OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting held on Tuesday, 8 December 2020 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 3.55 pm.

Present:

Councillor Les Sibley – in the Chair

Councillors:

John Howson	Mike Fox-Davies	Jeannette Matelot
Sobia Afridi	Stefan Gawrysiak	Charles Mathew
Jamila Begum Azad	Mark Gray	Glynis Phillips
David Bartholomew	Carmen Griffiths	Susanna Pressel
Dr Suzanne Bartington	Pete Handley	Laura Price
Tim Bearder	Jane Hanna OBE	Eddie Reeves
Maurice Billington	Jenny Hannaby	G.A. Reynolds
Liz Brighouse OBE	Neville F. Harris	Judy Roberts
Paul Buckley	Steve Harrod	Alison Rooke
Kevin Bulmer	Damian Haywood	Dan Sames
Nick Carter	Mrs Judith Heathcoat	Gill Sanders
Mark Cherry	Hilary Hibbert-Biles	John Sanders
Dr Simon Clarke	Ian Hudspeth	Emily Smith
Yvonne Constance OBE	Tony Ilott	Roz Smith
Ian Corkin	Bob Johnston	Lawrie Stratford
Arash Fatemian	Liz Leffman	Dr Pete Sudbury
Neil Fawcett	Lorraine Lindsay-Gale	Alan Thompson
Ted Fenton	Mark Lygo	Michael Waine
Nicholas Field-Johnson	D. McIlveen	Liam Walker
Mrs Anda Fitzgerald-O'Connor	Kieron Mallon	Richard Webber

The Council considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting and decided as set out below. Except insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda and reports, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.

68/20 MINUTES

(Agenda Item 1)

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 3 November 2020 were approved and signed as an accurate record.

69/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
(Agenda Item 2)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Hannah Banfield and Councillor Emma Turnbull.

70/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
(Agenda Item 3)

Councillor Jenny Hannaby declared a personal non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 12 by Virtue of her position as Chairman of a local Nursing Home and Chairman of Wantage Hospital League of Friends.

Councillor Arash Fatemian declared a personal non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 13 by virtue of a family member's employment at Bicester Village in the past.

71/20 OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS
(Agenda Item 4)

The Chairman passed on a request from the Education Scrutiny Committee to invite County Councillors to consider using unspent Councillor Priority Fund to either Fund Laptops for underprivileged children where the Government Scheme had not yet reached – contact Kim James or Hayley Good and a request of £50 to purchase Christmas Presents for Children Leaving Care – contact Hannah Farncombe.

Council paid tribute for the ongoing efforts of Staff throughout the pandemic.

72/20 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS
(Agenda Item 6)

Council received the following public address:

Ms Janet Phillips spoke in support of the question at Agenda Item 8 (Question from Susanna Pressel) to keep test and tracing local on the basis that she believed that a local and publicly-run system – from finding to testing, to tracing, and then encouraging isolation, and providing necessary support for that, was the way to get on top of the virus and that the Council's excellent Public Health Department should take control back from the national operation.

She urged Council to give its full support to Councillor Pressel's request for the Leader of the Council urgently to contact the DHSC and our MPs, to ask them to transfer the work of testing and tracing to our local authorities and the NHS, with the necessary funding.

Mr Michael Taylor spoke in support of Agenda Item 17 (Motion by Cllr Leffman) on the basis that the IPCC had said that to avert catastrophe we must stop global temperature rise at 1.5°C. However, the government's own

advisors, the Climate Change Committee, had warned that there was only a 50/50 chance of doing that if current plans were followed which was why the Bill was absolutely necessary.

The Bill did more to deal with the crisis than other currently proposed measures and had gained wide cross-party support. It required the UK to play its fair share in the global effort to fight climate change, taking responsibility for our entire CO2 footprint, including international air travel and shipping, and overseas supply chains, recognising the damage caused through the goods imported both manufactured and agricultural. The motion provided an opportunity for the people of Oxfordshire, through the County Council, to ask the six MPs to treat the climate crisis with the urgency it required. He urged the Council to support the motion.

Mr Charlie Hicks spoke in support of Agenda Item 18 (Motion by Councillor Arash Fatemian) welcoming the intention behind motion 18 to create a new governance structure that puts cycling and walking more highly on the agenda, but asked councillors to scrutinise the detail of such a new structure to ensure it really would get stuff done. He urged that any mechanisms had sufficient budget allocation and sufficient weight to enable decision to carry through Cabinet. He offered a suggestion to make explicit the role of walking and cycling within the Cabinet member for Environment and Transport's brief as It seemed there was no mention of walking or cycling within any Cabinet member's responsibility on the council website, despite all the targets and press briefings about how important the council was taking it. In recognition that there were severe resource limitations on the councils and the huge amount of work to be done for EATF2, he also urged that the Council took more seriously the prospect of working with members of the public - from all parts of society: business, people who drive, people who cycle, people who took the bus, people who walked, wheelchair users, parents, delivery drivers, older people, younger people, students and so on - and look also to the world leading universities in Oxford: Brookes - with the Urban Design and Architecture expertise, and to Oxford University - with Transport Studies, Human Geography, Environmental Change Institute, and all manner of departments. It was possible to create such a structure that was open to Oxfordshire, that had representation across local society and built a bridge with institutions, and with goodwill could create a togetherness that would enable those projects to be a success.

Mr Michael O'Connor spoke in support of Agenda Item 18 (Motion by Councillor Arash Fatemian) as a way of drawing greater attention to cycling and walking, but worried that getting rid of the role of cycling champion, a public role with an independent position and their own voice, would have a counter-productive effect by reducing the time devoted to those issues and removing an independent perspective. He questioned why the cycling champion couldn't exist alongside a CAG? And whether they in theory could attend the CAG given the ad-hoc, informal nature of CAGs?

Oxfordshire has recently received £2.9m from the government's Active Travel Fund; £411,000 had been set aside for Oxford North and West. He emphasised the importance of agreeing on a firm timetable, so that it was

known when consultations would occur and when changes would come in. He further emphasised the importance of keeping the Council website updated with details of Active Travel Fund proposals.

Ms Miranda Markham, spoke in support of Agenda Item (Motion by Councillor Michael Waine) on the basis that the decision will have a real impact on the local community of Oxfordshire and that she felt everything needed to be done to encourage the government to review this policy.

The Treasury had made a case that abolishing the scheme would save the Government money. However, HMT's own analysis was deeply flawed, and stands to crystallise losses to the country's economy and to Government revenues way in excess of any potential benefit and with the likely and terrible cost of job losses in already hard-hit retail, tourism and manufacturing industries.

According to the tourism board, Oxfordshire currently attracted £30 million tourists a year - who, through spending, contributed £2.5 billion to the local economy - which was 10% of the annual GDP and 12% of all jobs in Oxfordshire. 800,000 international tourists visited Oxfordshire and surrounding areas per year - with a ⅓ of all staying overnight. Overnight spend per trip was £492 for an overseas visitor compared to £215 for a domestic one. All in all - overseas visitors spent £32 million per month in Oxfordshire's economy.

Any change in those visitor's numbers would be acutely felt by Oxfordshire and surrounding areas. Lower tourism numbers meant less spending, which would significantly affect businesses in Oxfordshire and the surrounding areas. She urged the Council to support the Motion.

73/20 QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

(Agenda Item 7)

Mr Andrew Crawford asked Councillor Lorraine Lindsay-Gale the following question on Notice:

Does a County Council policy, procedure or briefing note exist on this issue and if so; a) may I see a copy and b) can it be sent to all Head Teachers and c) can it be shared with all relevant parents so that there is clarity and openness over the policy adopted by the Council for all parties?

Do Learner Engagement Services staff ensure that when discussing such issues with individual parents and their children's schools' staff that full disclosure of the County's approach to this situation is made clear? Are Learner Engagement Services staff encouraged to influence Head Teachers to authorise absence from school using the X code in the school registers in these circumstances?

Councillor Lindsay-Gale answered as follows:

Oxfordshire County Council follows the Department for Education and Public Health England advice regarding the attendance at school of children who have members of their family deemed CEV (clinically extremely vulnerable). Currently, that advice is that children can, and are expected to attend school under these circumstances. The guidance is publicly available on the Department for Education website and has been shared with Head Teachers. Schools in Oxfordshire have worked and continue to work extremely hard to make settings Covid secure and have delivered on this effectively.

Quoting directly from the current Department for Education guidance available on their website, shared with schools and informed by Public Health England;

''A small number of pupils will still be unable to attend in line with public health advice to self-isolate because:

- *they have had symptoms, or a positive test result themselves*
- *they live with someone that has symptoms or has tested positive and are a household contact*
- *they are a close contact of someone who has coronavirus (COVID-19)*

More evidence has emerged that shows there is a very low risk of children becoming very unwell from coronavirus (COVID-19), even for children with existing health conditions. Far fewer children should remain in the clinically extremely vulnerable group in the future following their routine discussions with their clinician.

The advice for pupils who remain in the clinically extremely vulnerable group is that they should return to school from 2 December, at all local restriction tiers, unless they are one of the very small number of pupils or students under paediatric or NHS care (such as recent transplant or very immunosuppressed children) and have been advised specifically by their GP or clinician not to attend an education setting.
Children who live with someone who is clinically extremely vulnerable, but who are not clinically extremely vulnerable themselves, should still attend school.''

Oxfordshire County Council's policy regarding Elective Home Education (which is different to remaining on a school roll and accessing remote learning opportunities) is available on the Oxfordshire County Council webpages. If residents require additional help in locating or accessing it, please email ehe@oxfordshire.gov.uk

Oxfordshire County Council's approach, through Learner Engagement Services, adheres to the Department for Education and Public Health England advice and our own policies. We seek to mediate between families and schools to reach a conclusion that is satisfactory to all, with Covid safety and ongoing access to education as key priorities.

It is the duty of Head Teachers to determine the most appropriate use of attendance codes, including the X code. Learner Engagement Services advise Head Teachers to take a supportive and pragmatic approach under the circumstances described, and not to go behind advice from medical practitioners pertaining to children or members of their household at heightened risk due to CEV.

74/20 QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

(Agenda Item 8)

33 questions with Notice were asked. Details of the questions and answers and supplementary questions and answers will be set out in the Annex to the minutes.

In relation to Question 6, Councillor Walker undertook to investigate the issues Councillor Webber raised in relation to Drayton, including why it had taken, so far, three goes to get it right and whether an assurance that the work would be carried out correctly could be given.

In relation to Question 8, Councillor Constance gave an assurance to Councillor Webber that she would endeavour to accommodate the wishes of Drayton, Sutton Courtenay and Marcham parishes in terms of LED colour, should budget allow.

In relation to Question 13, Councillor Walker gave Councillor Buckley an assurance to take the issue up with Senior Officers for a quick resolution of where the failings in the County were and whether they were within the organisation or with Contractors

In relation to Question 19, Councillor Gray undertook to provide Councillor Pressel with a further written answer giving more details on the progress of all LGA Peer Review recommendations.

In relation to Question 26, Councillor Stratford gave an assurance that he would look into providing Domestic Violence training to all front-line staff such as teachers, fire fighters and trading standards, subject to the funding being available to do so.

In relation to Question 30, Councillor Stratford undertook to provide Councillor Hannaby with a written answer detailing whether the contract gave the elderly and their families had the same rights and choices that existed when they had concerns and complaints as existed when the elderly received their reablement in Acute of Community Hospital provision and in relation to the new Living Well at Home future Commissioning which was a large part of the County budget spend. As the cost of delivering the new service would be met from the Pooled Budget fund, where would the accountability, monitoring and outcomes sit within the new service.

In relation to Question 31, Councillor Stratford undertook to provide Councillor Hannaby with a written answer on how the new way of working safeguards the elderly and vulnerable in their homes without 24hrs care continuity.

In relation to Question 33, Councillor Constance gave an assurance to Councillor Sudbury to ensure that specific targets for traffic reduction and modal shift are in the updated Local Transport Plan.

75/20 REPORT OF THE CABINET

(Agenda Item 9)

Council received the report of the Cabinet.

76/20 TREASURY MANAGEMENT MID-TERM REVIEW (2020/21)

(Agenda Item 10)

Council had before it a report which set out the Treasury Management activity undertaken in the first half of the financial year 2020/21 in compliance with the CIPFA Code of Practice. The report included Debt and Investment activity, Prudential Indicator monitoring and forecast interest receivable and payable for the financial year.

Councillor Bartholomew moved and Councillor Carter seconded the recommendations set out in the report and on the face of the Agenda. In moving and seconding Councillor Bartholomew and Councillor Carter paid tribute to Lorna Baxter, Tim Chapple and Team for the excellent report.

Following debate, in which several members also paid tribute to the Team, the Motion was put to the vote and was carried nem con.

RESOLVED: (nem con) to note the Council's Mid-Term Treasury Management Review 2020/21.

77/20 REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL ON MEMBER'S ALLOWANCES

(Agenda Item 11)

The Council had asked that a review be undertaken during this Autumn to help shape a Scheme of Allowances to apply from 1 April 2020. The last full review of the allowances agreed by Members was in December 2014. The Independent Remuneration Panel had now met and were recommending some changes to the Scheme as set out in the report.

Council had before it a report which presented the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel following a recent full review of the Council's Members' Allowances Scheme.

Councillor Hudspeth Moved and Councillor Heathcoat seconded that the Council adopt recommendation 2 as set out in the report and on the face of the Agenda, to allow the new Council following the May elections to give full consideration of the issues. In moving the report, Councillor Hudspeth thanked the Independent Remuneration Panel for their work and report which would be considered by the new Council after May.

Following debate, the Motion was put to the vote and was carried nem con.

RESOLVED: (nem con) not to accept the Panel's recommendations at this time, in whole or in part, and to agree a status quo Scheme of Allowances for 2021/22 for any unchanged aspect with the proviso that the newly elected Council after May 2021 is asked to revisit the matter during the 2021/22 Council Year.

78/20 BOB JOINT HEALTH SCRUTINY & OVERVIEW COMMITTEE

(Agenda Item 12)

Council had before it a report which outlined changes to delegation of health scrutiny powers for a new Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (HOSC) covering the Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West footprint. The changes sought to ensure health scrutiny occurs at an appropriate scale.

Councillor Fatemian moved and Councillor Hudspeth seconded that the recommendations set out in the report and on the face of the Agenda be adopted.

During debate, Councillor Roz Smith moved and it was seconded that there be a named vote (names recorded in the Minutes).

Accordingly, the Motion was put to the vote and was carried by 44 votes to 14, with 2 abstention. Voting was as follows:

Those voting for:

Afridi, Azad, Bartington, Bartholomew, Billington, Brighouse, Bulmer, Carter, Cherry, Clarke, Constance, Corkin, Fatemian, Fenton, Field-Johnson, Fitzgerald O'Connor, Fox-Davies, Gawrysiak, Gray, Griffiths, Harris, Harrod, Haywood, Heathcoat, Hudspeth, Ilot, Lindsay-Gale, Lygo, Matelot, Mathew, McIlveen, Phillips, Pressel, Price, Reeves, Reynolds, Sames, G Sanders, J. Sanders, Sibley, Stratford, Thompson, Waine, Walker.

Those vote against:

Bearder, Buckley, Fawcett, Hanna, Hannaby, Hibbert-Biles, Howson, Johnston, Leffman, Roberts, Rooke, E Smith, R Smith, Webber.

Those Abstaining:

Handley, Sudbury.

RESOLVED: (by 44 votes to 14, with 2 abstentions) that Subject to agreement by the other relevant local authorities; to agree the Terms of Reference (set out in Annex 1 to the report) for delegation of health scrutiny powers to Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee across the Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West geography to allow of health issues at a system level.

79/20 MOTION BY COUNCILLOR MICHAEL WAINE

(Agenda Item 13)

Councillor Waine moved and Councillor Fatemian seconded the following Motion:

"Council notes with Concern the decision by HM Treasury to bring to an end VAT-free shopping for the majority of goods from 31st December 2020 unless said goods are posted to the buyer's Home address abroad.

Whilst Council recognises that Brexit will present many challenges, the need for levelling up across the Country as highlighted by the treasury, and the need to ensure such schemes are appropriately used, Council feels that the approach adopted is akin to the proverbial 'Sledgehammer to crack a nut'.

Council believes the best way to achieve the 'Levelling up' agenda is by increasing economic performance in other areas, not harming or penalising existing well performing areas.

In particular Council is concerned of the impact this measure will have on Bicester Village and the wider economy and local jobs supported, but also the knock-on effect to wider tourist attractions and businesses whom rely on visitors who make Bicester just one step of an itinerary around Oxfordshire and who may choose not to do so if the cost of shopping is now 20% more expensive.

Council calls on the Leader and Chief Executive to write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and all the local Members of Parliament opposing such as move and asking them to reconsider or allow exceptions, given the likely detrimental effect this will have on the Oxfordshire Economy."

Following debate, the Motion was put to the vote and was carried by 35 votes to 15, with 11 abstentions.

80/20 MOTION BY COUNCILLOR EMMA TURNBULL

(Agenda Item 14)

With the consent of Council, Councillor Brighouse withdrew this Motion.

81/20 MOTION BY COUNCILLOR JANE HANNA

(Agenda Item 15)

Councillor Hanna moved and Councillor Hannaby seconded the following Motion:

"The increasing powers of non-elected decision makers is impacting negatively on Oxfordshire's population.

Buckingham, Oxfordshire and West Integrated Care System (BOB) is an exemplar. A local pilot for an Oxfordshire Population Health and Care Needs Framework has stalled since February awaiting a review by BOB under national instruction. It marks an early test case of the value placed on local communities across Oxfordshire by non-elected agencies.

The pilot in OX12 targeted a population of over 27,000. The local community endured the loss of a GP practice, a vibrant community hospital, with no delivery of infrastructure needed for 1000 new houses. A further 50% increase in housing is planned. There have been many excess deaths in recent months disproportionately impacting care homes. A starting point for recovery would be a clear commitment to completing the population-based pilot with a plan acceptable locally. A successful completion of this pilot would ensure consideration of local communities by people making decisions who do not know our local communities, who are less effective in securing confidence, and are not accountable to the public.

Council calls on the leader to influence a positive commitment now within BOB to the OX12 pilot. In addition, we request that he send an open letter to the Prime Minister, the Select Committees for Health and Social Care, Housing, Communities and Local Government to urge the vital importance of safeguarding local democracy and scrutiny as non-elected decision-makers implement policy across Oxfordshire."

Following debate, the Motion was put to the vote and was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: Accordingly.

82/20 MOTION BY COUNCILLOR PETE SUDBURY

(Agenda Item 16)

With the consent of Council, Councillor Sudbury and Councillor Mathew seconded the following motion, amended at the suggestion of Councillor Sames as shown in bold italics and strikethrough below:

"The Stockholm declaration, endorsed by the UK government in February this year, sets a framework to reduce road deaths and injuries by 50%: A critical measure is to:

"…mandate a maximum road travel speed of 30 km/h in areas where vulnerable road users and vehicles mix in a frequent and planned manner, except where strong evidence exists that higher speeds are safe"

The Spanish Government recently announced it will introduce this limit nationally. 20mph limits are popular with residents, make them feel safer, and increase walking and cycling.

Currently, 20mph limits are only put in place where average speeds are already at relatively safe levels (24mph). This is perverse and sends the wrong message to drivers about the dangers of speeding. Evidence says that simply introducing 20mph limits disproportionately slows those driving the fastest.

This County Council supports the premise that 20mph is the optimum speed limit in built-up areas and therefore:

1. Unless there is compelling evidence for a higher limit, ~~newly adopted residential roads, and adopted highway in commercial areas leading to residential roads, will have 20mph limits or zone~~. ***new residential roads should be designed for 20mph at the planning stage. Particular attention should be given in areas in the vicinity of new schools.***
2. Parish, Town, City Councils will ~~by default~~ be supported in reducing speed limits ~~in existing streets or areas on the basis of their local knowledge and the wishes of their residents, whilst~~ ***where requested by local residents and*** taking note of national guidance. Where funding from any source is available, they will subsequently be supported to put in place necessary speed-calming measures to bring maximum and average speeds down to acceptable levels."

Following debate, the Motion as amended was put to the vote and was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: (unanimously)

"The Stockholm declaration, endorsed by the UK government in February this year, sets a framework to reduce road deaths and injuries by 50%: A critical measure is to:

"…mandate a maximum road travel speed of 30 km/h in areas where vulnerable road users and vehicles mix in a frequent and planned manner, except where strong evidence exists that higher speeds are safe"

The Spanish Government recently announced it will introduce this limit nationally. 20mph limits are popular with residents, make them feel safer, and increase walking and cycling.

Currently, 20mph limits are only put in place where average speeds are already at relatively safe levels (24mph). This is perverse and sends the wrong message to drivers about the dangers of speeding. Evidence says

that simply introducing 20mph limits disproportionately slows those driving the fastest.

This County Council supports the premise that 20mph is the optimum speed limit in built-up areas and therefore:

1. Unless there is compelling evidence for a higher limit, new residential roads should be designed for 20mph at the planning stage. Particular attention should be given in areas in the vicinity of new schools.
2. Parish, Town, City Councils will be supported in reducing speed limits where requested by local residents and taking note of national guidance. Where funding from any source is available, they will subsequently be supported to put in place necessary speed-calming measures to bring maximum and average speeds down to acceptable levels."

83/20 MOTION BY COUNCILLOR LIZ LEFFMAN

(Agenda Item 17)

Councillor Leffman moved and Councillor Sudbury seconded the following Motion:

"On September 20th, an Early Day Motion, the Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill, was tabled in the House of Commons. While the Government's recent Ten Point Plan is an important step towards tackling the UK's carbon emissions, this Bill recognises that our carbon footprint extends beyond the UK's borders. The Bill calls for:

- the UK to make and enact a serious plan to combat climate change. This means dealing with our real fair share of emissions so that we don't go over critical global rises in temperature.
- our entire carbon footprint be taken into account (in the UK and overseas).
- the protection and conservation of nature here and overseas along supply chains, recognising the damage we cause through the goods we consume.
- those in power not to depend on technology to save the day, which is used as an excuse to carry on polluting as usual.

Many Oxfordshire residents have made it clear through social media and by forming campaign groups that they want to see this Bill succeed. This Council agrees with the principles of this Bill and supports Oxfordshire residents in their efforts to see it come into law. This Council, our residents and all local bodies have a role in tackling climate change, and we therefore ask to Leader to urge Oxfordshire's MPs to support this Bill, in order to maximise opportunities for local authorities, communities and businesses to make a real difference in combating climate change and reducing global carbon emissions."

Following debate, the Motion was put to the vote and was carried by 51 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.

RESOLVED: Accordingly.

84/20 MOTION BY ARASH FATEMIAN

(Agenda Item 18)

Councillor Fatemian moved and Councillor Reeves seconded the following Motion:

"This Council welcomes recent funding awards for Active Travel measures, and the hard work undertaken by all to encourage greater levels of cycling and walking across the county, including but not limited to:

- The successes of attracting the Women's Tour
- Lasting improvements in cycling infrastructure
- The award of £2.9m from Tranche 2 of the Emergency Active Travel Fund vs our original allocation of £2.4m
- The award of £1.4m for cycling provision from OXLEP

More needs to be done to improve opportunities for cycling and walking. Oxfordshire is a diverse county with a rich mix of urban, suburban and rural communities. Some communities are better connected for cycling, walking, and other forms of transportation, while others are less so. No single policy will therefore suit all divisions.

As with other modes of transport, diversity of approach is needed. What works in cycling and walking for Banbury and its hilly surrounds will not necessarily suit the comparatively flatter and better-established commuter routes between Oxford, Abingdon and the Culham science park. A more consultative approach to policymaking is therefore needed to ensure more collaborative and effective policymaking.

Accordingly, this Council calls on the Leader to:

(a) abolish the post of Cycling Champion; and
(b) establish a cross-party, multi-locality Cabinet Advisory Group (CAG) for cycling and walking to better inform strategic decision-making making on cycling infrastructure;
(c) ensure that this CAG directly influences the next LTP to ensure that the needs of each locality and its cyclists and pedestrians are better served."

Councillor Haywood moved and Councillor John Sanders seconded the following amendment as shown in bold italics and strikethrough below:

"This Council welcomes recent funding awards for Active Travel measures, and the hard work undertaken ~~by all~~ to encourage greater levels of cycling and walking across the county, including ~~but not limited to~~:

- ~~The successes of attracting the Women's Tour~~
- Lasting improvements in cycling infrastructure

- The award of £2.9m from Tranche 2 of the Emergency Active Travel Fund vs our original allocation of £2.4m
- The award of £1.4m for cycling provision from OXLEP

More needs to be done to improve opportunities for cycling and walking. Oxfordshire is a diverse county with a rich mix of urban, suburban and rural communities. Some communities are better connected for cycling, walking, and other forms of transportation, while others are less so. No single policy will therefore suit all divisions.

As with other modes of transport, diversity of approach is needed. ~~What works in cycling and walking for Banbury and its hilly surrounds will not necessarily suit the comparatively flatter and better-established commuter routes between Oxford, Abingdon and the Culham science park.~~ A more consultative approach to policymaking is therefore needed to ensure more collaborative and effective policymaking.

Accordingly, this Council calls on the Leader to:

(a) ~~abolish the post of Cycling Champion~~; ~~and~~ ***implement the motion passed at full council (Nov 2018) fully;***

(b) establish a cross-party, multi-locality Cabinet Advisory Group (CAG) for cycling and walking to better inform strategic decision-making making on cycling infrastructure;
(c) ensure that this CAG directly influences the next LTP to ensure that the needs of each locality and its cyclists and pedestrians are better served;
(d) ***develop a role to ensure the outputs of this CAG are implemented."***

Following debate, the amendment was put to the vote and was lost by 30 votes to 29.

The substantive Motion was then put to the vote and was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED: (unanimously)

"This Council welcomes recent funding awards for Active Travel measures, and the hard work undertaken by all to encourage greater levels of cycling and walking across the county, including but not limited to:

- The successes of attracting the Women's Tour
- Lasting improvements in cycling infrastructure
- The award of £2.9m from Tranche 2 of the Emergency Active Travel Fund vs our original allocation of £2.4m
- The award of £1.4m for cycling provision from OXLEP

More needs to be done to improve opportunities for cycling and walking. Oxfordshire is a diverse county with a rich mix of urban, suburban and rural communities. Some communities are better connected for cycling, walking, and other forms of transportation, while others are less so. No single policy will therefore suit all divisions.

As with other modes of transport, diversity of approach is needed. What works in cycling and walking for Banbury and its hilly surrounds will not necessarily suit the comparatively flatter and better-established commuter routes between Oxford, Abingdon and the Culham science park. A more consultative approach to policymaking is therefore needed to ensure more collaborative and effective policymaking.

Accordingly, this Council calls on the Leader to:

(d) abolish the post of Cycling Champion; and
(e) establish a cross-party, multi-locality Cabinet Advisory Group (CAG) for cycling and walking to better inform strategic decision-making making on cycling infrastructure;
(f) ensure that this CAG directly influences the next LTP to ensure that the needs of each locality and its cyclists and pedestrians are better served."

..... in the Chair

Date of signing .....