

# Minutes

of a meeting of the

## Council



held on **Wednesday 9 October 2019 at 7.00 pm**  
at **The Ridgeway, The Beacon, Portway, Wantage, OX12 9BY**

### Open to the public, including the press

#### Present:

Members: Councillors Margaret Crick (Chair), Jerry Avery, Matthew Barber, Paul Barrow, Ron Batstone, Eric Batts, Samantha Bowring, Nathan Boyd, Cheryl Briggs, Andy Cooke, Andrew Crawford, Eric de la Harpe, Amos Duveen, Neil Fawcett, Andy Foulsham, Hayleigh Gascoigne, David Grant, Debby Hallett, Jenny Hannaby, Simon Howell, Alison Jenner, Bob Johnston, Diana Lugova, Robert Maddison, Sarah Medley, Patrick O'Leary, Helen Pighills, Mike Pighills, Judy Roberts, Val Shaw, Janet Shelley, Emily Smith, Bethia Thomas, Elaine Ware, Catherine Webber and Richard Webber

Officers: Steven Corrigan, Nadeem Din, Adrian Duffield, Holly Jones, Margaret Reed and Clare Roberts

Number of members of the public: 10

#### **Co.25 Apologies for absence**

An apology for absence was submitted on behalf of Councillor Max Thompson.

#### **Co.26 Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** to approve the minutes of the meeting of Council held on 17 July 2019 as a correct record and agree that the chair sign them as such.

#### **Co.27 Declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest**

Councillors Batts, Bowring, Crawford, Fawcett, Hannaby and Smith made statements declaring that they are a member of, or in receipt of a pension from, the Oxfordshire Pension Fund.

Councillor Johnston made a statement that he is a representative on the Local Pension Board of the Oxfordshire Pension Fund Committee.

Councillor Barber made a statement that as Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner he had a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 8 "Budget for replacement CCTV equipment" and agenda item 11 "Appointment of substitute member to the Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel".

Councillor Medley made a statement that she is employed by UKAEA which could benefit from any funding from the Housing Infrastructure Fund.

All of the above remained in the meeting and took part in the discussion and/or vote on the items.

## **Co.28 Urgent business and chair's announcements**

The chair provided general housekeeping information. There were no items of urgent business.

## **Co.29 Public participation**

The chair reported that she would invite public speakers who had registered to address Council on an agenda item to do so at the item.

Ms Lynda Crowley, Chair of Radley Parish Council, addressed Council in respect of a planning application for the development of 283 homes in the north of the parish. She stated that a condition requested by the Planning Committee in respect of upgrades to sewerage works had not been included in the planning permission issued by officers. The parish council was not satisfied by the responses received from the council to date.

## **Co.30 Petitions**

None.

## **Co.31 Local Plan 2031 Part 2 - options for adoption**

A correction to the report was circulated to all councillors at the meeting. Paragraph 75 of the report provided an indicative timetable for preparing a new local plan following adoption. The timetable as published did not include dates for the latter stages of the plan making process. The table below sets out the complete indicative timetable:

<b>October 2019</b>	<b>Decision to adopt LPP2 (returning to Reg 19)</b>
<b>November 2019 – November 2020</b>	Draft Reg 19 Local Plan production
<b>Spring 2021</b>	Consultation on Reg 19 Local Plan (six weeks)
<b><sup>1</sup> April 2021 – October 2021</b>	Submission and Examination in Public
<b>November 2021</b>	Inspector's report
<b>December 2021</b>	Adoption

<sup>1</sup> Once the Plan is submitted for Examination the timetable for the examination is set by the Inspector and may be longer than that indicated

Mr Michael Tyce addressed Council on behalf of the Campaign to Protect Rural England. He stated that the Plan was unsound because the housing numbers contained within it were too high and based on the outdated housing needs assessment from 2014. The Plan also included an allocation of Oxford's unmet housing need, figures for which had not yet been tested at the Oxford Local Plan examination hearing. The Plan would have a detrimental impact on the Green Belt, put a strain on services and impact social cohesion. He urged Council to withdraw the Plan or defer consideration of it until Oxford's unmet housing need figures had been tested.

Mr Simon Jenkins, Chair of Uffington Parish Council, addressed Council. He urged Council to adopt the Plan to provide certainty, protect against speculative development and the risk of a judicial review.

Mr Richard Bartle, Chair of Shrivenham Parish Council, addressed Council. He urged Council to adopt the Plan. To not adopt the Plan would have serious implications for villages with further speculative development which would impact on the existing infrastructure, schools and medical facilities.

Council considered Cabinet's recommendations made at its meeting on 4 October 2019 on the options for the adoption of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2 (LPP2).

Council was advised that, at its meeting on 19 September 2019, the Scrutiny Committee considered a report on options for the adoption of the LPP2. The committee expressed concern that the process to form and describe the options, and the analysis of those options, provided insufficient detail to allow councillors to make an informed choice. In particular, councillors believed that the report had not sufficiently analysed the risks of each option. The Cabinet report provided the additional information requested. In addition, the confidential QC legal advice was circulated to all councillors at the request of the committee.

The majority of councillors supported Cabinet's recommendation to adopt the LPP2. However, a number of councillors, in supporting the adoption, expressed reservations. They expressed the view that the plan provided for too high a number of houses, included provision to meet Oxford City's unmet housing need without an assessment of that need, removed land from the Green Belt and did not include measures to address the climate emergency. Councillors acknowledged that the risk of not adopting the plan presented a number of risks to the council and Vale communities including an uncertain planning environment, communities being vulnerable to speculative developments, the costs of appeals to the council and the potential loss of infrastructure funding.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 67, which provides for a recorded vote if three members request one, the Chairman called for a recorded vote on the motion which was declared carried with the voting as follows:

<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstentions</b>
<b>Councillors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>	<b>Councillors</b>
Jerry Avery		Margaret Crick
Matthew Barber		Mike Pighills
Paul Barrow		

<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstentions</b>
Ron Batstone		
Eric Batts		
Samantha Bowring		
Nathan Boyd		
Cheryl Briggs		
Andy Cooke		
Andrew Crawford		
Eric de la Harpe		
Amos Duveen		
Neil Fawcett		
Andy Foulsham		
Hayleigh Gascoigne		
David Grant		
Debby Hallett		
Jenny Hannaby		
Simon Howell		
Bob Johnston		
Alison Jenner		
Diana Lugova		
Robert Maddison		
Sarah Medley		
Patrick O'Leary		
Helen Pighils		
Judy Roberts		
Val Shaw		
Janet Shelley		
Emily Smith		
Bethia Thomas		
Elaine Ware		
Catherine Webber		
Richard Webber		
<b>Total: 34</b>	<b>Total: 0</b>	<b>Total: 2</b>

**RESOLVED:** to

1. note the conclusions, including the Main Modifications, of the independent Inspector who was appointed to examine the Local Plan 2031 Part 2;
2. note the process followed to develop the options in relation to the Local Plan 2031 Part 2;
3. accept the Inspector's report and recommendation and adopt the Local Plan 2031 Part 2; and
4. authorise the head of planning in consultation with the Cabinet member for planning to make any minor amendments, typographical and grammar corrections to the documents prior to publication.

**Co.32 Budget for replacement CCTV equipment**

Council considered Cabinet's recommendation, made at its meeting on 4 October 2019, on the procurement of new CCTV recording and monitoring equipment for the CCTV control room.

**RESOLVED:** to approve the transfer of £22,000 from the capital contingency programme and to create a new capital programme for the procurement of new CCTV recording and monitoring equipment for the CCTV control room.

### **Co.33      Review of political balance**

Council considered the report of the head of legal and democratic on a review of the political balance following the resignation of Councillor Ruth Molyneux as a member of the Liberal Democrat Group.

**RESOLVED:** to

1. appoint the membership, substitutes and chairs/chairmen and vice-chairs/vice-chairmen as indicated to sit on them (see table below);

<b>Planning Committee, 9 Members</b>	
<b>Liberal Democrat (8 – one seat to be offered to Conservative Group)</b>	<b>Conservative (1) plus additional Liberal Democrat seat</b>
Jerry Avery	Eric Batts
Ron Batstone	Janet Shelley
Bob Johnston (Chair)	
Diana Lugova	
Rob Maddison	
Val Shaw (Vice-Chair)	
Max Thompson	
<b>Preferred substitutes</b>	
<b>Liberal Democrat (7)</b>	<b>Conservative (3)</b>
Paul Barrow	Nathan Boyd
Andy Cooke	Elaine Ware
Amos Duveen	Simon Howell
Hayleigh Gascoigne	
David Grant	
Eric de la Harpe	
Mike Pighills	

<b>Scrutiny Committee, 9 Members</b>		
<b>Liberal Democrat (7)</b>	<b>Conservative (1)</b>	<b>Non-group councillor</b>
Jerry Avery	Nathan Boyd (Chairman)	Cheryl Briggs
Ron Batstone		

Samantha Bowring	
Andy Foulsham	
Rob Maddison	
Mike Pighills	
Max Thompson	
<b>Preferred substitutes</b>	
<b>Liberal Democrat (7)</b>	<b>Conservative (3)</b>
Paul Barrow	Elaine Ware
Hayleigh Gascoigne	Eric Batts
Alison Jenner	Janet Shelley
Diana Lugova	
Sarah Medley	
Patrick O'Leary	
Vacancy	

<b>Joint Scrutiny Committee, 5 Members</b>	
<b>Liberal Democrat (4)</b>	<b>Conservative (1)</b>
Andy Cooke	Nathan Boyd (Co-Chairman)
Amos Duveen	
Hayleigh Gascoigne	
David Grant	
<b>Preferred substitutes</b>	
<b>Liberal Democrat (4)</b>	<b>Conservative (3)</b>
Samantha Bowring	Elaine Ware
Andy Foulsham	Eric Batts
Alison Jenner	Janet Shelley
Max Thompson	

<b>Joint Audit and Governance Committee, 4 Members</b>	
<b>Liberal Democrat (3)</b>	<b>Conservative (1)</b>
Amos Duveen	Simon Howell (Co-Chairman)
Andy Foulsham	
Eric de la Harpe	
<b>Preferred substitutes</b>	
<b>Liberal Democrat (3)</b>	<b>Conservative (3)</b>

Samantha Bowring	Elaine Ware
Andy Cooke	Nathan Boyd
Alison Jenner	Janet Shelley

### Community Governance and Electoral Issues Committee, 6 Members

<b>Liberal Democrat (5)</b>	<b>Conservative (1)</b>
Paul Barrow	Janet Shelley
Ron Batstone (Chair)	
Alison Jenner	
Sarah Medley (Vice-Chair)	
Mike Pighills	
<b>Preferred substitutes</b>	
<b>Liberal Democrat (5)</b>	<b>Conservative (3)</b>
Patrick O'Leary	Simon Howell
Max Thompson	Elaine Ware
Vacancy	Eric Batts
Vacancy	
Vacancy	

### Joint Staff Committee, 3 Members

<b>Liberal Democrat (2)</b>	<b>Conservative (1)</b>
Debby Hallett	Elaine Ware
Emily Smith	
<b>Substitutes</b>	
<b>Liberal Democrat</b>	<b>Conservative</b>
The Leader may be substituted by another Cabinet member. Other members of the Committee may be substituted by any member of that Council's political group (executive or non-executive).	Other members of the Committee may be substituted by any member of that Council's political group.

### General Licensing Committee, 12 Members

<b>Liberal Democrat (9)</b>	<b>Conservative (2)</b>	<b>Non-group councillor</b>
-----------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------

Jerry Avery	Matt Barber	Ruth Molyneaux
Paul Barrow	Eric Batts	
Ron Batstone (Vice-Chair)		
Margaret Crick		
Debby Hallett		
Alison Jenner (Chair)		
Diana Lugova		
Patrick O'Leary		
Val Shaw		
<b>NO SUBSTITUTES</b>		

<b>Licensing Acts Committee, 12 Members</b>		
<b>Liberal Democrat (9)</b>	<b>Conservative (2)</b>	<b>Non-group councillor</b>
Jerry Avery	Matt Barber	Ruth Molyneaux
Paul Barrow	Eric Batts	
Ron Batstone (Vice-Chair)		
Margaret Crick		
Debby Hallett		
Alison Jenner (Chair)		
Diana Lugova		
Patrick O'Leary		
Val Shaw		
<b>NO SUBSTITUTES</b>		

<b>Appeals Panel, 3 Members</b>	
<b>Liberal Democrat (2)</b>	<b>Non-group councillor (1)</b>
Paul Barrow	Cheryl Briggs
Alison Jenner (Chair)	
<b>PREFERRED SUBSTITUTES</b>	
<b>Liberal Democrat (3)</b>	
Vacancy	
Vacancy	
Vacancy	

- allocate a seat on the Planning Committee to the Liberal Democrat Group;

3. allocate a seat on the Joint Staff Committee to the Conservative Group;
4. (with no councillor voting against) allocate one of the Liberal Democrat Group's seats on the Planning Committee to the Conservative Group;
5. (with no councillor voting against) allocate one of the Liberal Democrat Group's seats on the Appeals Panel to Cheryl Briggs
6. authorise the head of legal and democratic to make appointments to any vacant committee or panel seat and substitute positions in accordance with the wishes of the relevant group leader.

### **Co.34 Constitution Review Task Group**

Council considered a proposal to establish a joint Constitution Review Task Group with South Oxfordshire District Council to undertake a review of the constitution and make recommendations to Council.

**RESOLVED:** to

1. establish a joint Constitution Review Task Group with South Oxfordshire District Council comprising five councillors from each council;
2. allocate three seats to the Liberal Democrat Group and two seats to the Conservative Group and appoint Councillors Debby Hallett, Diana Lugova, Alison Jenner (Liberal Democrat Group) and Councillors Elaine Ware and Nathan Boyd (Conservative Group) to the task group;
3. agree that councillors from the same political group on the council may substitute for this council's appointed representatives.

### **Co.35 Appointment of substitute member to the Thames Valley Police and Crime**

At its meeting on 17 July 2019, Council appointed Councillor Ruth Molyneaux as the substitute member on the Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel. In light of the recent change to Cabinet membership Council considered a proposal to appoint Councillor Jenny Hannaby, Cabinet member with responsibility for community safety, as the substitute member.

**RESOLVED:** to appoint Councillor Jenny Hannaby as the substitute member on the Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel.

### **Co.36 Appointment of independent persons to advise on code of conduct issues**

Council considered the report of the head of legal and democratic and monitoring officer on extending the term of office of two independent persons to advise on code of conduct issues.

**RESOLVED:** to authorise the Monitoring Officer to extend the terms of office of Chris Smith and Martin Wright, the council's independent persons for code of conduct matters until 31 October 2020 pending the receipt of further information on potential changes to the standards framework.

## **Co.37 Report of the leader of the council**

Councillor Emily Smith, Leader of the council, addressed Council. The text of her report is available on the council's [website](#).

## **Co.38 Motions on notice**

### **1. Motion proposed by Councillor Judy Roberts and seconded by Councillor Neil Fawcett**

Council notes that a hierarchy of organisations has grown up which influence regional development, some more accountable than others. These are collectively making increasing incursions into the decision-making abilities of elected local councils and placing significant growth demands on our districts.

These organisations or bodies include:

- England's Economic Heartland
- The Oxford-Cambridge Arc Region
- The Oxfordshire Growth Board (and associated Oxfordshire 2050 Joint Statutory Spatial Plan)
- OxLEP (and the Local Industrial Strategy)

Council notes that officers and members attend meetings related to these bodies, and welcomes the opportunity for regional collaboration, as many of us share the same concerns, but wishes to update its formal position to assist those representing our district.

This Council believes that development within our district must balance the needs of people and their communities, the environment and the local economy. Specifically, it should contribute to this Council's (and the Government's) commitment to carbon neutrality.

It should be based on genuine consultation and demonstrable public support.

It should ensure that infrastructure, both strategic and local, is in place to support development, with the aim of building communities, not just houses.

This Council supports the following approaches **in relation to regional economic growth**:

1. Planned development should demonstrate how it will help our economy move towards its zero-carbon target
2. Housing targets should be based on an up-to-date objective assessment of need
3. Planned housing should reflect the needs of the local community, offering a range of sizes and tenures including genuinely affordable housing to buy, and rent at affordable and social rates
4. Housing developments should be sited near to existing or proposed public, mass and active transport facilities, not based on ever increasing road traffic
5. Seek greater developer contributions to expand rail capacity and bus services and cycle paths
6. All housebuilding and other development should meet zero-carbon standards or better.

7. Strategic planning should reduce the need to travel by building homes near to employment sites
8. The priority for transport investment should be in the rail network (e.g. an electrified East-West rail, electrification of the Didcot-Oxford line, re-opening of Grove Station), improved bus (and similar) services, and substantial investment in 'active travel' – including cycle and pedestrian infrastructure - within and between settlements
9. Opposition to the proposed Oxford-Cambridge Expressway
10. Increasing biodiversity, protecting landscapes, capturing carbon naturally and increasing access for residents to green spaces
11. Genuine consultation with the public on the rate of growth and housing development to produce plans that carry genuine public support
12. Genuine democratic accountability and scrutiny for any plans or strategies that come forward (i.e. we do not support basing spatial planning solely on the Local Industrial Strategy which faced no democratic scrutiny.)
13. Spatial planning decisions to be informed by strong evidence
14. Flexibility in plans and strategies in order to take account of changing circumstances and public opinion

This Council is positive about working with other Oxfordshire authorities, regional colleagues and the Government to deliver growth where it is sustainable, and to provide housing that meets residents' needs. Strategies and plans to achieve this should be based on the above positions.

The majority of councillors welcomed the motion which provided both officers and lead councillors with guidance on the priorities of the new administration and a clear direction of travel particularly in respect of measures to address the climate emergency.

After debate and on being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

**RESOLVED:**

That Council notes that a hierarchy of organisations has grown up which influence regional development, some more accountable than others. These are collectively making increasing incursions into the decision-making abilities of elected local councils and placing significant growth demands on our districts.

These organisations or bodies include:

- England's Economic Heartland
- The Oxford-Cambridge Arc Region
- The Oxfordshire Growth Board (and associated Oxfordshire 2050 Joint Statutory Spatial Plan)
- OxLEP (and the Local Industrial Strategy)

Council notes that officers and members attend meetings related to these bodies, and welcomes the opportunity for regional collaboration, as many of us share the same concerns, but wishes to update its formal position to assist those representing our district.

This Council believes that development within our district must balance the needs of people and their communities, the environment and the local economy. Specifically, it should contribute to this Council's (and the Government's) commitment to carbon neutrality.

It should be based on genuine consultation and demonstrable public support.

It should ensure that infrastructure, both strategic and local, is in place to support development, with the aim of building communities, not just houses.

This Council supports the following approaches **in relation to regional economic growth**:

1. Planned development should demonstrate how it will help our economy move towards its zero-carbon target
2. Housing targets should be based on an up-to-date objective assessment of need
3. Planned housing should reflect the needs of the local community, offering a range of sizes and tenures including genuinely affordable housing to buy, and rent at affordable and social rates
4. Housing developments should be sited near to existing or proposed public, mass and active transport facilities, not based on ever increasing road traffic
5. Seek greater developer contributions to expand rail capacity and bus services and cycle paths
6. All housebuilding and other development should meet zero-carbon standards or better.
7. Strategic planning should reduce the need to travel by building homes near to employment sites
8. The priority for transport investment should be in the rail network (e.g. an electrified East-West rail, electrification of the Didcot-Oxford line, re-opening of Grove Station), improved bus (and similar) services, and substantial investment in 'active travel' – including cycle and pedestrian infrastructure - within and between settlements
9. Opposition to the proposed Oxford-Cambridge Expressway
10. Increasing biodiversity, protecting landscapes, capturing carbon naturally and increasing access for residents to green spaces
11. Genuine consultation with the public on the rate of growth and housing development to produce plans that carry genuine public support
12. Genuine democratic accountability and scrutiny for any plans or strategies that come forward (i.e. we do not support basing spatial planning solely on the Local Industrial Strategy which faced no democratic scrutiny.)
13. Spatial planning decisions to be informed by strong evidence
14. Flexibility in plans and strategies in order to take account of changing circumstances and public opinion

This Council is positive about working with other Oxfordshire authorities, regional colleagues and the Government to deliver growth where it is sustainable, and to provide housing that meets residents' needs. Strategies and plans to achieve this should be based on the above positions.

## **2. Motion proposed by Councillor Bob Johnston and seconded by Councillor Cheryl Briggs**

The Vale of White Horse District Council welcomes the progress made on climate change in as much as Environmental, Social and Governance issues are now recognised as a risk to the Oxfordshire Local Government Pension Scheme. However, it would now like matters to be taken further.

Council requests that the Leader writes to the Chair of the Oxfordshire Pensions Committee asking them to consider as part of its new investment strategy for the Brunel Partnership investing in a passive low carbon fund, now that one is available, and that generates similar financial returns to the wider investment market.

The majority of councillors supported the motion because climate change and investment in fossil fuels present a long term financial risk to the pension fund. As members of the pension fund, the council had a fiduciary duty to protect the pension fund from long-term financial risk associated with the investment in fossil fuels. Fossil fuel divestment and investment in low carbon funds was financially responsible and consistent with the funds' responsibilities.

After debate and on being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

**RESOLVED:**

That Vale of White Horse District Council welcomes the progress made on climate change in as much as Environmental, Social and Governance issues are now recognised as a risk to the Oxfordshire Local Government Pension Scheme. However, it would now like matters to be taken further.

Council requests that the Leader writes to the Chair of the Oxfordshire Pensions Committee asking them to consider as part of its new investment strategy for the Brunel Partnership investing in a passive low carbon fund, now that one is available, and that generates similar financial returns to the wider investment market.

**3. Motion proposed by Councillor Sarah Medley and seconded by Councillor Amos Duveen**

"Council notes that Non-UK EU nationals are part of our shared communities. They are our husbands, wives, parents, friends and colleagues. They are an integral part of our vibrant and thriving district and local economy.

Since 2016 EU nationals were promised again and again that "there will be no change for EU citizens already lawfully resident in the UK and [...] will be treated no less favourably as they are at present". After three years of living in limbo, their homes and livelihoods are yet again being threatened by the further uncertainty brought about by the prospect of a chaotic no-deal Brexit.

Council recognises that some businesses in the Vale report that the uncertainty around Brexit is making it harder for them to recruit and retain staff who are non-UK EU nationals.

Council notes that much work has been undertaken, and significant cost to the public purse, by this council and other public bodies to ensure it can maintain access to key services, should Brexit happen.

But, according to the Home Office's June statistics, only a third of non-UK EU nationals had applied for Settled Status and many of them had been granted the inferior Pre-Settled. There is no way of knowing exactly how many EU nationals need to apply, leaving vulnerable non-UK EU nationals at risk of becoming unlawful residents. Lack of clarity regarding differentiating between EU citizens arriving before and after the UK's exit from the EU could lead to discrimination in the labour market and may prevent many from accessing the services that they are entitled to.

Therefore, Council asks that:

1. Officers prepare a report to the Leader (to be shared with all members) on what more the Council may be able to do to mitigate adverse impacts on the rights of non-UK EU nationals (including but not limited to, informing landlords and employers about immigration status and therefore avoid potential discrimination against non-UK EU nationals)
2. The Leader of the Council writes to the Home Secretary to ask that the current European Settlement Scheme is clarified by:
  - a. Providing a clear deadline for application to the EUSS in case of no-deal exit from the EU
  - b. Providing physical proof of settled status that can be used to access services
  - c. Confirming that there will be no changes to the rights of settled non-UK EU citizens that they currently have by ratifying the Immigration Bill as primary legislation before the exit day”.

Ms Alexandrine Kantor addressed Council in support of the motion. She stressed it was important to seek ways to reach and help EU citizens understand the process required to obtain EU settled status to mitigate against the risk of discrimination and address the uncertainty being experienced by many EU citizens.

Councillors expressed the view that non-UK EU nationals are an integral and valuable part of the community and that the council should do everything possible to ensure information and clarity is provided to those affected.

After debate and on being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

**RESOLVED:**

That Council notes that Non-UK EU nationals are part of our shared communities. They are our husbands, wives, parents, friends and colleagues. They are an integral part of our vibrant and thriving district and local economy.

Since 2016 EU nationals were promised again and again that "there will be no change for EU citizens already lawfully resident in the UK and [...] will be treated no less favourably as they are at present". After three years of living in limbo, their homes and livelihoods are yet again being threatened by the further uncertainty brought about by the prospect of a chaotic no-deal Brexit.

Council recognises that some businesses in the Vale report that the uncertainty around Brexit is making it harder for them to recruit and retain staff who are non-UK EU nationals.

Council notes that much work has been undertaken, and significant cost to the public purse, by this council and other public bodies to ensure it can maintain access to key services, should Brexit happen.

But, according to the Home Office's June statistics, only a third of non-UK EU nationals had applied for Settled Status and many of them had been granted the inferior Pre-Settled. There is no way of knowing exactly how many EU nationals need to apply, leaving vulnerable non-UK EU nationals at risk of becoming unlawful residents. Lack of clarity regarding differentiating between EU citizens arriving before and after the UK's exit from the EU could lead to discrimination in the labour market and may prevent many from accessing the services that they are entitled to.

Therefore, Council asks that:

1. Officers prepare a report to the Leader (to be shared with all members) on what more the Council may be able to do to mitigate adverse impacts on the rights of non-UK EU nationals (including but not limited to, informing landlords and employers about immigration status and therefore avoid potential discrimination against non-UK EU nationals)

2. The Leader of the Council writes to the Home Secretary to ask that the current European Settlement Scheme is clarified by:

- a. Providing a clear deadline for application to the EUSS in case of no-deal exit from the EU
- b. Providing physical proof of settled status that can be used to access services
- c. Confirming that there will be no changes to the rights of settled non-UK EU citizens that they currently have by ratifying the Immigration Bill as primary legislation before the exit day.

**4. With the agreement of Council, Councillor Andrew Crawford moved an altered motion from that set out in the agenda, seconded by Councillor Patrick O’Leary, to take account of a proposed amendment. Additional words are shown in bold with deleted words shown by a strikethrough**

“Council notes that the re-routing arrangements for scheduled closures of the A34 in southern Oxfordshire are creating a totally intolerable blight on the lives of many of the residents of Wantage, Charlton Ward and further afield. These closures, which typically operate between 10pm and 6am, re-route traffic on to the A338 and the A417. In the 3 months to the end of October 2019 closures will have occurred on 25 occasions. Council further notes that the consequence of these arrangements ~~are~~ **is** to divert very high volumes of traffic, much of it heavy commercial, from a Designated Primary Route to minor roads, occasionally single lane, not considered suitable for heavy traffic in built up residential areas. Residents of impacted houses report that this creates intolerable noise, sleep deprivation and vibration and structural damage to properties, as many of their homes are only a matter of feet away from the highway. Council is also aware that the diversions create significant road safety issues and that damage has occurred to Infrastructure and other vehicles.

Council is aware that **alternatives exist, including re-routing via a designated Primary Route or introducing a contraflow system on the A34 itself.** ~~Previously, when OCC was responsible for maintaining the A34, the official diversion was via the A420, itself a designated Primary Route, but that following the transfer of responsibility to Highways England, and its contractor Kier Group plc, this policy was altered~~ Furthermore, Council is concerned that any future re-routing scheme ~~via the A420 may be ineffective if it is advisory and voluntary rather than mandatory~~ **due to increased use of satellite navigation systems which could risk the use of rat runs.**

Therefore, Council requests that the Scrutiny Committee consider including this matter in their work programme, noting that Scrutiny has the power to invite parties such as Highways England, OCC, Thames Valley Police, Kier Group plc and Wantage Traffic Diversion Group to attend any such meeting”.

Councillors supported the motion noting that the risks, inconvenience and costs associated with the current arrangements were not acceptable.

After debate and on being put to the vote the motion was agreed.

**RESOLVED:** That

Council notes that the re-routing arrangements for scheduled closures of the A34 in southern Oxfordshire are creating a totally intolerable blight on the lives of many of the residents of Wantage, Charlton Ward and further afield. These closures, which typically operate between 10pm and 6am, re-route traffic on to the A338 and the A417. In the 3 months to the end of October 2019 closures will have occurred on 25 occasions. Council further notes that the consequence of these arrangements is to divert very high volumes of traffic, much of it heavy commercial, from a Designated Primary Route to minor roads, occasionally single lane, not considered suitable for heavy traffic in built up residential areas. Residents of impacted houses report that this creates intolerable noise, sleep deprivation and vibration and structural damage to properties, as many of their homes are only a matter of feet away from the highway. Council is also aware that the diversions create significant road safety issues and that damage has occurred to Infrastructure and other vehicles.

Council is aware that alternatives exist, including re-routing via a designated Primary Route or introducing a contraflow system on the A34 itself. Furthermore, Council is concerned that any future re-routing scheme may be ineffective due to increased use of satellite navigation systems which could risk the use of rat runs.

Therefore, Council requests that the Scrutiny Committee consider including this matter in their work programme, noting that Scrutiny has the power to invite parties such as Highways England, OCC, Thames Valley Police, Kier Group plc and Wantage Traffic Diversion Group to attend any such meeting.

**Co.39 Questions on notice**

No questions were submitted by councillors under Council procedure rule 33.

The meeting closed at 9.10pm