



**Summary of the decisions taken at the meeting
of the Executive held on Tuesday 7 April 2015**

1. Date of publication of this summary: 8 April 2015
2. Decisions (if any) taken as a matter of urgency under Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules as set out in the Constitution (and not therefore subject to the call-in procedure): None
3. Date by which notice of call-in of any of the following decisions must be received in writing by the Chief Executive (see notes below):- Noon on Monday 13 April 2015
4. Notes:-
 - (a) For background documentation to the following decisions, please refer to the agenda and supporting papers (copies of which are available on the Council's website (www.cherwell.gov.uk) or from Democratic Services);
 - (b) Notice of call-in must be submitted in writing, by email or text to the Chief Executive by the deadline specified above, and must state the reason or reasons why "call-in" has been requested;
 - (c) Call-in can be requested by any six non-executive members of the Council.
However, if at any point during a municipal year the total number of opposition councillors is six or less the total number of non-executive members required to call-in a decision shall be the total number of opposition councillors less two.
 - (d) Decisions not called-in by the deadline specified above will become effective immediately the deadline has expired (unless they are recommendations to the Council).
 - (e) The Council has stipulated that the call-in procedure should not be used to challenge decisions as a matter of course and should be used only when fully justified.

**Sue Smith
Chief Executive**

Agenda Item and Recommendation	Decision	Reasons	Alternative Options	Conflicts of Interest Declared and Dispensations Granted by Head of Paid Service
<p>Agenda Item 7 Joint ICT Business Development Strategy</p> <p>Report of Head of Joint ICT Business Services</p> <p>Purpose of report</p> <p>The purpose of this report is to present the Joint ICT Business Development Strategy which sets out the vision and direction for the Joint ICT Business Service for Cherwell, South Northamptonshire and Stratford-on-Avon Councils.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <p>The meeting is recommended:</p> <p>1.1 To approve the Joint ICT Business Development Strategy.</p>	<p>Resolved</p> <p>(1) That the Joint ICT Business Development Strategy (annex to the Minutes as set out in the Minute Book) be approved.</p>	<p>The Strategy sets a clear direction for the partnership in respect of harmonising and joining up all business areas shaped around the needs of customers and to maximise opportunities to reduce cost and increase income. To deliver it successfully requires an ICT Business service that is shaped towards delivering on the priorities identified in the Strategy. All three councils have already approved and implemented the Joint ICT Business Service staffing re-structure so the foundations are in place to fully exploit the opportunities that ICT offers in respect of new ways of working and to maximise efficiencies.</p>	<p>If the strategy is not adopted then the full range of efficiencies and cost savings identified in the business case may not be delivered so this is not recommended.</p>	<p>None</p>

Agenda Item and Recommendation	Decision	Reasons	Alternative Options	Conflicts of Interest Declared and Dispensations Granted by Head of Paid Service
<p>Agenda Item 8 Neighbourhood Planning: Application for the designation of a Neighbourhood Area for a Proposed 'Mid-Cherwell' Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Report of Head of Strategic Planning and the Economy</p> <p>Purpose of report</p> <p>To consider the designation of a 'Mid-Cherwell' Neighbourhood Area comprising eleven parishes.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <p>The meeting is recommended:</p> <p>1.1 To approve the formal designation of the</p>	<p>Resolved</p> <p>(1) That the formal designation of the specified 'Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Area' under Section 61G of The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) be approved.</p> <p>(2) That the Head of Strategic Planning and the Economy be authorised to issue a Notification of Decision pursuant to resolution (1).</p>	<p>The area application presented would, if approved, result in the designation of a 'Mid-Cherwell' Neighbourhood Area comprising the parishes of Ardley with Fewcott, Kirtlington, Duns Tew, Lower Heyford, Middleton Stoney, Somerton, Steeple Aston, Middle Aston, North Aston, Fritwell and Upper Heyford. For the reasons set out in section 3 of this report it is considered that the specified area would be coherent logical, notwithstanding the challenges of producing a Neighbourhood Plan for such an extensive area and including the district's largest strategic development site – Former RAF Upper Heyford. The specified parishes</p>	<p>Option 1 - to refuse to designate the proposed area, provide reasons and to designate an alternative area based on separately designating individual parishes</p> <p>Option 2 - to refuse to designate the proposed area, provide reasons and to designate an alternative area based on removing the former RAF Upper Heyford site</p> <p>Were the Executive minded to refuse the application, an alternative area would need to be designated. Designating individual parishes would, in this case, not provide for the collective working</p>	<p>None</p>

Agenda Item and Recommendation	Decision	Reasons	Alternative Options	Conflicts of Interest Declared and Dispensations Granted by Head of Paid Service
<p>specified 'Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Area' under Section 61G of The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).</p> <p>1.2 To authorise the Head of Strategic Planning and the Economy to issue a Notification of Decision pursuant to recommendation 1.1.</p>		<p>represent a reasonable 'sphere of influence' on which to collectively base the plan, albeit with wider community and stakeholder consultation and potentially a much wider referendum being required.</p> <p>The Council has a statutory duty to provide advice or assistance to a parish council, neighbourhood forum or community organisation that is producing a neighbourhood plan. The PPG advises that local planning authorities must be proactive in providing information to communities about neighbourhood planning and constructively engage with the community throughout the process.</p> <p>The involvement of 11 Parish Councils and the district's</p>	<p>being proposed. Excluding the Former RAF Upper Heyford site from the Neighbourhood Area would still allow for a collective approach among the parishes but would remove the principal reason for the joint working. Local Plan Part 2 would provide an alternative mechanism for collective working but the application expresses the local support for progressing a Neighbourhood Plan and the NPPF makes clear that local planning authorities should facilitate neighbourhood planning.</p>	

Agenda Item and Recommendation	Decision	Reasons	Alternative Options	Conflicts of Interest Declared and Dispensations Granted by Head of Paid Service
		largest strategic development site means that this Neighbourhood Plan process will particularly require the close involvement of officers and regular reports to the Joint Management Team and to Members.		
<p>Agenda Item 9 Neighbourhood Planning: Hook Norton Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Report</p> <p>Report of Head of Strategic Planning and the Economy</p> <p>Purpose of report</p> <p>The Hook Norton Neighbourhood Plan (HNNP) has now been examined by an appropriately qualified</p>	<p>Resolved</p> <p>(1) That the modifications to the Hook Norton Neighbourhood Plan in accordance with the Examiner's recommendations be approved, and the issue of a decision statement to that effect be authorised.</p> <p>(2) That all of the Examiner's</p>	<p>The Hook Norton Neighbourhood Plan (HNNP) as recommended for modification by the Examiner would satisfy the basic conditions, the preparation has been in accordance with the legislation and it complies with the definition of a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The Examiner's modifications involve additions and amendments which don not raise issues of major</p>	<p>Option One: Not to approve some of the Examiners recommendations and to proceed to a referendum. Where a LPA proposes to make a decision that differs from the Examiner's recommendation then there would need to be another round of consultation including notifying all those on the consultation statement of the Parish Council. This</p>	<p>None</p>

Agenda Item and Recommendation	Decision	Reasons	Alternative Options	Conflicts of Interest Declared and Dispensations Granted by Head of Paid Service
<p>independent Examiner who has produced a report with recommendations for modifications. Cherwell District Council as the Local Planning Authority is required to consider the recommendations and to determine whether the Plan should proceed to a referendum and the area of the referendum.</p> <p>This report presents the Neighbourhood Plan, the background to the Examination and the process followed. The report outlines the next stages in the process which includes the holding of a referendum. On completion the Neighbourhood Plan will become part of the Development Plan and decisions on planning applications will then be made</p>	<p>recommendations and modifications to enable the Plan to proceed to a referendum be approved.</p> <p>(3) That the area for the referendum as recommended by the examiner to be the Hook Norton parish council area (which is the approved designated neighbourhood area) and that there will be no extension to the area be approved.</p>	<p>concern. The majority of the recommended modifications are intended to provide more clarity particularly in relation to compliance with the strategic policies of the submitted and examined Cherwell Local Pan. The HNNP as recommended for modification by the Examiner should therefore proceed to a referendum.</p>	<p>would take more time and would have cost implications.</p> <p>Option Two: Not to accept the examiner's report of recommendations and not to proceed to a referendum. This option can only be justified if the Examiner recommends that the Plan should not proceed to a referendum, or the Council is not satisfied that the plan has met the procedural and legal requirements.</p> <p>Option Three: To extend the area in which the referendum is to take place. Under the neighbourhood planning legislation the LPA cannot make a decision that differs from the Examiner's</p>	

Agenda Item and Recommendation	Decision	Reasons	Alternative Options	Conflicts of Interest Declared and Dispensations Granted by Head of Paid Service
<p>in accordance with the Plan.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <p>The meeting is recommended:</p> <p>1.1 To approve the modifications to the HNNP in accordance with the Examiner's recommendations, and to authorise the issue of a decision statement to that effect;</p> <p>1.2 To approve all of the Examiner's recommendation and modifications to enable the Plan to proceed to a referendum;</p> <p>1.3 To approve the area for the referendum as recommended by the examiner to be the</p>			<p>recommendation about the referendum area.</p> <p>Option Four: To adopt the course of action proposed in this report. This is consistent with both the Hook Norton Neighbourhood Plan, the Examiners proposed modifications and the Regulations that apply to Neighbourhood Plans.</p>	

Agenda Item and Recommendation	Decision	Reasons	Alternative Options	Conflicts of Interest Declared and Dispensations Granted by Head of Paid Service
<p>Hook Norton parish council area (which is the approved designated neighbourhood area) and that there will be no extension to the area.</p>				
<p>Agenda Item 10 Connecting Oxfordshire: Local Transport Plan (LTP4) 2015-2031 Draft for Consultation</p> <p>Report of Head of Strategic Planning and the Economy</p> <p>Purpose of report</p> <p>To inform members of the consultation by Oxfordshire County Council on the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4; to advise on the potential implications for</p>	<p>Resolved</p> <p>(1) That the content of LTP4 relevant to Cherwell be noted and the officers' comments as the Council's response to the consultation be endorsed. The officer response recommends general support but highlights a number of issues which need to be resolved.</p>	<p>The draft LTP4 is expected to be adopted by summer 2015. While officers note and support the County Council's approach to prioritise and address areas of change in the County and the focus on managing sustainable modes of transport to manage transport demand, officers have a number of significant concerns that need to be addressed. In its current form draft LTP4 does not provide a comprehensive strategy which clearly sets out what the LTP4 is meant</p>	<p>Option 1: Not to comment on the LTP4 consultation. The adoption of a LTP4 in its current form would reduce its effectiveness as a material consideration to be used when deciding planning applications and would not inform key land use decisions as part of forthcoming Local Development Documents in Cherwell.</p> <p>Option 2: Object to LTP4. There may be scope to work with the County</p>	<p>None</p>

Agenda Item and Recommendation	Decision	Reasons	Alternative Options	Conflicts of Interest Declared and Dispensations Granted by Head of Paid Service
<p>Cherwell and ask for the endorsement of officers comments as the Cherwell District Council formal response to the consultation.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <p>The meeting is recommended:</p> <p>1.1 To note the content of LTP4 relevant to Cherwell and to endorse officers' comments as the Council's response to the consultation. The officer response recommends general support but highlights a number of issues which need to be resolved.</p>		<p>to comprise now and what it will cover in the future. It does not address transport implications required to inform Local Plan Part 2 (Development Management Policies, Non-Strategic allocations across the District including the rural areas) nor other land-use plans in the Local Development Scheme and emerging Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>The LTP4 seems southern centric (apart from the Banbury Area Strategy), more could be done within LTP4 Volume 1 to reflect corridors and economic priorities in the northern part of Cherwell and connections outside the County boundaries.</p> <p>The LTP4 approach to</p>	<p>Council to address the shortcomings of the LTP4.</p>	

Agenda Item and Recommendation	Decision	Reasons	Alternative Options	Conflicts of Interest Declared and Dispensations Granted by Head of Paid Service
		<p>transport options does not clearly set out how the County Council intends to assess the specific options proposed and their social, economic and environmental impacts.</p> <p>Without a clear program to finalise options and an implementation plan, it is unclear how the policy objectives for sustainable transport and specific transport initiatives will be delivered and how this is going to inform Cherwell's local plan process.</p>		
Agenda Item 11 Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 (Part 2): Development Management Policies and Sites	Resolved (1) That the report be noted.	A Local Plan Part 2 is needed to ensure that non-strategic development provided for by the modified Submission Local Plan (Part 1) is	Not applicable. This report is for noting only.	None

Agenda Item and Recommendation	Decision	Reasons	Alternative Options	Conflicts of Interest Declared and Dispensations Granted by Head of Paid Service
<p>Report of Head of Strategic Planning and the Economy</p> <p>Purpose of report</p> <p>To advise members on the commencement of work on Local Plan Part 2 and the project timetable.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <p>The meeting is recommended:</p> <p>1.1 To note the report.</p>		<p>appropriately planned and sustainably delivered. The Council's non-strategic allocations and its detailed development management policies are in need of review. This report is presented to ensure that the Executive is kept fully informed of the process and timetable for producing the Part 2 plan in the interest of ensuring that the plan is produced efficiently and in accordance with Council priorities.</p>		
<p>Agenda Item 12 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and Developer Contributions SPD</p> <p>Report of Head of Strategic Planning and the Economy</p>	<p>Resolved</p> <p>(1) That the report be noted.</p>	<p>The Council needs to consider the potential adoption of CIL, and an up-to-date Developer Contributions SPD needs to be prepared, in the interest of securing the delivery of infrastructure to support</p>	<p>Not applicable. This report is for noting only.</p>	<p>None</p>

Agenda Item and Recommendation	Decision	Reasons	Alternative Options	Conflicts of Interest Declared and Dispensations Granted by Head of Paid Service
<p>Purpose of report</p> <p>To advise Members on the process and on-going work for the setting of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and on the preparation of a new Developer Contributions SPD.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <p>The meeting is recommended:</p> <p>1.1 To note the report.</p>		<p>planned growth. This report is presented to ensure that the Executive is kept fully informed of the process and timetable for the two parallel projects in the interest of ensuring that the plan is produced efficiently and in accordance with Council priorities.</p>		
<p>Agenda Item 13 NW Bicester Apprenticeships Scheme</p> <p>Report of Commercial Director (Bicester)</p> <p>Purpose of report</p> <p>To update the Executive on</p>	<p>Resolved</p> <p>(1) That the report be noted and Cherwell District Council's role as accountable body for this grant award be approved.</p>	<p>The Eco Bicester Team submitted a bid to OxLEP's City Deal Initiative in December 2014 for funding to support the set-up of the Apprenticeship Training Agency (ATA) and its early operation. The bid was successful and a £50,000 grant has been awarded by</p>	<p>Option 1: Not to accept the funding</p>	<p>None</p>

Agenda Item and Recommendation	Decision	Reasons	Alternative Options	Conflicts of Interest Declared and Dispensations Granted by Head of Paid Service
<p>the successful outcome of a recent bid to OxLEP to support the NW Bicester Apprenticeship Scheme, in order that Cherwell District Council can receive the funding as the accountable body.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <p>The meeting is recommended:</p> <p>1.1 To note the contents of the report and approve Cherwell District Council role as accountable body for this grant award.</p>		<p>OxLEP, subject to the signing of a legal agreement which the Eco Bicester Team are in the processes of negotiating. The funding is anticipated to be awarded in April 2015 and needs to be spent over 2 years during 2015/2016 and 2016/2017.</p> <p>The aim is to set up the ATA by summer 2015 so that it can be referred to in future S106 agreements attached to any consents for NW Bicester, as a preferred route to enable developers to deliver apprenticeships.</p> <p>The £50,000 funding was bid for specifically to set up the ATA in the first year and then to fund its operation in the second year. CDC will be using the funding to carry out the necessary research and</p>		

Agenda Item and Recommendation	Decision	Reasons	Alternative Options	Conflicts of Interest Declared and Dispensations Granted by Head of Paid Service
		<p>background work into the options for the ATA and to support the ATA becoming accredited by the Skills Funding Agency (SFA) so it can operate as a bone fide organisation. The actual setting up of the setting and registering it as a company will be carried out by a third party rather than CDC which is preferable in terms of minimising exposure of CDC to any associated risks. So although the funding will rest with CDC, it will be used to support a third party set up of the organisation.</p> <p>There will be regular monitoring of the outcomes against the grant award with regular updates being given to the One Vision Steering Group.</p>		

Agenda Item and Recommendation	Decision	Reasons	Alternative Options	Conflicts of Interest Declared and Dispensations Granted by Head of Paid Service
<p>Agenda Item 15 Additional Capital bids for CCTV at Thorpe Lane Depot and Bodicote House</p> <p>Exempt Report of Head of Finance and Procurement</p>	<p>Resolved</p> <p>(1) That the recommendation from the Budget Planning Committee on the 17 February 2015 for two additional 2015-16 capital bids (annex to the Minutes as set out in the Minute Book) be supported and Full Council be recommended to add them to the approved 2015-16 Capital Programme.</p>	<p>This report provides the additional information as requested by the Budget Planning Committee at the meeting on 19 January 2015. Members of the Executive are asked to consider the recommendations.</p>	<p>To reject the current proposals and to make alternative recommendations or ask officers for further information.</p>	<p>None</p>