

CABINET

MINUTES of the meeting held on Tuesday, 20 July 2021 commencing at 2.00 pm and finishing at 4.00 pm

Present:

Voting Members:

Councillor Liz Leffman – in the Chair
Councillor Liz Brighthouse OBE (Deputy Chair)
Councillor Glynis Phillips
Councillor Neil Fawcett
Councillor Dr Pete Sudbury
Councillor Tim Bearder
Councillor Duncan Enright
Councillor Calum Miller
Councillor Jenny Hannaby
Councillor Mark Lygo

Other Members in Attendance:

Councillors Kevin Bulmer, Ian Corkin, Ted Fenton, Nick Field-Johnson, Donna Ford, Dan Levy, Michael O'Connor, Eddie Reeves

Officers:

Whole of meeting

Yvonne Rees (Chief Executive); Stephen Chandler, Corporate Director for Adult and Housing Services; Bill Cotton, Corporate Director Environment & Place; Kevin Gordon, Corporate Director for Children's Services; Steve Jordan, Corporate Director Commercial Development, Assets and Investment; Claire Taylor, Corporate Director Customers & Organisational Development; Anita Bradley, Director for Law & Governance and Monitoring Officer; Colm Ó Caomhánaigh, Committee Officer

The Committee considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting, together with a schedule of addenda tabled at the meeting and decided as set out below. Except insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda, reports and schedule, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.

64/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

(Agenda Item. 1)

There were no apologies for absence.

65/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(Agenda Item. 2)

There were no declarations of interest.

66/21 MINUTES

(Agenda Item. 3)

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2021 were approved.

67/21 QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS

(Agenda Item. 4)

The questions received from County Councillors and responses are set out in an Annex to these Minutes.

68/21 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda Item. 5)

The following requests to address the meeting had been agreed by the Chair:

Item 10 – Draft Oxfordshire Plan 2050: Professor Richard Harding, Chairman, CPRE – The Countryside Charity

Item 13 – A40 HIF2 Smart Corridor: Graham Smith, Cyclox

69/21 A FAIR DEAL FOR OXFORDSHIRE - SHAPING OUR IMMEDIATE AND LONGER-TERM PRIORITIES

(Agenda Item. 6)

Cabinet considered a report setting out the policy objectives and areas of priority for the new administration. The report's Annex had been updated in Addenda 3.

The Performance Scrutiny Committee had met on 16 July 2021 to consider this report. Councillor Eddie Reeves, Chair, summarised the comments from that meeting. He commended the new administration on publishing their priorities before the summer.

There had been varied views expressed on the priorities but Members were agreed that it will be ultimately judged on its delivery. There were concerns expressed about the financial consequences of the proposals and while it was a noble aim to increase the funding available to the Council, the administration would inevitably be faced with a series of zero-sum decisions

at some point. Members could see what was being prioritised but struggled to see what would consequently be deprioritised.

Councillor Reeves asked when non-Cabinet Members would be able to engage with the further development of the corporate plan. He suggested that the role of Localities be enhanced as a great resource. Members had made the point that there should be more on prioritising children and young people.

Some Members of the Committee warned of a danger of consultation fatigue, particularly with the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 going into consultation shortly. There were also questions about how we make best use of the data from consultation.

Decarbonisation was commended across parties but there were concerns about how that would be achieved beyond divestment of assets and the LED street lighting programme.

Councillor Liz Leffman introduced the report. She stated that the new administration wanted to make its priorities clear and easy to understand. These priorities would inform the budget and work towards a fairer and greener county. Councillor Leffman moved the Recommendations.

Councillor Liz Brighthouse added that promises made to the electorate in the recent Council elections were reflected in the document. They intended it to be a living document and would engage with residents on it. While it was the beginning of a process, the Cabinet had already started to deliver, for example by providing over 20,000 places for young people over the summer to participate in activities that they would not otherwise be able to access. Councillor Brighthouse seconded the Recommendations.

Councillor Calum Miller, responding to the scrutiny committee's questions about the next stages, stated that he looked forward to working with colleagues to flesh out the proposals and demonstrate how, by aligning the resources with the priorities, a programme of change can be delivered.

Councillor Pete Sudbury assured Councillor Reeves that divestment from buildings will not be counted as a carbon saving – they will report on like for like. It was also planned to include indirect emissions such as the data centre and road maintenance as well as reporting on the effects of Council decisions.

The Recommendation was put, including the revised Annex document in Addenda 3.

RESOLVED: to

- a) **approve the approach to the development of a new strategic plan for the period commencing 2022/23, including a programme of public consultation 'Oxfordshire**

Conversations' and stakeholder engagement to take place in the autumn.

- b) endorse the priorities of the Oxfordshire Fair Deal Alliance as set out in paragraph 6 (and the attached annex) to form the basis of these conversations and a new strategic plan.**

70/21 BUSINESS MANAGEMENT & MONITORING REPORT - MAY 2021

(Agenda Item. 7)

Cabinet had before it a report setting out Oxfordshire County Council's (OCC's) progress towards Corporate Plan priorities for 2021/22 during April and May 2021.

Councillor Calum Miller introduced the report and moved the Recommendation. He noted that of the 22 indicators 11 were Green, 4 Amber and 6 Red which was a small improvement on last month. He also drew attention to two risks rated Red: demand management for children's services and staff shortages in the construction industry.

Planned savings of £16.1m were expected to be delivered in this financial year, though it should be noted that 25% were rated amber and needed to be monitored closely. Since the last Cabinet meeting the Government had allocated £10.9m to support the Council's Covid response. The specific recommendations on virements and writing off bad debts were within the Council's budget.

Councillor Glynis Phillips seconded the Recommendations. She noted the continuing strong performance of the Customer Service Centre with a 96% satisfaction rating and 89% of calls resolved on first contact. An improvement on figures for abandoned calls was expected when new features in the system upgrade take effect.

Councillor Liz Brighthouse reported on developments in her portfolio including the expansion of the School Streets pilot, enabling children to have carbon-free journeys and a safer environment around their schools. This was supported by Government finance but more was needed.

Councillor Brighthouse added that there had been an inspection of the Youth Justice Service in May in which it had been seen very positively. She paid tribute to the strong team. Absence rates in schools were lower than the national average which was due to hard work by officers and schools.

The number of contacts to the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) were 51% higher in May than in pre-Covid times. This reflected the situation across the country and represented a major risk. The Council was working to reduce its dependency on agency staff in children's social care by training its own staff and working to retain them in the county.

RESOLVED:

- a) **To note April and May 21 business management and monitoring report.**
- b) **To approve the virement set out in Annex C- 2b and note virements set out in Annex C-2c;**
- c) **To approve the bad debt write off set out in paragraph 44 of Annex C.**

71/21 CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING REPORT - MAY 2021

(Agenda Item. 8)

Cabinet considered the first monitoring report and Capital Programme update for 2021/22, setting out the monitoring position for 2021/22 based on activity to the end of May 2021 and providing an update to the Capital Programme approved by Council in February 2021 to take into account additional funding and new schemes.

Councillor Calum Miller drew particular attention to the increases outlined in paragraphs 3 and 4. The forecast expenditure for 2021/22 had increased by £3.4m compared to the latest approved capital programme which was largely due to deferred expenditure from the previous year.

The 10 year Capital Programme had increased by £49.2m compared to the capital programme approved by Council in February 2021, due equally to slippage from last year and new grant funding.

Borrowing for this year was estimated to be £70m some of which was borrowed on behalf of others, such as OxLEP. Councillor Miller thanked officers for their prudent management of borrowing in the past. He referred to the recommended additions to the capital fund, in particular, potential forward funding for the A40 Access to Witney Scheme ahead of the receipt of S106 contributions.

Councillor Miller stated that he was confident that these represented prudent capital investments for the Council and moved the Recommendations.

Councillor Glynis Phillips seconded the proposal.

RESOLVED to:

- a) **agree the inclusion in the Capital Programme of the following grants funded schemes:**
 - i. **£1.5m Green Homes Grant programme (Paragraph 27);**
 - ii. **£2.1m Public Sector De-Carbonisation Grant programme (Paragraph 28),**
- b) **agree the inclusion in the Capital Programme of the following schemes:**

- i. the New St Edburg's expansion to 3 Form Entry Primary School with a budget of £10.3m funded from s106 contributions (Paragraph 42);
 - ii. the A420 Coxwell Road Junction scheme with a budget of £1.80m funded from s106 contributions (Paragraph 44),
- c) agree the increase in the budget for the following schemes:
 - i. £2.2m for the Benson Relief Road scheme funded from Housing & Growth Deal grant and s106 contributions (Paragraph 46);
 - ii. £0.5m for the Carterton Community Safety Centre funded from s106 contributions (Paragraph 29),
- d) note the risk that forward funding of up to £7.0m may be required on the A40 Access to Witney scheme (Paragraph 48) ahead of receipt of s106 contributions,
- e) approve the updated Capital Programme at Annex 2 (taking into account recommendations 1-4)

72/21 SEND TOP-UP FUNDING FOR SCHOOLS

(Agenda Item. 9)

Cabinet considered a report recommending that the increase in Top-Up funding for 2020-21 be maintained for the academic year 2021-22.

Councillor Ian Corkin, Shadow Cabinet Member for Children, Education and Young People's Services, spoke to support the Recommendation which was an extension of the policy of the last administration. He described the problems in this area as complex with a complicated financial backdrop across the country. He paid tribute to the work by the Corporate Director for Children's Services, Kevin Gordon, and his team in trying to resolve the situation.

Councillor Corkin suggested that the long-term solution should include

- strong partnership working in co-production with parents, carers and young people at the formative stages of policy development;
- joint commissioning across education, health and social care;
- a focus on core processes so that needs can be identified early and accurately;
- a commitment to deliver specialised in-county provision including a 'mainstream plus' option.
- preparation for adulthood which should include engagement with local employers

Councillor Liz Brighthouse thanked Councillor Corkin for his support and responded that the points he had raised were being examined. The problem was that a solution was needed quite quickly but there would be a consultation process in the autumn.

Councillor Brighthouse added that when the previous administration provided the top-up funding, they had envisaged that the government review would be complete by now but it had been further delayed. She asked Councillor Corkin to use his network to impress upon government the urgency of the matter.

Councillor Glynis Phillips proposed an amendment to Recommendation a) to include the amount of the increase - £3.2. This was seconded by Councillor Brighthouse.

The following comments from the Performance Scrutiny Committee that discussed this Cabinet proposal at its meeting on 16 July 2021 were read out:

- Members supported this important provision.
- The pressure on schools had increased following cuts to other services for children with SEN.
- Training for teaching staff was a key support. There was a need to recognise that fatigue can be a significant factor.
- What was being done to achieve a more sustainable solution and to create more capacity for special needs education within the county?
- Did the increase in numbers of children with SEN reflect an actual increase in need or were we getting better at identifying these needs? Do we need to re-evaluate the criteria?
- Some schools have a much higher proportion of children with SEN. Should the funding allocations take account of that?
- When it came to looking at reform, schools and teachers were key stakeholders that needed to be central to any consultation.

Kevin Gordon thanked the scrutiny committee for the points which were very relevant and useful. He was pleased to see an overall consensus on the problems. He had been working with schools for the last nine months on the new approach. The SEND budgets belonged to schools – the Council was a custodian of the funds. He proposed to come back to future meetings with more briefings on reforms that will address the points raised.

The amended Recommendations were put to the meeting.

RESOLVED to:

- a) Agree an increase of £3.2m in Top-Up funding for Early Years settings, mainstream Primary, mainstream Secondary and Special Schools. The increase will only be available in the year 2021-2022.**
- b) Note that for Secondary Schools, the increased top-up is applicable where the formulaic approach is insufficient for schools to meet the needs of the child. This decision would not reduce the amount of Top-Up funding a Secondary school currently receives.**

- c) **Note that system reform is required for SEND in Oxfordshire. A public consultation on this is planned for later in 2021. The interim arrangements above for Top-Up funding are a holding position while the detailed work in this complex area are worked through.**

73/21 DRAFT OXFORDSHIRE PLAN 2050 REG 18 (STAGE 2)

(Agenda Item. 10)

Cabinet had been asked to agree the process for public consultation on the Oxfordshire Plan and further consider the Council's formal response at the September Cabinet meeting.

The following speaker had been agreed with the Chair:

Professor Richard Harding, Chair, CPRE - The Countryside Charity welcomed the commitment in the draft to carbon reduction and environmental protection. However, they were concerned that the consultation document was not fit for purpose because

- it did not make clear the tough decisions needed
- it will let the Oxford-Cambridge Arc proposal dominate
- it will undermine the role of local councillors.

The draft plan presented a wide range of policies which were to be imposed on all the local councils because otherwise different approaches might be taken and this could result in less certainty and clarity for developers.

Professor Harding maintained that the public deserved a revised consultation document that sets out the preferred growth and spatial options and provides adequate information to allow the impacts, risks and benefits to be compared.

Councillor Duncan Enright introduced the report. The plan involved a new partnership enabling the County, City and Districts to speak with one voice. It would actually reinstate local democratic control. The main themes chosen from public consultation were climate change, environmental quality, strong communities, travel, jobs and homes. Five spatial options were listed for feedback. It was expected that the next stage will draw from all five options.

Councillor Enright stated that the plan took into account the local plans already adopted up to the 2030s. Oxfordshire had been one of the most enthusiastic supporters of the Arc and in fact the leaders of the Arc were thinking of taking a similar planning approach to Oxfordshire's in other areas. The document was not intended to be proscriptive so this would be a genuine consultation.

Other Members of Cabinet made the following observations:

- Everyone should get involved in the consultation especially anyone who had concerns about the level of growth planned in Oxfordshire.
- The Plan set out what good growth looked like. However, current policies were going in the opposite direction – particularly in regard to carbon reduction. It will be very difficult to set out a plan to 2050 that will meet the challenges in this paper.
- Green spaces had provided a lifeline for people during the pandemic lockdown. The Cabinet Member for Public Health will be looking closely at the proposals for healthy place shaping.
- The Plan involved a lot of weighty documents. An executive summary would be appreciated. Members need to engage with their communities and parish councils to ensure that we get their views on the questions asked and not rely just on the website for feedback.
- Standards need to be prescriptive in the final document and not advisory, to ensure that they are effective. Carbon offsetting should not be accepted. Buildings need to be efficient in themselves and reducing the financial drag of energy costs would be a big help to the poorest families.
- Some of the poorest areas did not have parish councils. We need to ensure that their voices are heard.
- There were interesting proposals around market towns but their main problem was poor road infrastructure. Getting old railway lines reopened and freight moved off the roads would be of huge benefit to market towns.

Councillor Sudbury seconded the Recommendations. Councillor Enright reminded Members that Cabinet itself would be submitting a response for the consultation and that would be discussed at the September meeting.

RESOLVED to

- a) Consider and agree the process for the Oxfordshire Plan Regulation 18 (Part 2) document for public consultation commencing on 30 July;**
- b) Further consider the Plan at its meeting on 21 September after an all member seminar, with a view to making formal representations on the Oxfordshire Plan Regulation 18 (Part 2) by the closing date of 8 October 2021.**

74/21 A40 ACCESS TO WITNEY - IN PRINCIPLE USE OF STATUTORY POWERS

(Agenda Item. 11)

Cabinet had been asked to approve the preferred option and in principle use of a compulsory purchase order for this scheme.

Councillor Duncan Enright summarised the report. The scheme was making changes around the periphery of Witney designed to reduce traffic in the town and improve air quality as well as making walking and cycling more attractive. He proposed the Recommendations.

Councillor Pete Sudbury referred to the predicted increases in traffic outlined in the report and noted that he and his Cabinet colleagues were working to turn that around. He asked if this scheme would still be necessary if they were successful in that.

Councillor Enright responded that the need for a scheme similar to this one had been identified as long as thirty years ago so it was long awaited.

Councillor Sudbury seconded the Recommendations.

RESOLVED to:

- a) **Note the progress in developing the A40 Access to Witney project specifically the recent public engagement event undertaken to inform the preferred scheme options.**
- b) **Approve Officer's preferred option recommendation and for the formal adoption by the Council of the A40 Access to Witney as an approved scheme.**
- c) **Approve in principle the development of The Oxfordshire County Council (A40 Access to Witney) Compulsory Purchase Order 202[x] in parallel with negotiations for private acquisition, with such powers of compulsory purchase used only as a matter of last resort, in order to bring forward the timely development of the A40 Access to Witney project. Formal authority for the making of The Oxfordshire County Council (A40 Access to Witney) Compulsory Purchase Order 202[x] will be reported to Cabinet, and necessary approval sought, following public engagement on preferred options and submission of a planning application for the scheme.**
- d) **Approve the preparation and service of statutory notices for the Requisition of Information pursuant to Section 16 Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 (as amended) to assist with determining the interests in the land required for the delivery of the scheme.**
- e) **Approve the preparation of The Oxfordshire County Council (A40 Access to Witney) Compulsory Purchase Order 202[x] in draft , together with a draft Order Map, draft Order Schedule, draft Statement of Reasons and all necessary land referencing activity in advance of seeking formal authority to make the Order.**

75/21 A40 HIF 2 SMART CORRIDOR - PREFERRED OPTIONS AND FUNDING

(Agenda Item. 12)

Cabinet had before it a proposal to approve the scheme, preferred options and finding for this project.

The following speaker had been agreed:

Graham Smith, Cyclox and representative of Cycling UK, called for improved safety measures for walking and cycling at the Eynsham Roundabout. The original design to widen the approaches had no crossing facilities. There were now Toucans in the East-West directions which were welcome. However, consultation showed that safe crossing facilities were needed on the other roads. Officers have said that this was not feasible and suggested alternatives but Members needed to take back control and insist that safe crossings are provided for walkers and cyclists.

Councillor Duncan Enright responded that the details on the scheme were still being worked out and there was still an opportunity to make safety improvements at the roundabout.

Other Cabinet Members asked if the crossing was used by children travelling to school and if Cabinet would have a further opportunity to ensure that the concerns around the design of the roundabout had been taken on board.

Councillor Enright confirmed that the roundabout was used by school children and also noted that a medical centre was proposed that would require pedestrian and cycling access. He agreed that it was important to provide safe options for the north-south axis at the roundabout and noted that there was also a separate proposal for an underpass being examined. The scheme was to go for planning approval in September with detailed design from October.

Councillor Enright proposed the Recommendations which were seconded by Councillor Pete Sudbury

RESOLVED to:

- a) **Note the progress in developing the A40 HIF2 Smart Corridor project specifically the recent public engagement event undertaken to inform the preferred scheme options.**
- b) **Approve Officer's preferred options recommendation and for the formal adoption by the Council of the A40 HIF2 Smart Corridor as an approved scheme.**
- c) **Note the preferred options are confirmed as fully funded following the recent agreement to amend the Grant**

Determination Agreement with Homes England, securing the full £106.756m budget.

- d) To notify Cabinet of the Statutory Blight regime that requires the Council to respond to claims for Statutory Blight pursuant to Part VI, Chapter II and Schedule 13 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) which would be a consequence of it formally approving the preferred route.**
- e) In respect to Statutory Blight delegate authority to the Director for Property, Investment & Facilities Management and the Director of Law and Governance to agree appropriate terms in accordance with statutory provisions.**

76/21 FIBRE BROADBAND FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS

(Agenda Item. 13)

Cabinet had before it a proposal on awarding a contract to the winning bidder of the council's procurement of full-fibre broadband for public buildings.

Councillor Glynis Phillips introduced the report. Since 2013/14 broadband has been seen as an essential service. The previous Cabinet went to public procurement to provide lower cost broadband for council and other public sector buildings. This report detailed the outcome from that and proposed to delegate authority to award the contract. She move the Recommendation.

Councillor Neil Fawcett welcomed this provision especially for libraries and heritage facilities. The previous year had shown how important digital access had become. He seconded the Recommendation.

Councillor Phillips thanked Craig Bower, Programme Director, Digital Infrastructure Team, in particular for his negotiating skills.

RESOLVED to approve delegated authority to the Corporate Director, Customers, Organisational Development and Resources, in consultation with the Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Corporate Services for awarding a contract to the winning bidder of the council's procurement of full-fibre broadband for public buildings, up to the value of £8m (Oxfordshire County Council Funding of £5m and Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) funding of £3m).

77/21 DELEGATED POWERS - JULY 2021

(Agenda Item. 14)

It was noted that there had been no executive decisions taken in the period reported April to June 2021.

78/21 FORWARD PLAN AND FUTURE BUSINESS

(Agenda Item. 15)

The Cabinet considered a list of items (CA16) for the immediately forthcoming meetings of the Cabinet together with changes and additions set out in the schedule of addenda.

RESOLVED:to note the items currently identified for forthcoming meetings.

It was agreed to adjourn the meeting and consider Item 11 Department for Transport Active Travel Fund – Tranche 3 at a time and date to be confirmed in order for the Cabinet to obtain more information.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing

ITEM 4 – QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS

Questions	Answers
<p>1. COUNCILLOR DAN LEVY</p> <p>Can I ask Councillor Enright what measures are being taken to ensure that any outstanding concerns of residents and active travellers are being addressed as part of the continuing design of the A40 corridor from Shores Green to Wolvercote? In particular there are continuing concerns about</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. access arrangements at Barnard Gate, so as to restrict rat running through South Leigh 2. the crossings in the section which will be between Eynsham and Salt Cross, and which will be used by people crossing between the two villages, including many schoolchildren, people on bikes and other mobility aids, people going to the single medical centre covering the villages and many others. These crossings will primarily be two stage pelican crossings across a dual carriageway. 3. Arrangements on the cycle routes along each 	<p>COUNCILLOR DUNCAN ENRIGHT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRAVEL AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The current proposals use the southern arm to provide a new service road to Ambury Close and Fir Tree Farms (details shown on Annex A1 General Arrangement plan within the related Cabinet paper on today's agenda), as the proposals remove the dedicated access to these properties from the A40. The current access points to these premises will no longer be safe as the scheme proposes a dual carriageway arrangement at this location, so traffic will only have a "left in-left out" option with a high proportion of large slow moving vehicles. <p>Any closure of this southbound through route would need further traffic modelling work to understand diversion of traffic and formal consultation with the residents and businesses who use this stretch of road before any such decision could be taken. There would also need to be a Traffic Regulation Order statutory process. I have asked that this be further investigated by officers within the relevant Localities Team.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. It is correct that the project is futureproofed in terms of the level of at grade crossing provision which is inbuilt to cater for the new Salt

Questions	Answers
<p>side of the A40 as it crosses Lower Road and the B4449 by Eynsham roundabout, where the proposed arrangement has no protection for cyclists from fast-moving traffic.</p> <p>Clearly we want the A40 changes to work in so far as they encourage bus use, but does he agree that we also need to ensure that cycling and other active travel is encouraged both along the A40 and across it, and that there is still work to do to make this a reality?</p>	<p>Cross Garden Village and the desire lines which will form to move between the two. Design work is ongoing in respect to the effective operation of these signalised crossings and how they can be timed effectively, during both peak and off peak traffic periods, to ensure minimum crossing times for pedestrians and cyclists. Officers are also exploring through the design process how these crossings can be linked with intelligent technology to limit the impact on the flow of the A40 for both public transport and private vehicles.</p> <p>Officers are developing this next layer of detail for the scheme and there will continue to be engagement with those interested stakeholders as the design process evolves.</p> <p>3. The current proposals which have been amended as a result of engagement with the various cycling groups and that feedback received through the formal public engagement process. They now include signal controlled crossings both north and south of the roundabout. Details are shown on Annex A2 Sheet 1 General Arrangement plan within the related Cabinet paper on today's agenda.</p> <p>Encouraging modal shift to public transport and walking and cycling is a core objective of the A40 HIF2 scheme. The scheme designs as presented today provide a step-change in the quality of active travel infrastructure along this section of the A40, making the journey for walkers and cyclists more convenient and safer. There will continue to be</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>more work to be undertaken beyond the current stage as the project progresses through subsequent stages of detailed design. This process will refine the design proposals further, optimising them to ensure best use of the Housing Infrastructure and other grant funding the Council has secured to deliver this project.</p>
<p>2. COUNCILLOR DAN LEVY</p> <p>The County Council has agreed to undertake a feasibility study for a railway from Oxford to Carterton via Eynsham and Witney. When will this be undertaken, and assuming that the feasibility study produces a positive result, what measures are being taken to ensure that the current expected changes to the A40 do not physically prevent building a rail or light rail link?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR DUNCAN ENRIGHT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRAVEL AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</p> <p>The Council is currently scoping out a proposal to commission a feasibility study for an Oxford to Carterton rail line. The output of this rail feasibility study will help determine what future proposals for the A40 corridor and the wider transport network should look like. Nothing in the A40 scheme rules a route alongside the A40 out. We are working with the Witney-Oxford Transport Group on this proposal and awaiting the outcome of a funding bid submitted by the Group to the Government's 'Restoring Your Railways' fund to accelerate this work. The A40 programme would provide significant bus priority and highway improvements along this transport corridor with considerable potential for integration with rail.</p>
<p>3. COUNCILLOR DAVID BARTHOLOMEW</p> <p>While reviewing Cabinet papers on Wednesday 14th, I noted an error in the Business Management & Monitoring Report that the Cabinet Member for</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR CALUM MILLER, CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE</p> <p>I am grateful to Cllr Bartholomew for his careful reading of the Business Management & Monitoring Report and for spotting my oversight. He offered at Council last week to be a careful scrutineer of my work and I</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>Finance had inadvertently overlooked, and advised officers accordingly. Would he like to join me in thanking officers for the rapidity of their response in issuing updated tables on paragraph 21 of the main report and paragraph 9 of Annex C later that day?</p>	<p>thank him for taking up that role so promptly. I am happy to join him in thanking officers for speedily issuing corrected tables.</p>