

## OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

**MINUTES** of the meeting held on Tuesday, 11 February 2020 commencing at 10.30 am and finishing at 3.30 pm.

**Present:**

Councillor Les Sibley – in the Chair

Councillors:

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

*The Council considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting, together with additional papers circulated prior to the meeting and a Schedule of Addenda and decided as set out below. Except insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda, reports, additional papers and schedule, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.*

**1/20 MINUTES**  
(Agenda Item 1)

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 5 November 2019 were approved and signed as an accurate record.

**2/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

(Agenda Item 2)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Sobia Afridi and Councillor Hilary Hibbert-Biles.

**3/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

(Agenda Item 3)

Councillors Bartholomew, Gawrysiak, E. Smith, Thompson, Fawcett, Hannaby, Johnston, Webber, Rooke and Roberts, for the sake of transparency, declared non-pecuniary interests in Agenda Item 9 (Arrangements for SODC Local Plan following Holding Direction by the Secretary of State) on the basis that they were dual hatters.

**4/20 OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS**

(Agenda Item 4)

Council welcomed Councillor Pete Sudbury, newly elected County Councillor for Wallingford.

Council received a statement which outlined the latest guidance in relation to the Corona Virus.

Council sent its thoughts and warm wishes to Keith Mitchell and his family.

Council paid tribute and held a minute's silence in memory of former County Councillor and Chairman of the Council, Ann Spokes Symonds and former County Councillor Phillip (John) Baston.

The Chairman thanked members for their attendance at his Charity Concert which had raised money for the Soldiers of the Museum and the ABF Soldiers' Charity. The Chairman thanked Tim Stimpson and Sara Lenihan for their help in making the evening such a success.

**5/20 APPOINTMENTS**

(Agenda Item 5)

**RESOLVED:** Council noted the following appointments:

Performance Scrutiny Committee

Councillor Jeanette Matelot in place of Councillor Liam Walker.

Councillor Hudspeth had given notice of a number of changes to Cabinet Member portfolios and membership as set out in the Schedule of Business to the Meeting. The changes would come into effect come into effect on 1 February 2020.

## **6/20 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS**

(Agenda Item 6)

Council received the following Petition and Public Address:

A Petition from Mrs Beverley Darlison, on behalf of the Milton Heights Action Group requesting that the Council take all necessary steps to preserve and maintain the care and support of those at Hft Milton Heights who were threatened with the impending closure of the site.

Public Addresses – Agenda Item 9

The Leader of South Oxfordshire District Council, Sue Cooper urged the Council to reject the officer recommendations on the basis that the Secretary of State removing of a statutory power from one local authority to another would have a very serious impact on local Democracy and working relationships. Within local government. There was no formal public decision of SODC to withdraw the emerging local plan; the directive from the SoS had delayed any further work on the plan and the housing infrastructure funding on much needed roads in Didcot. SODC agreed with the SoS that the Local Plan was unsatisfactory, so she was therefore bemused that the SoS had said that the local plan should proceed, it was inconsistent. SODC residents had voted against the plan in the elections in May. She further outlined concerns regarding the financial implications of the Council taking over the Local Plan in that Oxfordshire would get the money, but that it would come from SODC and they had no idea how much it would be. She reminded Council that they were all part of the Housing & Growth Deal and that they needed to work together in the interests of the residents of Oxfordshire and that SODC intended to recognise that and go along with the numbers in the deal.

Professor Richard Harding spoke against the recommendations on behalf of CPRE, who contended the plan on the basis that it was flawed. They believed the allocation of housing was far higher than was needed by any scientific or rational method, but crucially that the draft plan had no recognition of the climate emergency facing the country; no targets for emission reductions; it had no plans to protect and enhance the natural environment. The proposed housing around Oxford would severely damage the greenbelt. The plan was for a car-based society completely unsuited to the 21<sup>st</sup> century and would do immeasurable damage to the local environment and social fabric of South Oxfordshire. The last district election result of the ruling party being overturned was as a direct result of people objecting to the overdevelopment of SODC set out in the plan. SODC had a valid plan to 2027.

He believed the SoS Holding Direction which meant that SODC could not even debate their local plan, let alone withdraw or start a new plan was a complete denial of freedom of speech and local democracy.

Ms Alice Bragg, speaking on behalf of A Better South Oxfordshire against the recommendations to take over control of SODC local plan which would affect thousands of residents in SODC. The take over would not be because the Council had been deemed unfit such as Rotherum, although this intervention would suggest that they were. The recommendations would strip locally elected councillors of their ability to do their duty. She suggested that there needed to be very serious grounds to take this course of action and requested that the Council ask themselves the question of what it was SODC councillors had done to have their powers stripped from them, and that if they could not answer this question honestly and with all the information laid bear and that if they could not justify the enormity of what they were being asked to do to reject the recommendation.

Mr Mark Stevenson, The Clays Organic Market Garden spoke against the recommendations on the basis that the recommendation would have a profound impact on local democracy and the climate emergency. Residents of SODC elected councillors to act on their behalf. The previous Council had not, they had promised to protect the greenbelt and then didn't and the plan proposed more housing than was desired or required. The plan seemed to be more about creating profit for businesses than providing thriving sustainable communities. Therefore, local residents voted a new council in on the basis that they would fight against unsustainable development and work together to achieve it. In relation to Climate change he explained that building a new house on average omitted about 50 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>. There was no room for unnecessary building. The poor energy performance of the current stock of houses, was in his opinion completely unnecessary as zero carbon development had been around since 2002. There was no attempt in LTP 2034 to recognise any bioregional awareness, water resilience or food security.

Ms Mandy Rigault, spoke against the recommendations on behalf of all the local residents who had rejected the Plan, on the basis that the recommendation was only about Money. The newly elected administration had voted against the previous administrations plan in which 6 out of the 7 proposed developments were in the Greenbelt. This had frustrated the County Council as the £215 million promised by the growth deal was contingent on every district having a local plan. She believed that the proposal was because central government wanted to control SODC and that if the Council agreed it would be striking a blow at the principal of democracy itself. It would set a dangerous precedent for the Government to change the rules every time a local authority dared to adopt a course of action in opposition to the Government. She believed that if the County Council chose Money over Democracy it would be a historical moment.

Mr Ian Ashley spoke as a member of A Better South Oxfordshire urging the Council to reject the recommendations, on the basis that to accept the invitation would be completely undemocratic. He refuted the suggestion that SODC did not have a plan that would prevent speculative development; the plan that was adopted in 2012 provided adequate protection until such time that a suitable replacement for the 2034 could be adopted. He believed the

risks to the County Council would be substantial, including legal challenge, the distraction from the day to day job the council had to perform, and disenfranchised SODC electorate and the knock-on effect to the rest of the districts in the County wondering if they are next. He suggested that, rather than undermine SODC Councillors, the Council should liaise with Government to find a way how to secure the necessary infrastructure and public service funding before new houses are built and without pre-conditions.

Dr Sue Roberts spoke against the recommendations on the basis that she believed that there was more housing per person in this county than there ever had been; that homelessness was not caused by a lack of housing and that building more homes did not reduce their price. In 2014 the Strategic Housing Market Assessment doubled the previous allocation set down by Labour to two whole new Oxfords by 2031, well in excess of need according to Dominique Raab. The SODC Plan for 2034 allocated land for 10,000 more than that target, which would cause carbon dioxide damage, cutting up the landscape and killing off wildlife and eating up high grade farmland - she warned that once the natural land was gone so were we. She believed what was proposed was illegal and that for the County Council to take over the Plan it must first be withdrawn.

Mr Robin Bennett, Chair of the Green Group SODC spoke against the recommendations on the basis that in the elections in the Green Group had gone from 0 to 6 in May 2019 with SODC voters responding to the Green Group's message regarding the over-development of the Greenbelt. This was not Nimbyism. Voters saw a planning system that delivered car dependent sprawl at unaffordable prices. The SoS had said at the launch of the 'Building Better' report that ...." we must have the confidence to say no to schemes that we know in our hearts are bad for the people destined to live in them and the surrounding community... We were in a Climate Crisis which required a different set of actions to those proposed in the old set of Local Plans. In April SODC declared a Climate Emergency which demanded a review of the council policies and the Plan had had no such review. He questioned why thousands of homes were being built now that would need to be retro-fitted tomorrow? Mr Jenerick had said that he wanted to Zero Carbon houses being built as standard in the next five years. The pressure on the plan was the need for roads to connect Culham Science Centre and the Growth Deal, the Plan including thousands more houses than required by the Growth Deal. He believed it was up to the SoS to use Political will to turn positive discussion with officials at MHCLG into a solution and that a method to allow SODC to work on a new plan that made commitments around the Growth Deal and HIFF ought to be possible or alternatively a clear indication should be given on how significant changes could be made to the submitted Plan in the inspection process beyond the limited scope so far permitted.

Mr Peter Emery spoke against the recommendations on the basis that the recommendation represented a 'disturbing power grab' by Mr Jenrick to remove Statutory planning powers from SODC Council. SODC had recently gone from being Conservative Led to Liberal Democrat/Green control. He

believed the Local Plan housing numbers were at the heart of the election and that Mr Jenerick now wanted to pass those powers onto the Conservative led County Council. In doing so, he had sighted the White Paper which was still not passed 3 years later. He believed there was no legal basis on which to accuse SODC of not carrying out their responsibilities correctly and there was no planning reason to remove powers from SODC. SODC had a mandate from the residents of South Oxfordshire to review the local Plan. OCC had no such powers. He urged the Council to vote against the proposal.

Mr Ian Middleton, speaking as a SODC Councillor against the recommendations, spoke of his concern over the precedent being set if the County were to accept the recommendation. The Local Plan was not a County matter, only district councils had the democratic mandate to develop local plans and the role should not be traded between councils as a matter of political expediency. Last year councillors were voted in on the basis of what they would do if they got in. The Council were now keeping their promise by looking again at their local plan – they were not saying they would scrap the plan only re-examine it. By preventing that, the SoS was telling those people that their votes counted for nothing. He believed this was only happening because the Council was no longer ruled by the Conservatives and the SoS wanted to give it to a Conservative led Council that would tow the line which was pre-determination. Localism only mattered if councils followed a rigid national dogma. He warned the Council against taking this route. Instead he asked that they send a message that Oxfordshire councils should not be set against each other and are united in their support of a truly representative local democracy.

SODC Councillor Leigh Rawlins spoke as a local resident and a SODC Councillor urging the Council to reject the recommendations which he believed to be an attempted coup against local democracy. He stood in the last elections so he could rectify the ELP 2034 plan. The new councillors had a strong mandate for change and there was broad agreement that the HIFF infrastructure was necessary and that the OGD commitment to the supply of 22.8k homes would be honoured and committed to, the truth of which had been grossly misrepresented. The Plan provided for more than 32.6k, there were a lot of site issues; too much greenbelt released; it was dramatically weak on climate change – far worse than the core strategy; density policy was grossly in error and inflexible and the mix continued to provide the ongoing market housing as 4+ bedroom homes – which did not meet the need and the delivery was not achievable and would have led to speculative development. Oxfordshire did not want driven mass inward migration; over-heating of Oxford City; more imbalance of jobs and homes; more long-distance commuting and the associated social cleansing and electoral remodelling implied. He asked the Council to protect the basis of mutual respect on which all Oxfordshire cooperation must be based.

Dr Peter Kirby spoke against the recommendations and expressed his concern regarding the strong erosion of democracy the meeting represented. He believed there had been a three-year campaign of misinformation by the

Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy in order to influence local planning decisions. Outrageous claims had been made in the national and local press by the department's atomic energy, that nuclear fusion research at Culham would provide a commercial nuclear reactor in 20 years. This was to enable an attack on the Greenbelt, under the false flag of exceptional circumstances. He believed fusion research was being used to justify commercial property portfolio in the greenbelt; the construction of a new small town in the greenbelt and further road irrespective of the damage to human health. The claims of fusion were not supported by reality. SODC was a valid fully functioning part of local government and its present political constitution was determined by a lawful democratic process. Interference by Central Government was contrary to that process. He urged the Council to vote against it.

Ms Claire Bird spoke as a local resident against the recommendations on the basis that her community had voted for the present administration because of the local plan and their views on climate change, believing they could make a difference and now that was being taken away from them as they dared to be bold. She felt that although the experience of speaking to the Council was daunting, her overriding fear was about the destruction of green spaces; climate change and how we hadn't fully woken up to it yet and the loss of democracy. She urged the Council that however tangled up they felt in the detail and however much fear they felt about the money, party politics or on this planet power play to step back and look at the bigger picture. The things that really mattered were a sustainable future on this planet and democracy. She had been brave, and she urged the Council to be brave for all of them too.

## **7/20 PAY POLICY STATEMENT - REPORT OF THE REMUNERATION COMMITTEE**

(Agenda Item 7)

In 2012, a stand alone Remuneration Committee was set up to report each year directly to full Council and to make recommendations regarding the Council's Pay Policy Statement. The Council had before it a report of the Remuneration Committee which updated the Council's Pay Policy Statement and set out future proposals of the Remuneration Committee in relation to this area.

**RESOLVED:** (on a Motion by Councillor Hudspeth, seconded by Councillor Brighthouse and carried nem con) to:

- (a) receive the report of the Remuneration Committee;
- (b) approve the revised Pay Policy Statement at Annex 1 to this report;
- (c) approve the Gender Pay Gap Data Summary at Annex 2 to this report.

**8/20 CORPORATE PLAN AND SERVICE & RESOURCE PLANNING  
2020/21 - 2023/24**

(Agenda Item 8)

Before the Council was the Corporate Plan and Service & Resource Planning reports and annexes, an Addenda setting out the changes to the Cabinet's proposed revenue budget for 2020/21 and Medium Term Financial Plan for 2021/22 to 2023/24 arising from information received after the publication of Council papers on 3 February; the Labour and Liberal Democrat Group's joint amendment and the Leader's Budget Speech as set out in Annex 2 to the Schedule of Business.

With the consent of Council, Councillor Hudspeth moved and Councillor Brighouse seconded his motion, amended at the suggestion of the Labour and Liberal Democrat Group as set out in bold italics below:

***The Council is RECOMMENDED (in respect of revenue) to approve a budget for 2020/21 and a medium term financial plan for 2020/21 – 2023/24 including the amendment as proposed by the Labour Group & Liberal Democrat Group to approve the allocation of £200k in 2020/21 to develop an up to date assessment of the services young people in Oxfordshire want and need. To identify whether these services are currently being delivered and to investigate future service delivery options to meet that need. This funding will be met from the Budget Priorities Reserve.***

Following debate, the motion as amended was put to the vote and carried by 60 votes to 0, with 1 abstention.

Voting was as follows:

Councillors voting for the motion (60)

Azad, Banfield, Bartholomew, Bartington, Bearder, Billington, Brighouse, Buckley, Bulmer, Carter, Cherry, Clarke, Constance, Corkin, Fatemian, Fawcett, Fenton, Field-Johnson, Fitzgerald O'Connor, Fox-Davies, Gawrysiak, Gray, Griffiths, Handley, Hanna, Hannaby, Harrod, Haywood, Heathcoat, Howson, Hudspeth, Johnston, Ilt, Leffman, Lindsay-Gale, Lygo, Mallon, McLLveen, Matelot, Mathew, Phillips, Pressel, Price, Reeves, Reynolds, Roberts, Rooke, Sames, Gill Sanders, John Sanders, Sibley, Emily Smith, Roz Smith, Stratford, Sudbury, Thompson, Turnbull, Waive, Walker, Webber,

Councillors voting against the motion (0)

Councillors abstaining on the motion (1)

Harris

It was accordingly:"



**RESOLVED:** (60 votes to 0, with 1 abstention) to:

(in respect of revenue) to approve a budget for 2020/21 and a medium term financial plan for 2020/21 – 2023/24 including the amendment as proposed by the Labour Group & Liberal Democrat Group to approve the allocation of £200k in 2020/21 to develop an up to date assessment of the services young people in Oxfordshire want and need. To identify whether these services are currently being delivered and to investigate future service delivery options to meet that need. This funding will be met from the Budget Priorities Reserve.

- (a) approve the Corporate Plan 2020-2024 as set out in Section 2 and delegate authority to the Corporate Director Customers and Organisational Development in consultation with the Leader and relevant portfolio holder(s) to make appropriate changes to the priorities framework.
- (b) have regard to the statutory report of the Director of Finance (at Section 3) in approving recommendations c to e below;
- (c) (in respect of the budget and medium term financial plan) approve:
  - (1) the council tax and precept calculations for 2020/21 set out in Section 4.3 and in particular:
    - (i) a precept of £391,445,480;
    - (ii) a council tax for band D equivalent properties of £1,527.44;
  - (2) a budget for 2020/21 as set out in Section 4.4;
  - (3) a medium term plan for 2020/21 to 2023/24 as set out in Section 4.1 (which incorporates changes to the existing medium term financial plan as set out in Section 4.2;
  - (4) virement arrangements to operate within the approved budget for 2020/21 as set out in Section 4.5;
  - (5) the Financial Strategy for 2020/21 at Section 4.6;
  - (6) the Earmarked Reserves and General Balances Policy Statement 2019/20 at Section 4.7 including
    - (i) the Chief Finance Officer's recommended level of General Balances for 2020/21 (Section 4.7), and
    - (ii) the planned level of Earmarked Reserves for 2019/20 to 2023/24 (Section 4.7.1)
  - (7) the use of Dedicated Schools Grant (provisional allocation) for 2020/21 as set out in Section 4.8.
- (d) (in respect of capital) approve:
  - (1) the Capital & Investment Strategy for 2020/21 – 2029/30 including the Prudential Indicators and Minimum Revenue Provision Methodology Statement as set out in Section 4.9;
  - (2) a Capital Programme for 2019/20 to 2029/30 as set out in Section 4.9.1 which includes new capital proposals set out in Section 4.9.2 and the Highways Maintenance Programme to 2024/25 set out in Section 4.9.3; and

- (3) the Investment Strategy for 2020/21 set out in Section 4.9.4.
- (e) (in respect of treasury management) approve:
  - (1) the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy for 2020/21 at Section 4.9.5 including the Treasury Management Prudential Indicators and the Specified Investment and Non-Specified Investment Instruments.
  - (2) the continued delegation of authority to withdraw or advance additional funds to/from external fund managers to the Treasury Management Strategy Team;
  - (3) that any further changes required to the 2020/21 strategy be delegated to the Chief Finance Officer in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Finance;
- (f) delegate authority to the Leader of the Council, following consultation with the Director of Finance and the Cabinet Member for Finance, to make appropriate changes to the budget for 2020/21.

**9/20 ARRANGEMENTS FOR SODC LOCAL PLAN FOLLOWING HOLDING DIRECTION BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.**

(Agenda Item 9)

South Oxfordshire District Council had submitted its Local Plan to the Planning Inspectorate for examination in March 2019. In October 2019, following a period in which the new South Oxfordshire administration were considering either withdrawing or significantly amending their Local Plan, they were issued with a Holding Direction by the Secretary of State. This had the effect of preventing them from withdrawing their plan. Since October discussions had been taking place between the District Council and the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government to try and find a way to allow the due process of examining the Local Plan to continue. The holding direction remained in place.

In his most recent letter to South Oxfordshire District Council on the 7 January 2020, the Secretary of State reiterated that the Government was committed to ensuring every area had an up to date and suitably ambitious Local Plan in place. In addition to considering Local Plan intervention under section 21 and 27 the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (“the 2004 Act”), he also stated that he was considering whether it was appropriate to exercise powers under section 27A of, and paragraph 7B of Schedule A1 to, the 2004 Act and invite Oxfordshire County Council to prepare the South Oxfordshire Local Plan.

Paragraph 7B of Schedule A1 to the 2004 Act provides:

“If the Secretary of State—

- (a) thinks that a lower-tier planning authority are failing or omitting to do anything it is necessary for them to do in connection with the **preparation, revision or adoption** of a development plan document, and

- (b) invites the upper-tier county council to **prepare or revise** the document, the upper-tier county council may **prepare or revise** (as the case may be) the development plan document.”

Paragraph 44 of the Explanatory Notes as set out in the Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017 (the amending legislation) states: “Where a county council accepts the invitation, they are responsible for preparing the document and having it examined. They may then approve the document (or approve it subject to modifications recommended by the inspector)”.

The Secretary of State’s letter of 7 January asked South Oxfordshire District Council to outline, by 31st January 2020, any exceptional circumstances as to why they did not have a plan in place that should be taken into account when a decision on next steps was made. The Secretary of State’s decision was awaited as to how he now intended to proceed, including whether to formally invite the County Council to prepare the South Oxfordshire Local Plan. Should the County Council agree to accept any such invitation then it would require satisfactory assurances that, as set out under the provisions of the 2004 Act, its costs would be fully recovered.

Council were asked to consider whether or not it would accept an invitation by the Secretary of State, to prepare or revise the South Oxfordshire Local Plan pursuant to powers under section 27A of, and paragraph 7B of Schedule A1 to, the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Councillor Liz Brighouse moved and Councillor Laura Price seconded the following amendment to the recommendations as shown in bold italics below:

***Given that:***

1. ***SODC had not been able to come up with suggestions which would change the previously agreed Local Plan in a way which would honour the promises made to residents when they were elected.***
2. ***The SODC Local Plan had implications beyond the District.***
3. ***The houses proposed in the Plan to be developed in Grenoble Road and the associated opening of the Cowley Branch Line would meet both the desperate need for housing close to Oxford and the need for such a development to be cognisant of the Climate Emergency.***
4. ***The traffic issues in Didcot need to be addressed urgently:***

**In the event of the receipt of an invitation by the Secretary of State to prepare or revise the South Oxfordshire Local Plan pursuant to powers under section 27A of, and paragraph 7B of Schedule A1 to, the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, Council is RECOMMENDED to accept such an invitation subject to satisfactory assurances being received in relation to the recovery of its costs.**

Following debate, the amendment was put to the vote and was carried by 43 votes to 16, with 2 abstentions.

During debate on the substantive Motion Councillor Harris moved that the matter be referred back until a full legal and risk assessment could be carried out. The Chairman ruled that the motion was not a procedural motion and therefore not allowed.

During debate on the substantive motion, Councillor Hanna moved and Councillor Harris seconded a procedural motion in line with section 15.10.3 of the Council Procedural Rules to adjourn the debate pending further legal advice.

The Motion was put to the vote and was lost by 38 votes to 16, with 5 abstentions.

Councillor Roz Smith and 6 other members stood in their seats to require that the vote be recorded in the minutes.

The substantive motion as amended was put to the vote and was carried by 39 votes to 16, with 4 abstentions.

Voting was as follows:

Councillors voting for the motion (39)

Azad, Banfield, Bartholomew, Bartington, Billington, Brighthouse, Bulmer, Cherry, Clarke, Constance, Corkin, Fatemian, Fenton, Fitzgerald O'Connor, Fox-Davies, Gawrysiak, Griffiths, Handley, Harrod, Haywood, Heathcoat, Hudspeth, Ilot, Lygo, Mallon, McLLveen, Phillips, Price, Reeves, Reynolds, Sames, Gill Sanders, John Sanders, Sibley Stratford, Thompson, Turnbull, Waine, Walker.

Councillors voting against the motion (16)

Bearder, Buckley, Fawcett, Grey, Hanna, Hannaby, Harris, Howson, Johnston, Leffman, Mallon, Roberts, Rooke, Emily Smith, Roz Smith, Sudbury.

Councillors abstaining on the motion (4)

Carter, Field-Johnson, Lindsay-Gale, Matelot.

It was accordingly:"

**RESOLVED:** (by 39 votes to 16, 4 abstentions)

Given that:

1. SODC has not been able to come up with suggestions which would change the previously agreed Local Plan in a way which would honour the promises made to residents when they were elected.
2. The SODC Local Plan has implications beyond the District.

3. The houses proposed in the Plan to be developed in Grenoble Road and the associated opening of the Cowley Branch Line will meet both the desperate need for housing close to Oxford and the need for such a development to be cognisant of the Climate Emergency.
4. The traffic issues in Didcot need to be addressed urgently:

In the event of the receipt of an invitation by the Secretary of State to prepare or revise the South Oxfordshire Local Plan pursuant to powers under section 27A of, and paragraph 7B of Schedule A1 to, the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, Council is to accept such an invitation subject to satisfactory assurances being received in relation to the recovery of its costs.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing .....