

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION****Council****16 December 2019**

Agenda Item Number	Page	Title
5.	(Pages 1 - 2)	Petitions and Requests to Address the Meeting
10.	(Pages 3 - 6)	Motions Proposed amendment to motion
12.	(Pages 7 - 8)	Constitutional Changes Proposed amendment to recommendations

If you need any further information about the meeting please contact Natasha Clark, Democratic and Elections democracy@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk, 01295 221589

This page is intentionally left blank



Council

Monday 16 December 2019

Agenda Item 5, Petitions and Requests to Address the Meeting

There have been 2 requests to address Council as set out below.

Agenda Item 9: Motion on Oxfordshire Cambridge Expressway

- Professor David Rogers, local resident
- Linda Newberry, local resident

The Chairman will call the speakers to the front of the Chamber to address Council in the order they registered to speak prior to the motions being presented to Council by the proposers.

The speakers will each be able to speak for a maximum of 5 minutes and will return to the public gallery after their address. There is no question and answer of speakers.

This page is intentionally left blank



Council

Monday 16 December 2019

Agenda Item 10, Motions

Motion Proposer: Councillor Sean Woodcock

Motion Seconder: To be advised

Topic: Oxford to Cambridge Expressway

Motion

"Council notes the continued uncertainty faced by communities in Cherwell the proposed corridor for the Oxford to Cambridge Expressway.

This Council regrets this opaque process - with the decision made by Highways England – with little input from local people.

This council remains wholly unclear what the final route will be, let alone how the Expressway might help reduce the congestion on local roads including junction 9 of the M40.

This council believes that interface between the proposed Expressway and the new East-West Rail is also key. We welcome the commitment to plan for and invest in major infrastructure to support housing and economic growth in Oxfordshire, but we want to see the development of integrated transport systems and the prioritisation of clean, green and public transport.

These principles need to be central in determining the final detailed route. However, this Council remains concerned at the environmental damage proposed by this Expressway for obscure economic gain. In light of the Council's recently declared Climate Emergency, therefore, this council retains a sceptical Outlook on the endeavour as a whole.

This council demands at a minimum that any proposals are up for meaningful public consultation conducted by Highways England.

In addition, the Leader of council should not endorse any proposals for an Expressway given this council's concerns over the lack of clarity and environmental impact without further reference to council.

Throughout must be emphasised that any proposal which goes ahead should not contradict the council's commitment to the environment. There also needs to be integration with public transport.

Council regrets the lack of clarity from government on its proposals which contributes to considerable uncertainty both about how the Expressway is intended to deliver benefit, and about the possible impact on homes, lives, the environment, amenities and facilities especially in our area.

In particular, Council notes with regret that:

1. It is unclear what the word "Expressway" means in this context
2. Insufficient work has been done on the potential of enhanced rail links to deliver better outcomes for passengers, freight, and sustainable economic growth
3. Actual and proposed consultation is inadequate
4. It is unclear which of a range of possible justifications for the Expressway, which potentially contradict each other, are being used, including:
 - a) A 'strategic route' to carry freight traffic from the west and south to the east.
 - b) A route to make commuting between Oxford/Milton Keynes/Bedford/Cambridge easier and quicker.
 - c) A road that will enable significant housing growth of 1,000,000 extra houses along its length.
 - d) Relieving traffic.

Council therefore resolves to oppose the Expressway as it is currently proposed, to continue to press national government for more investment in sustainable transport, and to ask the Department for Transport to urgently clarify its proposals around the Expressway."

For information: The Constitution sets out that no Motion to rescind or vary an agreed Motion can be considered within a 6 month period unless signatures or email from a recognised source from 8 councillors is received. The Director Law and Governance / Monitoring Officer has received 8 signatures and therefore confirms that the motion is valid.

Proposer of Amendment: Cllr Ian Middleton

Seconder of Amendment: Councillor Katherine Tyson

Motion with Amendments

"Council notes the continued uncertainty faced by communities in Cherwell the proposed corridor for the Oxford to Cambridge Expressway.

This Council regrets this opaque process - with the decision made by Highways England – with little input from local people.

This council remains wholly unclear what the final route will be, let alone how the Expressway might help reduce the congestion on local roads including junction 9 of the M40.

This council believes that interface between the proposed Expressway and the new East-West Rail is also key. We would welcome the commitment to plan for and invest in sustainable major infrastructure to support housing and economic growth in Oxfordshire, and but we want to see the development of integrated transport systems and the prioritisation of clean, green and public transport.

~~These principles need to be central in determining the final detailed route. However, this~~ This Council remains concerned at the environmental damage proposed by this Expressway for obscure economic gain. In light of the Council's recently declared Climate Emergency, therefore, this council retains a sceptical outlook on the endeavour as a whole.

This council demands at a minimum that any proposals are up for meaningful public consultation conducted by Highways England.

In addition, the Leader of council should not endorse any proposals for an Expressway given this council's concerns over the lack of clarity and environmental impact without further reference to council.

Throughout it must be emphasised that any proposal which goes ahead should not contradict the council's commitment to the environment. ~~There also needs to be integration with public transport.~~

Council regrets the lack of clarity from government on its proposals which contributes to considerable uncertainty both about how the Expressway is intended to deliver benefit, and about the possible impact on homes, lives, the environment, amenities and facilities especially in our area.

In particular, Council notes with regret that:

1. It is unclear what the word "Expressway" means in this context
2. Insufficient work has been done on the potential of enhanced rail links to deliver better outcomes for passengers, freight, and sustainable economic growth
3. Actual and proposed consultation is inadequate
4. It is unclear which of a range of possible justifications for the Expressway, which potentially contradict each other, are being used, including:
 - a) A 'strategic route' to carry freight traffic from the west and south to the east.
 - b) A route to make commuting between Oxford/Milton Keynes / Bedford / Cambridge easier and quicker.
 - c) A road that will enable significant housing growth of 1,000,000 extra houses along its length.

d) Relieving traffic.

Council therefore resolves to oppose the Expressway as it is currently proposed, to continue to press national government for more investment in sustainable transport, and to ask the Department for Transport to urgently clarify its proposals around the Expressway."

Agenda Item 12 – Constitutional Changes: Proposer Cllr Copland; Seconder TBA

Recommended Change	Proposed Amendment
<p>Section 3.1</p> <p>(c) At the moment there is little guidance in the Constitution with regard to the nature of Motions. The Constitution should be amended so that it states Motions should also not be vexatious, frivolous and must be factually accurate to align with the standard wording in many constitutions at other local authorities.</p>	<p>Amendment 1</p> <p>Replace section 3.1(c) with the following:</p> <p>(c) At the moment there is little guidance in the Constitution with regard to the nature of Motions. The Constitution should be amended so that it states Motions should also not be unlawful, defamatory and must be factually accurate to align with the standard wording in many constitutions at other local authorities in Oxfordshire. Where a motion is refused on these grounds it will be returned to the councillor who submitted it along with an explanation in writing about why it cannot be published in its current form.</p>
<p>Section 3.1</p> <p>(d) A word limit of 250 words be applied to motions.</p>	<p>Amendment 2</p> <p>Replace section 3.1(d) with the following:</p> <p>(d) A word limit of 650 words be applied to motions.</p>
<p>N/A</p>	<p>Amendment 3</p> <p>The following should be inserted at Section 3.1:</p> <p>(e) Points of reference to support a motion should be allowed where required and these should be excluded from the word count. This should be in the form of a clickable link to be included in the online version of the agenda and/or a footnote list of references cited in the motion.</p>

Page 7

Agenda Item 12

<p>Section 3.3</p> <p>It is proposed that amendments should be received by 12 noon on the second working day before the Council meeting to enable them to be reviewed. Amendments will then be published on the afternoon of the working day before the meeting. In practice this is likely to be a Friday afternoon. Amendments will continue to be considered in the order submitted.</p>	<p>Amendment 4</p> <p>Delete section 3.3 in its entirety</p>
<p>Section 3.4</p> <p>Any amendment must not take the original motion over 250 words and not amount to a direct negative or nullify the original Motion.</p>	<p>Amendment 5</p> <p>Replace section 3.4 with the following:</p> <p>Any amendment must not take the original motion over 1000 words and not amount to a direct negative or nullify the original Motion.</p>
<p>Section 3.6</p> <p>It is proposed to change the deadline for the receipt of written questions to noon on the eighth working day before Council (to align it with the receipt of Motions and enable written questions to be published with the agenda). A written response would be published on the afternoon of the working day before the meeting.</p>	<p>Amendment 6</p> <p>Delete section 3.6 in its entirety</p>