

## WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **Economic and Social Overview & Scrutiny Committee**  
held in Committee Room 1, Council Offices, Woodgreen, Witney,  
at 6.30pm on **Thursday 19 September 2019**

### PRESENT

Councillors: Andrew Beaney (Chairman), Laetisia Carter (Vice-Chairman), Jake Acock, Joy Aitman, Luci Ashbourne, Jill Bull, Suzi Coul, Harry Eaglestone, Hilary Fenton, Andy Graham, Nick Leverton, Carl Rylett and Ben Woodruff

### Also in Attendance

Councillor Mike Cahill

### Officers in Attendance

Christine Gore, Caroline Clissold, Dene Robson and Paul Cracknell

### 25. MINUTES

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 4 July 2019 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### 26. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

Councillor Martin McBride attended for Councillor Jane Doughty and Councillor Ben Woodruff attended for Councillor Neil Owen.

Apologies for absence were received from Val Messenger, the Director of Public Health, who was to have been present for agenda item No. 6 (Oxfordshire Health Care Transformation Programme) but who had been unable to get to the meeting.

There were no other apologies for absence or temporary appointments.

### 27. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

### 28. PARTICIPATION OF THE PUBLIC

There were no submissions from members of the public in accordance with the Council's Rules of Procedure.

### 29. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were none.

### 30. POLICING PRIORITIES IN WEST OXFORDSHIRE

The Committee received a verbal presentation from Superintendent Mark Johns and Chief Inspector John Batty regarding policing priorities for the area.

A summary of the presentation outlining the areas addressed is attached as an appendix to the original copy of these minutes.

In response to a question from Councillor McBride, Inspector Johns advised that, of the 812 reports of missing children, some were repeat occurrences and all had been recovered safely.

Councillor McBride asked whether online fraud was on the increase and Inspector Johns advised that this was not recorded locally. In addition, many cases went unreported. He explained that crimes of this nature were recorded centrally; some were assigned to the Economic Crime Unit or the National Fraud Investigation Unit whilst others were referred to local areas. 15 cases in West Oxfordshire had been referred to the local force area. Crimes of this nature were difficult to investigate as they were generally instigated overseas.

In response to a question from Councillor Eaglestone, Inspector Johns advised that the recently announced recruitment drive would potentially see an additional 600 officers employed across the Thames Valley. He explained that the recruitment process was going to change. At present, officers undertook a 15 week period of initial training before going on patrol under supervision, becoming fully qualified constables after two years. In future, the principal means of entry would be through a three year apprenticeship and, whilst the initial 15 week training programme would remain, recruits would receive ongoing training throughout the apprenticeship period.

Councillor Acock questioned whether plans were in place to respond to a no deal Brexit. Inspector Johns advised that, although the situation remained fluid, planning was taking place at force level headed by a Chief Superintendent. Significant preparation had been put in place although some potential impacts remained uncertain. It was important to prepare as much as possible and to identify potential resource requirements and risks.

Councillor Graham asked whether there was any strategy to transfer resources between forces should the need arise before, during or after Brexit took place. Chief Inspector Batty advised that officers held weekly meetings and that, whilst the impact in the Thames Valley was expected to be low, it was anticipated that other areas would face greater challenges and he expected that there would be a requirement to provide mutual aid.

Councillor Rylett welcomed the emphasis placed upon dealing with 'County lines' and advised that this had led to a marked improvement in Eynsham. However, he questioned whether this had simply pushed the problem elsewhere. Inspector Johns stressed that there was always a concern over displacing criminal activity. Consequently, the Area CID teams worked closely together and with other forces to address such issues. Whilst the challenge increased over greater areas, the intention was not to displace criminal activity but to deal with it.

Councillor Rylett then asked whether the Police could offer an assurance that they would send follow up letters to drivers found speeding by community speed watch groups. Inspector Johns confirmed that the Police would send letters and visit where they could do so but explained that this would only be possible if certain Home Office approved devices had been employed. The use of radar style guns could not be supported as these fell outside insurance arrangements and there had been complaints about their use.

Councillor Rylett went on to make enquiries regarding waiting times and abandoned calls for the 101 non-emergency phone line. Inspector Johns acknowledged that response times had been poor during the previous year and advised that the position had now improved. However, there had been a 12% increase in overall call volume (including 999 calls) and it was necessary for call handlers to prioritise the latter. Increased training had been provided and Inspector Johns advised that the target response times for 101 and 999 calls had been set at an average of three minutes and eight seconds, respectively. Currently, there was an abandonment rate of 20% for 101 calls which compared favourably with last year's 40%. Many calls were abandoned after one minute.

From April to August 153,311 999 calls had been received, together with 320,717 101 calls. The average waiting time for 101 calls to be answered had been 2.9 minutes which again compared favourably to last year's 4.5 minute average although Inspector Johns acknowledged that waiting times could vary at different times of the day.

Finally, Councillor Rylett returned to the question of online fraud and sought information on conviction rates. Inspector Johns advised that this was low with culprits being caught in only 1 in 50 cases. He explained that this was a multi-faceted crime that was dealt with by a number of different units. The principal concern in relation to fraud locally related to vulnerable groups such as the elderly and the Police worked in partnership with the banks who would inform them of any unusual large cash transactions. Online fraud was particularly difficult to address as it generally originated outside the UK. When asked how he would apply any additional resources, Inspector Johns indicated that he would direct this towards protecting vulnerable groups.

Councillor Coul asked whether there had been an increase in knife crime in the area as she felt it to be an issue in Carterton schools. She also asked if rural isolation was a factor in domestic abuse and whether the reported number of incidents included multiple calls from singular individuals. Inspector Johns advised that the Police were working with schools to discourage carrying of knives. The actual number of crimes committed involving the use of a knife was low but it was important to work with schools as preventative work was preferable and easier. Thames Valley Police had recently gained access to Central Government 'surge funding' directed towards tackling serious knife violence and was looking to use half of this to create a multi-agency task force to work together to address identified hotspots. The other half was to be used to provide some high visibility policing and produce some publicity material.

Turning to the question of domestic violence, Inspector Johns agreed that rural isolation presented a barrier to reporting a crime and that there was a perception that it was more difficult to access services in rural areas. He advised that a number of reports came from the same individuals and advised that repeat calls were used to form a risk assessment.

Councillor Ashbourne suggested that there was a perception that instances of vandalism and anti-social behaviour were on the increase in Witney and asked whether this was grounded in fact so as to reassure local residents. She also asked whether Inspector Johns would support the provision of additional CCTV. In response, Inspector Johns advised that he would always support the provision of CCTV provided that there was the funding and logistical support available for it. He indicated that there had been some increase in instances of anti-social behaviour in certain areas and that, when this was reported, it would be dealt with. However, there was often an unfounded element of perception surrounding groups of young people.

Councillor Leverton advised that there had been a recent increase in anti-social behaviour in Carterton and Inspector Johns advised that there was often a spike in such activities during the school holiday periods. Councillor Leverton noted that some years appeared to be worse than others and Inspector Johns advised that the Police would address such issues when identified.

Councillor Leverton went on to raise concern over a recent spate of door to door rogue traders operating in the town and questioned whether there was any way to preclude such activity. Inspector Stephen Hookham, who was also present at the meeting, advised that the best way to deal with such activity was through the development of community resilience.

Recently, the Neighbourhood Watch scheme in Chipping Norton had dealt successfully with a similar problem in the town and the Police worked closely with Trading Standards to tackle such issues. Similarly, the partnership with local banks helped to protect the elderly and vulnerable. Inspector Hookham advised residents to call the Police if they experienced such problems as they could act as a deterrent. However, he recognised that perpetrators tended to arrive in large numbers and swamp a town when targeting an area with crime of this nature.

In response to questions raised by Councillor Graham regarding crimes against the LGBTQ+ community, Inspector Johns advised that there had been a slight fall in reported hate crime with 33 instances recorded in West Oxfordshire from April to September this year against 35 during the comparable period the previous year. These covered a spread of offences, many of which were low level, involving neighbour disputes or actions by children. Inspector Johns advised that a meeting took place each morning at which reported crimes were reviewed and consideration given to victim support and care and how to deal with the alleged offender.

Inspector Johns advised that all officers received diversity training as part of their induction training and this was reinforced by specific training days throughout their service. He indicated that it was his intention to review training arrangements going forward. Further, a designated officer was employed to reinforce the message.

Councillor Graham suggested that the data may be skewed as there was reluctance amongst the LGBTQ+ community to come forward and a perception that their complaints would not be dealt with. He considered that there was a need for confidence building. Inspector Johns confirmed that the police were happy to work with anyone to make inroads around such concerns and invited Members to put forward any suggestions.

Councillor Woodruff advised that he had received a scam telephone call but had not reported it. He asked whether it was worthwhile to report such calls and questioned whether anything could be done. Inspector Johns advised that such calls were randomly directed but that it was always worthwhile to report a crime as, without such information, the police would be unaware that it was going on. He acknowledged that resourcing was tight and accepted that it would be very difficult to deal with for the reasons previously stated. In response to a request from Members, Inspector Johns confirmed that he would be happy to provide advice for inclusion in parish newsletters and magazines.

Councillor Coul asked whether there was any advice on dealing with abuse and threats against politicians.

Inspector Johns urged Members to remain mindful of their personal safety and their online presence, taking care to separate their private and public material and apply appropriate privacy settings. It was important to seek to deescalate potentially volatile situations and to report any concerns to the Police.

Councillor Carter asked whether the question of child sexual exploitation was still on the agenda. Inspector Johns confirmed that this issue remained a priority but has become embedded in everyday Police work. Officers were mindful of the potential when addressing issues such as missing children, county lines and the night time economy.

Councillor Carter also asked whether any of the surge funding provided to respond to serious knife violence could be used to address issues surrounding domestic violence. Inspector Johns advised that this was not possible as the funds had been made available to deal specifically with violence in public places.

The Chairman thanked Inspector Johns and his colleagues for their attendance at the meeting and for the information that they had provided.

31. ORDER OF BUSINESS

For the convenience of Officers present, the Chairman advised that he intended to take Agenda item Nos. 10 and 9 (Temporary Accommodation Placement Policy and Draft Council Plan 2019-2023) as the next items of business.

32. TEMPORARY ACCOMMODATION PLACEMENT POLICY

The Committee received and considered the report of the Group Manager, Residents' Services which invited Members to make comment on the implementation of the Temporary Accommodation Placement Policy.

The Housing Manager, Caroline Clissold, introduced the report and explained that the Policy was intended to provide guidance to both service users and Officers. There was a shortage of suitable affordable temporary accommodation within the District and Officers were seeking to secure additional provision.

Councillor Graham asked how the Council intended to address the issue of availability and the Housing Manager advised that Officers were looking to draw up protocols with Registered Social Landlords as a key priority.

Councillor Leverton suggested that, if cost was to be a relevant consideration, there was a need for proper robust guidelines. Both he and Councillor Carter expressed concern over the use of temporary accommodation outside the District. Christine Gore, the Executive Director – Commissioning, advised that the Cabinet was aware of these issues and that proposals would come forward in due course.

Councillor Ashbourne indicated that discretionary Housing Payments were the key to addressing debt resulting from a benefit cap. The Housing Manager advised that the Council had recently recruited two Officers whose role was the prevention of homelessness by offering debt management and other financial advice and by referring clients to other agencies that could assist.

Councillor Ashbourne asked whether local social landlords were aware of this service and pro-active in putting tenants in touch. The Housing Manager confirmed that this was the case and advised that Officers would be seeking to strengthen the existing relationships.

Councillor Graham asked how big a problem the lack of suitable temporary accommodation was and what strategy was in place to address it. The Housing Manager advised that, as most were focussed on the tourist trade, there was only one bed and breakfast provider within West Oxfordshire prepared to take Council clients. The Travelodge represented the only current viable alternative although discussions were underway with Cottsway Housing regarding the possibility of utilising some of their hard to let properties for families. Councillor Graham did not feel that the Travelodge was an appropriate environment and, at £65,000 per annum, the cost of the current arrangements was significant. He urged Officers to identify a more suitable, cost effective alternative.

Councillor Acock asked where high priority cases were placed and how many 16/17 year olds had been in bed and breakfast accommodation for an extended period. He also questioned the use of accommodation in Bristol. The Housing Manager advised that the property in Bristol had been used as it offered self-contained accommodation, the only other option being the Travelodge.

Temporary accommodation was only used until the Council was able to provide some other form of accommodation from other sources and the number of persons placed in temporary accommodation was low.

Councillor Coul noted that the Policy stated that there was no obligation on the Council to allow customers to view interim or longer term temporary accommodation before accepting an offer. The Housing Manager advised that a formal offer was only made after the customer's individual circumstances had been assessed and the options discussed with them. However, it was necessary to have a procedure in place to reach a final conclusion. In response to a further question from Councillor Coul, the Housing Manager advised that it was rare for a customer to request a viewing although it would not be a problem if they did. In response to a question from Councillor Carter, the Housing Manager advised that the Council would not facilitate a viewing and it was for the customer to make their own arrangements.

Councillor Acock made reference to a case known to him where a client with mental health issues had been offered accommodation with a two month waiting period or the option of temporary accommodation in Bristol. Although she was not able to comment on the particular case, the Housing Manager advised that, in general, mental health grounds would be considered a legitimate reason to refuse an offer of accommodation. Whilst it was necessary for the Council to have the discretion to close a case if insufficient reasons were given for refusing an offer of accommodation, in practice, it would keep the case under review and would not close the door on anyone.

Councillor Beaney noted that customers would be liable for meeting the cost of temporary accommodation and expressed concern that this could lead to debt. The Housing Manager advised that these costs would be met through Housing Benefit.

Councillor Graham suggested that the Cabinet be recommended to revise the wording of paragraph 4.3 of the Policy by adding the following wording *and will give every assistance to support such customers*. The Housing Manager advised that this wording could be incorporated into the Policy.

Councillor Graham asked who would conduct the review referred to at Paragraph 4.8 of the Policy. The Housing Manager advised that she and the two new Officers previously mentioned would conduct such reviews and that customers were advised of the process in their offer letter.

Councillor Coul suggested that health factors such as mental health issues and asthma could well be exacerbated by unsuitable accommodation and ought not to be considered likely to persist in any sort of accommodation. They should therefore be deleted from the relevant bullet point at paragraph 5.1. She also considered that attendance at local schools should be considered a legitimate reason to refuse an offer of temporary accommodation. The Housing Manager advised that, whilst this was an important factor, the availability of suitable temporary accommodation was so limited, that it was essential to prioritise. In addition, the Council had to ensure that the relevant support was in place and the Housing Manager agreed to incorporate this in the Policy.

Councillor Coul considered that access to local support links should be given a greater priority in order to maintain stability. The Housing Manager agreed that, in an ideal world this would be desirable. However, given the limited resources, the Policy reflected the reality of the situation and, whilst this was not ideal, Officers sought to limit the disruption resulting from re-location wherever possible by considering all other options first but could not say that this could always be achieved.

Councillor Acock suggested that a radius should be specified within the Policy and the Housing Manager advised that, whilst this had been considered, it was thought that to determine a radius would be too specific to deal with individual options.

Councillor Ashbourne suggested that there were wider social and economic barriers to be taken into account and made reference to a family re-located to Cheltenham whose children had needed a County Council bus pass to attend school in Witney.

In response to a question from Councillor Carter, the Housing Manager advised that the two new Officers would take up their positions at the end of October. One would replace the Families First Officer whilst the other would deal with those with complex needs.

Councillor Graham considered that the Council had a duty of care to inspect all temporary accommodation it used and to establish a benchmark standard and suggested that this be incorporated within the Policy. In response, the Housing Manager advised that all properties were inspected by either the Council's Houses in Multiple Occupation Officer or their equivalent for the relevant area.

Councillor Leverton considered that children ought not to be moved any distance when studying for exams. He felt that the Policy should contain more rigid guidelines and specify distances. The Housing Manager reiterated that this would make it more difficult to address individual requirements.

Councillor Carter suggested that the problem was not with the strategy but with the availability of suitable temporary accommodation; additional funding was required to address this. Councillor Bull agreed that more temporary accommodation was required and Councillor Beaney suggested that the need for more temporary accommodation throughout the District be emphasised to the Cabinet.

Councillor Coul considered that the two hour journey to work specified at Paragraph 5.1 of the report was not acceptable.

**RESOLVED:** That the comments set out above be conveyed to the Cabinet.

33. DRAFT COUNCIL PLAN 2019 – 2023

The Committee received and considered the report of the Business Manager – Insight and Intelligence which sought comment on the draft Council Plan 2019-2023.

Councillor Coul expressed her disappointment that the draft Plan failed to include specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time scaled objectives. Whilst she agreed with its emphasis, she felt that the content was not strong enough and that more robust, specific outcomes were required.

Councillor Beaney indicated that the key priorities did not match the Plan's vision and Councillor Acock questioned how the Plan would link to the Public Business Plan. In response, Christine Gore, the Executive Director – Commissioning, advised that the Council Plan addressed wider areas.

Councillor Coul felt that the six items in the Vision should reflect the Key Priorities.

Whilst endorsing the Plan's Vision, Councillor Rylett considered that it should incorporate a wider range of priorities. He believed that the priority of Climate Change and Ecological Emergency should incorporate measures such as improving sustainability, tackling pollution, improving resilience, encouraging the circular economy and creating well-connected ecological networks. Measures of success should include the provision of a higher proportion of housing constructed to environmental standards.

Councillor Beaney pointed towards the appointment of Councillor Harvey as Cabinet Member with responsibility for Climate Change.

Councillor Coul suggested that improvement to air quality should be added as a measure of success. Dene Robson, the Business Manager – Insight and Intelligence, explained that the current report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committees did not identify specific measures of success but was intended to set out the Council's priorities. There was a lot of work in the course of development in relation to those areas flagged as matters of concern but, as yet, this had not been fully developed. More clearly defined action plans would be developed. Councillor Coul maintained that the current document was too imprecise.

Councillor Graham indicated that he found some of the phraseology employed to be unclear. He felt that there was a danger that the Council's focus would be too introspective and believed that it should look outside as well as within West Oxfordshire. Councillor Graham considered that the measures of success should be more extensive and suggested that the establishment and increase of recycling centres should be included.

Councillor Coul suggested that the intention to make District Council services Carbon neutral by 2030 should extend to other areas such as its investments.

Councillor Leverton suggested that the environmental and ecological objectives related to the Garden Village should be extended to all developments.

Councillor Bull expressed concern that the measures of success did not identify the means by which they would be achieved. In response, the Business Manager – Insight and Intelligence advised that the Plan was a high level working document that would be supported by other more detailed work. Councillor Bull felt that it was inappropriate for the Cabinet to present a report with too many targets that did not show how they would be measured.

The Executive Director – Commissioning advised that the Cabinet had been keen to seek the views of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees and would welcome the observations Members made.

Given the extent of new and existing development, Councillor Acock questioned how the Council would improve congestion on the A40, suggesting that the reinstatement of a rail link from Witney to Oxford was a solution. The Business Manager – Insight and Intelligence, advised that work was ongoing in other areas in conjunction with other bodies. Councillor Acock suggested that this could perhaps be a way in which to measure success.

Councillor Ashbourne made reference to the health related issues identified in Annex 2 to the report and suggested that these should be included in the key priority of working towards healthier communities.

Councillor Coul felt that it was inappropriate to include reference to improvements to the Carterton Leisure Centre as this work had already been completed.

Councillor Rylett suggested that the measures of success should include improving health indicators. Councillor Beaney reminded Members that, whilst it undoubtedly had a part to play, not all such issues were under the Council's direct control and the Business Manager – Insight and Intelligence confirmed that the Authority would work with its partners to achieve this aim.



Councillor Ashbourne questioned whether the replacement of the Windrush Leisure Centre in Witney was a firm commitment. The Business Manager – Insight and Intelligence advised that this had been identified by the Council as a recognised objective and the Executive Director – Commissioning indicated that this formed part of the Council's leisure management contract.

Turning to the priority to maintain a vibrant economy, Councillor Graham emphasised the importance of maintaining the vitality and viability of town centres. He suggested that the Council should work with other districts to promote tourism and felt that, in view of the extent of planned and recent development, there was a need to review tourism, culture, arts and heritage.

Councillor Acock considered that more concrete measures of success were required. Councillor Coul felt that there was nothing to reflect the changing nature of the high street and suggested that the Council should support the change from traditional retail to a service based economy.

Whilst endorsing the objective, Councillor Leverton pointed out that there was no suitable land available in Carterton to accommodate commercial development.

With regard to developing stronger local communities, with reference to the development at Shilton Park, Councillor McBride questioned how the Council would seek to integrate new development with existing communities.

Councillor Ashbourne asked what was meant by multi agency working and made reference to asset based community development projects operating in Gloucestershire. The Business Manager – Insight and Intelligence advised that similar projects were under consideration in West Oxfordshire.

Councillor Coul considered that rural isolation and loneliness should be highlighted as a specific objective.

Councillor Graham found the proposals poor and believed that these were things that the Council should have been doing directly. He asked which partners promoted West Oxfordshire as a visitor destination and questioned the merit of the pilot project to promote local pubs. The Business Manager – Insight and Intelligence explained that the Cabinet was keen to build upon and strengthen existing relationships with local councils and wished to hold more Town and Parish Council Forum meetings. With regard to tourism, he advised that the destination management organisation promoted the local area and the intention was to connect with local projects. The pub walk project was an attempt to enhance the viability of local pubs.

Councillor Beaney considered this to be a good plan and Councillor Carter indicated that she did not share the negative opinions expressed by some Members of the Committee. She felt that it was good to be creative and welcomed the difference between the draft Plan and its predecessor document.

The Business Manager – Insight and Intelligence suggested that Members might be judging the Plan too early as it had only recently emerged and was to guide the Council's path over the next four years. The current draft was designed to offer Members the opportunity to engage in the Plan's development.

Councillor Rylett suggested that an additional priority to promote place making and community building in areas of new housing should be incorporated and questioned how it was intended to improve communication and engagement with town and parish councils.

The Business Manager – Insight and Intelligence reiterated that this was a high level document and that specific measures would come forward in the associated action plans.

In terms of meeting housing need, Councillor Coul reiterated the need for temporary accommodation within the District. Councillor Bull emphasised the need for more bungalows.

Councillor Graham considered that the provision of new pitches and plots to meet the needs of the travelling community should be identified as a key action as well as a measure of success and Councillor Acock suggested that this ought not to be restricted to fixed sites but also address the needs of those who travelled.

Councillor Carter stressed the need for more truly affordable housing.

With regard to the Council's Services and Finance, Councillor Acock considered maintaining a low level of Council Tax to be a political choice rather than a measure of success.

Councillor Ashbourne noted that, on occasion, there had been a significant underspend in previous years and suggested that there should be a commitment to spend to budget. Councillor Coul suggested that this could give rise to unnecessary expenditure and waste and the Executive Director – Commissioning advised that expenditure should be driven by the Council's Performance Indicators. The Business Manager – Insight and Intelligence indicated that original budgets could be underspent as a result of external funding being secured to support the Council's activities.

Councillor Graham considered that the Plan should include a caveat that the Council would not compromise its commitment towards green priorities and climate change and suggested that this be included at this point.

**RESOLVED:** That the comments set out above be conveyed to the Cabinet and Council.

#### 34. ORDER OF BUSINESS

In view of the lateness of the hour the Committee:-

**RESOLVED:** That consideration of Agenda Item Nos. 11 and 12 (Care Quality Commission Inspection Report – Oxford University Hospitals NHS Trust and Equality and Equal Opportunities) be deferred to the special meeting of the Committee to be held on 10 October 2019.

#### 35. COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2019/2020

The Committee received and considered the report of the Head of Democratic Services which gave an update on progress in relation to its Work Programme for 2019/2020.

##### 35.1 RAF Brize Norton

Dr Gore advised that a meeting of the Liaison Group was to take place the following week. Representatives of the Defence Infrastructure Organisation would be present and she undertook to advise Members should there be any significant update regarding the REEMA North site.

##### 35.2 Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme

Councillor Graham advised that the Working Group had met on 10 September and agreed its next actions. A further meeting was to be held within three months, following which the Group would report back to the Committee. It was **AGREED** that the notes of the last meeting would be circulated to all Members of the Committee.

### 35.3 Affordable Housing Seminars

Councillor Rylett asked if the question of affordable housing at the Oxfordshire Garden Village could be considered at the seminar to be held on 30 October.

It was explained that the seminar was one of a series of single issue events and, whilst the seminar on the 30<sup>th</sup> was to concentrate on the 'Blenheim Model' other issues such as the Garden Village could be addressed at a future event.

### 35.4 Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan 2018-2023

In response to a question from Councillor Graham, Members were advised that the composition of the AONB Board had changed following the elections in May and that its future proposals were uncertain. Officers would continue to monitor the situation and submit a report as necessary.

### 35.5 Domestic Violence

Councillor Carter advised that Members of the Committee had met with Officers to discuss issues relating to domestic violence and it was **AGREED** that a report on the actions taken as a result of that meeting be included within the Committee's Work Programme.

**RESOLVED:** That progress on the Committee's Work Programme for 2019/2020 be noted and that the additional items referred to above be included within the Committee's Work Programme.

## 36. CABINET WORK PROGRAMME

The Committee received and considered the report of the Head of Democratic Services, which gave members the opportunity to comment on the Cabinet Work Programme published on 20 August 2019.

In response to a question from Councillor Rylett, it was confirmed that the Oxfordshire Energy Strategy Delivery Plan was to be considered at the next meeting of the Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor Acock asked whether it was intended that the Housing and Homelessness Strategy was to be considered by this Committee and the Executive Director – Commissioning, indicated that she would make enquiries and advise Members accordingly.

In response to a question from Councillor Leverton, it was explained that the Cabinet was to consider whether a revision to the previously approved CIL Charging Schedule would be necessary prior to its submission for examination.

With regard to the revised Council Plan, Members considered that the draft should be reconsidered by the Committee prior to its submission to the Council for final approval. Accordingly, it was:-

**RESOLVED:** That the Cabinet be requested to defer recommending the Plan's adoption to the Council so as to enable further consideration by the Committee.

Councillor Acock suggested that the proposed revisions to the Visitor Information Service should also be considered by the Committee.

Officers suggested that this matter more properly fell within the remit of the Finance and Management Overview and Scrutiny Committee but Councillor Acock considered that there could be aspects of a review that related to the work of this Committee which warranted consideration by both bodies. Councillor Beaney undertook to make enquiries as to the content of the report and advise Members accordingly at the next meeting.

37. SERVICE PERFORMANCE 2019/2020 – Quarter One

The Committee received and considered the report of the Group Manager, Strategic Support, which provided information on the Council's performance at the end of Quarter 1 2019/2020.

Members joined the Chairman in congratulating Officers in the Planning Department on their performance in relation to indicators PSH3 and PSH4 (Quality of decisions based on the proportion of decisions overturned at appeal). Members were particularly gratified that none of the 117 decisions relating to major applications had been overturned on appeal during the two year assessment period.

**RESOLVED:** That the report be noted.

38. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

Councillor Rylett asked whether a report on the Digital Transformation Programme could be submitted to the Committee and Officers advised that this was to form part of the update report to be considered by the Finance and Management Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its next meeting.

Councillor Ashbourne advised that, at the last meeting of the Audit and General Purposes Committee, she had asked for relevant audit reports to be provided to Members.

There were no other questions from Members relating to the work of the Committee.

The meeting closed at 9:10pm

Chairman