above the national contract rate and had not attracted any interest. She indicated that the percentage of expenditure on primary care was lower than on the more costly specialisms dealt with at the major hospitals. Ms Hedges acknowledged the need for ongoing continuity in primary care but indicated that the management of complex conditions contrasted with the increased demand for same day access. Small practices found it increasingly difficult to remain sustainable and had great difficulty in recruitment.

Ms Hedges stressed that the CCG had gone out to tender for the Deer Park practice on a national basis in good faith with the expectation that a contract would be let. However, only one provider had come forward showing that a 6,000 patient practice was not an attractive proposition.

Mr Handley asked Ms Hedges to confirm that the contract had been offered at a price below that previously enjoyed. In response, Ms Hedges reiterated that, whilst the original contract might have been more favourable, the tender had been based above the national contract rate and had failed to give rise to any interest.

Mr Beaney enquired why Chipping Norton and Woodstock were not featured in the West Oxfordshire locality and Ms Hedges explained that the Health Authority's boundaries were not co-terminus with the Council's administrative boundary and that these areas fell within the North Oxfordshire Locality Group.

Mr Handley noted that funding levels were dependent upon patient numbers. Mrs Baker advised that discussions had taken place with a representative of the OCCG with regard to the possibility of bringing the northern practices within the West Oxfordshire region.

Ms Green advised that NHS boundaries were difficult to draw as they were related to patient preferences and the boundaries of different practices often overlapped. GP's in Chipping Norton considered patient flows which were generally directed towards the Horton Hospital rather than the John Radcliffe.

Ms Hedges indicated that the CCG expected to be told imminently who would be appointed as the independent person as required by the Independent Reconfiguration Panel's report. The CCG had to ensure that resources were applied evenly across Oxfordshire and was developing a plan for the provision of primary care and related services in Witney and the surrounding area. It was intended that the plan would be completed within a six month period and a draft would be available for public consultation in December.

(Mr Barrett left the meeting at this juncture)

Ms Hedges acknowledged the pressure on services resulting from housing growth and indicated that this could be met by either providing new facilities or strengthening existing practices. The Locality Group which was comprised of clinicians had indicated that the best way forward would be to consolidate existing practices.

Mr Kelland indicated that the expansion of the Eynsham practice appeared to have worked well and questioned how expansion would be funded. In response, Ms Hedges advised that capital funding was limited. The CCG had submitted a bid for some £50million but had received only £2million. However, the CCG could also use revenue funding to pay rents and was able to make short term grants. The CCG was working with local practices to explore ways in which services could be provided in the future within the current constraints.

There would be a need for some 30 new GP's to meet future requirements; 20 to replace existing doctors nearing retirement with a further 10 to address increased demand. Given the difficulty in recruitment, there was a need to create a wider skills mix within practices.

Mr Handley questioned whether sufficient funding would be available to meet future needs. Ms Hedges advised that, in relative terms, the provision of GP facilities did not represent a high cost; the CCG could never have as much funding as it wished. In consequence, there was a need to be creative in how existing premises were developed and Ms Hedges gave the example of freeing up space by digitising patient notes.

Mr Handley questioned how this would help without additional staff and expressed concern that, by caring for patients at home, the NHS was placing an additional financial burden on council social services. In response, Ms Hedges advised that patients recovered better at home and that the NHS met the cost of any necessary council services.

Mr Beaney agreed that patients found it preferable to be cared for at home and recognised the benefits of digitising patient records. He liked the concept of joined up thinking and expressed the hope that the relevant parts of the North Oxfordshire Locality Group could be brought within West Oxfordshire's boundaries. He noted that the relocation of the Wychwood practice had been a success and questioned whether developer funding secured by local councils through section 106 agreements could be used to support the development of GP practices.

Mr Beaney sought clarification of the current shortfall in GP numbers and Ms Hedges undertook to provide this information. Mrs Carter indicated that North Oxfordshire was some 28% under staffed at present.

Given that patients from Woodstock were referred to the Horton hospital, Mr Cooper questioned the CCG's decisions on the range of services at the Horton and bed based services. The introduction of a midwife led unit at the Horton had given rise to concerns that patients with more complex needs would have to be transferred to the John Radcliffe and the reduction in the level of critical care was also a worry for local residents. Ms Hedges advised that the decision to concentrate stroke care at the John Radcliffe had been a clinical one as this was the location at which the best care could be provided. The decision to confirm the permanent closure of the 110 beds had been made in order to deliver the ambulatory care model and increase planned care for outpatients. In response to the concerns regarding the closure of the Deer Park Surgery, Ms Hedges advised that the CCG's proposals would be published on 6 December and that matters would move on from there.

Mrs Carter expressed her sympathy with the NHS given its current funding position and suggested that additional funding was required. However, she expressed her concern over the CCG's engagement process which she felt had been rather paternalistic, aimed solely at providing information. Local residents wished to be a part of the process and, following the recent round table events, did not feel that they were being listened to. In response, Ms Hedges advised that the CCG had acted in good faith in organising the meetings.

Ms Green acknowledged that feelings were running high and that the CCG staff present understood this. They had been placed at each table to facilitate discussion and to record the key points that arose. The feedback sessions at the conclusion of the meetings had been intended as a summary, not as a comprehensive report of the discussion that had taken place. All the issues raised should have been recorded and feedback from the sessions would be made public. At that stage there would be an opportunity to raise any concerns over the accuracy or completeness of these reports. Members of the public would be able to say if their contributions had not been recognised in the way that they would have wished. The feedback reports would also explain any changes that had been made following the consultation process or, if suggested changes had not been adopted, why not.

Ms Green explained that people had been requested to register to attend the meetings so that the CCG could provide the right number of staff to facilitate discussion. In some cases, additional public turnout had left the organisers stretched. The venue for the meeting in Witney had been changed to accommodate additional capacity and Ms Green reiterated that the CCG had been trying to do the right thing and was acting in good faith. It had no wish to turn people away from meetings.

Mr Beaney questioned whether the meetings had been properly recorded and asked how the CCG was seeking to consult with hard to reach groups. Ms Green indicated that, whilst the feedback given at the meetings had been in summary form, the CCG staff present had taken detailed records of the discussions that had taken place. These would be considered and a report produced and Ms Green invited Members to contact her if they felt that the views expressed had not been adequately recorded. She went on to confirm that a group of staff had been specifically tasked to work with disadvantaged and difficult to reach groups.

Mr Beaney also enquired how the discrepancies in boundaries could be addressed. In response, Ms Hedges advised that the CCG could request the practices to align with the Council's administrative boundary but, given that the question had arisen in the past, she did not expect that they would be prepared to do so. However, she acknowledged that it was important for the CCG to recognise that their boundaries were not co terminus with the Council's and provide information accordingly.

Mrs Carter highlighted the incongruity of GP's referring patients to north Oxfordshire when services were being consolidated at the John Radcliffe. She suggested that the lack of adequate Government funding was an underlying factor in the difficulties currently faced by the health service.

The Executive Director (Commissioning) reminded Members that a workshop was to be held on Monday 27 November and suggested that it would be helpful if information regarding all West Oxfordshire practices was available. Mrs Baker expressed the hope that Members would endeavour to attend. She advised that the consultation meeting she had attended had been well run and indicated that she would be keen to receive the report to see if the suggestions made were brought forward.

In conclusion, Ms Hedges acknowledged the workforce challenges facing the authority and the importance of identifying ways in which these could be addressed. Mrs Bakes stressed that representatives of the CCG should meet with the Council's Planning Officers to help identify future needs.

Mr Handley thanked Ms Hedges and Ms Green for their contribution and, on behalf of the Committee expressed his appreciation of the work carried out by the NHS.

Mr Richard McDonald, Director of Operations, and Maria Langler, Head of Planning at South Central Ambulance Service Trust, were also in attendance to respond to Members' questions.

Mr McDonald made reference to the information provided prior to the meeting and, in particular, to the new Ambulance Response Standards now in operation. He explained that performance was now assessed on both a 90<sup>th</sup> percentile and a mean basis hence occasional long waiting times would be reflected in performance data and the Trust could no longer concentrate on services in urban areas. Category I calls were now assessed on both time taken for a first response and the ability to transfer patients to hospital.

The new standards also gave more time to triage calls. Category I calls required a response within 30 seconds whilst the remainder required a response within 240 seconds. The new standards had come into effect from 31 October and initial indications had been positive with response times by SCAS being the best in the country. As the new arrangements developed, the trust would change its vehicle and staffing profile in order to increase efficiency.

Mr Handley noted that the Fire Service had responded to some 1,700 calls and that SCAS had spent some £17 million on private ambulance services in the previous year. He also indicated that the Fire Service had been recovering the deceased on behalf of the Trust.

In response, Mr McDonald made it clear that the Fire Service had bid for that particular role whilst SCAS had not. The cost of the service was met by the NHS. Whilst the Fire Service had been responding on behalf of SCAS under previous arrangements, they had been paid to do so. A response by the Fire Service was now no longer counted under the new standards. With regard to the use of private ambulance services, Mr McDonald indicated that the service would prefer to spend that money on its own staff. However, there were difficulties in terms of its workforce. The training process now required three years of study to degree standard and bursaries were no longer available.

Ms Langler indicated that there had been a change within the health service and the value of staff within the ambulance service now received better recognition and there was greater integration within the health service. The use of private service providers was often cited as an issue but those employed by SCAS were used as exemplars for all in the trust. The reality was that private providers would continue to be used and the important thing was to ensure that they provided a good service. Private contractors were treated in the same way as those directly employed by the trust and if their performance was not satisfactory their contracts would be terminated.

The revised qualification arrangements and the introduction of a three year course meant that there had been no newly qualified paramedics for a year. The trust had started a programme to develop its own staff three years ago and some 60 new paramedics were due to qualify to go towards this shortfall.

Whilst the use of private contractors represented a significant financial burden, the way in which the trust utilised and managed their services was second to none and it was essential that a good working relationship was maintained.

In addition, the trust continued to look at ways in which it could develop its own personnel and establish more innovative ways of working. The profile of the workforce had changed with a greater proportion of female employees than in the relatively recent past and it was important for the trust to recognise their requirements through initiatives such as self-rostering.

By providing the non-emergency 111 service, the trust was now able to integrate the 111 and 999 services, allowing them to work together with clinicians to deliver the most appropriate outcomes.

There was no doubt that the service faced difficulties but the trust was prepared to address these. From a planning point of view there were challenges but the trust remained confident that it would be able to meet demand.

Mr Kelland suggested that the triage process could be considered over-complex and delay a response. Mr McDonald advised that it was necessary to ensure that an appropriate response was made.

Mr Beaney expressed his thanks and appreciation of the service provided by the trust and was pleased to see the 111 and 999 services operating together. He enquired whether employees and contractors were paid at the same rates. In response, Ms Langler advised that, whilst there were pay differentials, these were offset by the additional benefits available to NHS employees.



Mr McDonald advised that, prior to the trust taking on the service in September, the III service had simply performed a signposting function. However, it was now operated as a collaborative III integrated urgent care service, referring some 30% of calls to clinicians. It was hoped to increase this to 50% in future so as to ease the burden on primary care services.

Mr Beaney asked whether the trust was subject to time wasting calls. It was explained that there was a level of inappropriate calls and publicity campaigns were in operation in an effort to address these. However, it was important to ensure that those in genuine need were not dissuaded from seeking assistance.

Mr Handley thanked Mr McDonald and Ms Langler for their contribution to the meeting and on behalf of the Committee expressed his appreciation of the work carried out by the trust.

52. ORDER OF BUSINESS

Having regard to the remaining volume of business, the Committee **AGREED** to deal with those items of business for which Officers were present as a matter of priority.

53. CARTERTON LEISURE CENTRE – PHASE 2

The Committee received and considered the report of the Head of Leisure and Communities regarding the design and schedule of accommodation for Carterton Leisure Centre Phase 2.

Mr Beaney enquired whether Members who would be involved in the determination of any future planning application should take part in consideration of the report.

It was explained that the report currently before Members was not seeking approval of the detailed design and that, provided Members considered any future application with an open mind, there was nothing to preclude their participation in consideration of the report.

The Head of Leisure and Communities introduced the report and, in response to a question from Mr Handley, confirmed that the layout envisaged the provision of two cafes in the centre. In response to a question from Mr Beaney, she advised that GLL were the project contractors as the provision of phase 2 of the leisure centre had been an integral part of the procurement process for the leisure management contract. Each tenderer had been required to submit their proposals and these had been assessed as part of the scoring matrix.

Mr Beaney also enquired whether additional parking provision would be included and it was confirmed that additional spaces would be provided to the rear of the building. He also sought clarification of the composition of the project liaison group and questioned whether consultation to date had been adequate.

It was confirmed that, whilst GLL was represented on the project liaison group, it was primarily composed of Members and Officers of the Council and explained that the facilities indicated had been proposed by GLL as part of the tender process as being capable of generating a financial return.

In response to questions from Mr Kelland, it was indicated that the proposed trampoline park could be re-purposed for alternative use in the future and confirmed that exhaustive risk assessments would be carried out regarding its use.

Mr Handley noted that the project would be the subject of further public consultation.

**RESOLVED:** That the Cabinet be recommended to approve the design and schedule of accommodation as set out in the report and to authorise the submission of a planning application.

#### 54. LOCAL PLAN MONITORING REPORT

The Committee received and considered the report of the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing, together with the Council's Local Plan Monitoring Report for 2016 – 2017.

The Planning Policy and Implementation Officer introduced the report and outlined the key areas of information contained therein.

Mr Cooper made reference to paragraph 5.8 of the report and, in particular to the developments planned for the land east of Woodstock and the land west of Shilton Road, Burford and enquired whether the views of the Local Plan Inspector would be taken into account with regard to these sites. It was indicated that these applications had already received consent and were not before the Inspector.

Mr Cooper asked whether the cumulative impact of the developments referred to in paragraph E22 at page 5 of the report would be taken into account in the Local Plan process.

Having regard to the number of households in need of accommodation, Mr Cooper expressed his support for the alternative affordable housing model devised in conjunction with the Blenheim Estate. He requested a breakdown of the section 106 contributions totalled at page 20 and enquired whether the RAF quarters were included in the information regarding affordable housing at page 29.

The Planning Policy and Implementation Officer undertook to respond to these questions as appropriate.

Mr Beaney thanked Officers for the comprehensive report and asked about progress on the Shipton-Under-Wychwood and Milton-Under-Wychwood Neighbourhood Plans. The Planning Policy and Implementation Officer agreed to make enquiries and reply directly.

Mr Kelland questioned whether the plan proposed alternative sites to the Eynsham Garden Village and it was explained that, whilst the sustainability appraisal update had been asked to look at reasonable alternatives to the Eynsham site to enable comparative assessments, no applications had been submitted. The monitoring report related to past events, not future proposals.

Mr Cooper informed Members that the Cabinet's decision on the further suggested changes to the West Oxfordshire Local Plan had been the subject of a Call-in request.

**RESOLVED:** That the content of the Local Plan monitoring report be noted.

55. DURATION OF MEETINGS

In accordance with Paragraph 9 of the Council Procedure Rules and the meeting having lasted for three hours it was:-

**RESOLVED:** That, in order to deal with the following item of business, the meeting shall continue.

56. BUDGET – 2018 – 2019

The Committee received and considered the report of the Group Manager Go Shared Services, copies of which had been circulated, setting out the initial draft base budgets for 2018/19, draft fees and charges for 2018/19 and the latest Capital Programme for 2017/18 revised and future years.

The Finance Manager introduced the report and outlined the financial pressures facing the Council. He noted that it was proposed to recommend a £5.00 increase in Council Tax at Band D and the use of £154,000 from General Funds to support the budget.

Mr Handley thanked Officers for their report and enquired whether the Council had purchased or leased the new refuse collection vehicle fleet. The Finance Manager confirmed that the vehicles had been purchased outright as it was financially advantageous to do so.

Mr Cooper indicated that he remained to be convinced that a £5.00 increase in Council Tax would be necessary and questioned whether financial provision should be included within the Capital Programme to fund the provision of additional car parking in Woodstock.

In response to a question from Mr Beaney, the Finance Manager advised that it was estimated that the total cost of phase 2 of the Carterton Leisure Centre project would be in the region of £6.9 million. In response to a further question, he advised that the capital charges referred to at paragraph 10.2 were notional charges to reflect the cost of investment.

Mr Saul enquired whether the ERS project with regard to Houses in Multiple Occupation reflected an increase in number or changes in legislation. The Finance Manager indicated that he believed this reflected legislative changes but would check and confirm.

*(Post Committee Note: Officers can confirm that the project regarding Houses in Multiple Occupation was required as a consequence of legislative changes).*

In response to a question from Mr Handley, the Finance Manager confirmed that the Council maintained reserves to address any unforeseen expenditure.

**RESOLVED:** That the current budget proposals be endorsed.

57. REMAINING ITEMS OF BUSINESS

In view of the fact that a special meeting of the Committee would be required to consider the Call-in request submitted in respect of the Cabinet's decision on the further suggested changes to the West Oxfordshire Local Plan prior to the Cabinet meeting to be held on 13 December it was:-

**RESOLVED:** That consideration of the remaining items of business be deferred at a special meeting at a time and date to be fixed by the Chairman.

The meeting closed at 9:50pm

Chairman