

# **County Council**

**14 July 2020**

## **Schedule of Business**

This page is intentionally left blank

**OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL – 14 JULY 2020**

**SCHEDULE OF BUSINESS**

**VIRTUAL MEETING**

*This Meeting will be from 10.30 to 4.30 pm – Lunch will be from 1.00 pm to 1.30 pm – there will be a short comfort break for 10 mins at 3.35 pm*

| <b>AGENDA ITEM</b> | <b>PAGE NO.</b> | <b>MAXIMUM DURATION</b> | <b>APPROX START TIME<br/>TIME LIMIT<br/>PER DEBATE</b> | <b>SUBJECT</b>  | <b>PROPOSALS<br/>(M = Motion; SEC = Seconder;<br/>Am = Amendment<br/>S = Statement; Q = Question;<br/>REC = Recommendation to be<br/>determined)</b> |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--|---|--|
| 1.                 | 2               |                         | 10.30  | <p><b>Minutes</b></p> <p>Minutes of the Meeting held on 4 May 2020 (CC1).</p> <p>Members are asked to that, following a request, a sentence to explain that the Meeting was virtual will be added to the Minutes.</p> | Cllr Hanna   |
| 2.                 | 2               |                         |  | <b>Apologies for Absence</b>  |  |

| AGENDA<br>ITEM | PAGE<br>NO. | MAXIMUM<br>DURATION | APPROX<br>START TIME<br>TIME LIMIT<br>PER DEBATE | SUBJECT  | PROPOSALS<br>(M = Motion; SEC = Secorder;<br>Am = Amendment<br>S = Statement; Q = Question;<br>REC = Recommendation to be<br>determined) |
|----------------|-------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
| 3.             | 2           |                     |  | Declarations of Interest   |  |
| 4.             | 2           |                     |  | <b>Official Communications</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thanks to Staff</li> <li>• February 2021 Council</li> <li>• Honorary Alderman Patrick Greene;</li> </ul> | Hudspeth, Brighthouse, Hibbert-Biles, Mathew, Webber   |
| 5.             | 2           |                     |  | <b>Appointments</b><br><br>Councillor Ted Fenton to replace Councillor Mike Fox-Davies on Planning & Regulation Committee from September Committee.                              | - <b>To note</b>   |

| AGENDA ITEM | PAGE NO. | MAXIMUM DURATION | APPROX START TIME<br>TIME LIMIT<br>PER DEBATE | SUBJECT   | <b>PROPOSALS</b><br><b>(M = Motion; SEC = Seconder;</b><br><b>Am = Amendment</b><br><b>S = Statement; Q = Question;</b><br><b>REC = Recommendation to be</b><br><b>determined)</b>   |
|-------------|----------|------------------|---|---|--|
| 6.          | 2        | 5 mins           | 11.00   | <b>Petitions and Public Address</b>                     | <p><b>Petition</b></p> <p>Mr Jamie Hartzell, in relation to doubling woodland cover in Oxfordshire.</p> <p><b>Public Address</b></p> <p>Dr Liz Sawyer, on behalf of Liveable Streets Headington in relation to Motion 16;</p> <p>Mr Patrick Coulter, on behalf of Liveable Streets Oxford in relation to Motion 16.</p> <p><b>Please see Annex 3</b></p> |
| 7.          | 2        |                  |   | <b>Questions with Notice from Members of the Public</b> | <p>Mr Chris Henderson to Councillor Lorraine Lindsay-Gale;</p> <p>Mr Peter Barnett to Councillor Yvonne Constance</p> <p><b>See Annex 4</b></p>  |

| AGENDA<br>ITEM | PAGE<br>NO. | MAXIMUM<br>DURATION | APPROX<br>START TIME<br>TIME LIMIT<br>PER DEBATE | SUBJECT   | PROPOSALS<br>(M = Motion; SEC = Seconder;<br>Am = Amendment<br>S = Statement; Q = Question;<br>REC = Recommendation to be<br>determined) |
|----------------|-------------|---------------------|--|---|--|
| 8.             | 3           |                     | 11.10  | <p>Questions with Notice from Members of the Council</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fox-Davies to Constance</li> <li>2. Harris to Constance</li> <li>3. Harris to Hudspeth</li> <li>4. Bartington to Constance</li> <li>5. Bartington to Constance</li> <li>6. Bartington to Constance</li> <li>7. Leffman to Constance</li> <li>8. Cherry to Walker</li> <li>9. Cherry to Walker</li> <li>10. Cherry to Walker</li> <li>11. Heathcoat to Constance</li> <li>12. Waine to Constance</li> <li>13. Pressel to Stratford</li> <li>14. Pressel to Lindsay-Gale</li> <li>15. Turnbull to Lindsay-Gale</li> <li>16. Turnbull to Lindsay-Gale</li> <li>17. Turnbull to Harrod</li> <li>18. Phillips to Bartholomew</li> </ol> | See Annex 2  |

| AGENDA<br>ITEM | PAGE<br>NO. | MAXIMUM<br>DURATION | APPROX<br>START TIME<br>TIME LIMIT<br>PER DEBATE | SUBJECT   | PROPOSALS<br>(M = Motion; SEC = Seconder;<br>Am = Amendment<br>S = Statement; Q = Question;<br>REC = Recommendation to be<br>determined) |
|----------------|-------------|---------------------|--|---|--|
|                |             |                     |  | 19. G Sanders to Constance<br>20. Haywood to Constance<br>21. Roberts to Constance<br>22. Roberts to Bartholomew<br>23. Hanna to Hudspeth<br>24. Hanna to Hudspeth<br>25. Hanna to Hudspeth<br>26. Hannaby to Hudspeth<br>27. Hannaby to Hudspeth<br>28. Hannaby to Hudspeth<br>29. R Smith to Bartholomew<br>30. Sudbury to Stratford<br>31. Fenton to Constance<br>32. Azad to Stratford<br>33. Azad to Stratford |  |

| AGENDA<br>ITEM | PAGE<br>NO. | MAXIMUM<br>DURATION | APPROX<br>START TIME<br>TIME LIMIT<br>PER DEBATE | SUBJECT   | PROPOSALS<br>(M = Motion; SEC = Secorder;<br>Am = Amendment<br>S = Statement; Q = Question;<br>REC = Recommendation to be<br>determined)   |
|----------------|-------------|---------------------|--|---|--|
| 9.             |             | 20 mins             | 11.40  | <p><b>Report of the Cabinet</b></p> <p><b>Leader of the Council (Ian Hudspeth)</b></p> <p><b>Deputy Leader (Judith Heathcoat)</b></p> <p><b>Adult Social Care &amp; Public Health (Lawrie Stratford)</b></p> <p><b>Council Business &amp; Partnerships</b></p> <p><b>Education &amp; Cultural Services (Lorraine Lindsay-Gale)</b></p> <p><b>Environment (Yvonne Constance)</b></p> <p><b>Finance (David Bartholomew)</b></p> <p><b>Local Communities (Mark Gray)</b></p> | <p>Q. Hanna (2)</p> <p>Q. Price (3)</p> <p>Q. Pressel (4)</p> <p>Q. R. Smith (8), Johnston (9)</p> <p>Q. R. Smith, E. Smith (10), Johnston (11), J Sanders (12), Lygo, Haywood (13), Leffman (15)</p> <p>Q. Phillips (16), Phillips, Roberts (17), Phillips (18)</p> <p>Q. Mcilveen, Webber, Hanna, Buckley (19)</p> |



| AGENDA<br>ITEM | PAGE<br>NO. | MAXIMUM<br>DURATION | APPROX<br>START TIME<br>TIME LIMIT<br>PER DEBATE | SUBJECT   | <b>PROPOSALS</b><br><b>(M = Motion; SEC = Seconder;</b><br><b>Am = Amendment</b><br><b>S = Statement; Q = Question;</b><br><b>REC = Recommendation to be</b><br><b>determined)</b> |
|----------------|-------------|---------------------|--|---|--|
| 10.            | 3           | 35 mins             | 12.00  | <b>Director for Public Health<br/>Annual Report</b> | (M) Stratford<br>(SEC) Hudspeth<br>S Lygo<br>S Banfield<br>S Phillips<br>S Pressel<br>S Afridi<br>S Mcilveen<br>S Hanna<br>S Rooke<br>S R Smith<br>S Harris                        |

| AGENDA<br>ITEM | PAGE<br>NO. | MAXIMUM<br>DURATION | APPROX<br>START TIME<br>TIME LIMIT<br>PER DEBATE | SUBJECT   | PROPOSALS<br>(M = Motion; SEC = Seconder;<br>Am = Amendment<br>S = Statement; Q = Question;<br>REC = Recommendation to be<br>determined)                 |
|----------------|-------------|---------------------|--|---|--|
| 11.            | 3           | 30 mins             | 12.35  | <b>Scrutiny Annual Report</b>                             | (M) Brighthouse<br>(SEC) Fatemian<br>S Price<br>S Turnbull<br>S G Sanders<br>S Webber<br>S Roberts<br>S Sudbury<br>S Heathcoat<br>S Fatemian<br>S Harris |
|                |             | 30 mins             | 1.00 pm  | <i>lunch</i>  |  |
| 12.            | 3           | 15 mins             | 13.30  | <b>Audit &amp; Governance<br/>Committee Annual Report</b> | (M) Carter<br>(SEC) Ilot<br>S R Smith<br>S Buckley<br>S Harris   |

| AGENDA<br>ITEM | PAGE<br>NO. | MAXIMUM<br>DURATION | APPROX<br>START TIME<br>TIME LIMIT<br>PER DEBATE | SUBJECT  | PROPOSALS<br>(M = Motion; SEC = Seconder;<br>Am = Amendment<br>S = Statement; Q = Question;<br>REC = Recommendation to be<br>determined) |
|----------------|-------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
| 13.            | 4           | 15 mins             | 1.45   | <b>Appointment of Independent<br/>Persons</b><br><br><i>Members are asked to note that<br/>Mr Holt-Kenwell appears<br/>incorrectly throughout and<br/>should read <b>Mr Holt-Kentwell</b>.</i> | (M) Chairman<br>(SEC) Vice-Chairman<br>S Pressel<br>S Phillips   |
| 14.            | 4           | 15 mins             | 2.00   | <b>Health Scrutiny<br/>Arrangements</b>  | (M) Fatemian<br>(SEC) Mallon<br>S Phillips<br>S Rooke  |

| AGENDA<br>ITEM | PAGE<br>NO. | MAXIMUM<br>DURATION | APPROX<br>START TIME<br>TIME LIMIT<br>PER DEBATE | SUBJECT                                      | PROPOSALS<br>(M = Motion; SEC = Seconder;<br>Am = Amendment<br>S = Statement; Q = Question;<br>REC = Recommendation to be<br>determined)   |
|----------------|-------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
| 15.            | 4           | 1.10                | 2.15   | <b>Motion by Councillor Ian<br/>Hudspeth</b> | (M) Hudspeth<br>(SEC) Brighthouse<br>(AM) Brighthouse<br>(SEC)<br>(AM) Hudspeth<br>(SEC)<br>S Brighthouse<br>S Price<br>S Turnbull<br>S Phillips<br>S Cherry<br>S Damian<br>S E Smith<br>S Johnston<br>S Bearder<br>S Hanna<br>S Heathcoat<br>S Constance<br>S Billington<br>S Corkin<br>S Handley<br>S Mallon<br>S Mathew<br>S Harris |
|                |             | 10 mins             | 3.35   | <b>Comfort break</b>                         |  |

| AGENDA ITEM | PAGE NO. | MAXIMUM DURATION | APPROX START TIME<br>TIME LIMIT<br>PER DEBATE | SUBJECT                                    | <b>PROPOSALS</b><br><b>(M = Motion; SEC = Seconder;</b><br><b>Am = Amendment</b><br><b>S = Statement; Q = Question;</b><br><b>REC = Recommendation to be</b><br><b>determined)</b> |
|-------------|----------|------------------|---|--|--|
| 16.         | 5        | 25 mins          | 3.45  | <b>Motion by Councillor John Sanders</b>   | (M) J Sanders<br>(SEC) Haywood<br>S Pressel<br>S Phillips<br>S Brighthouse<br>S Webber<br>S Bartington   |
| 17.         | 5        | 20 mins          | 4.10  | <b>Motion by Councillor Neville Harris</b> | (M) Harris<br>(SEC) Gawrysiak<br>S Haywood<br>S Phillips<br>S Brighthouse<br>S Webber<br>S Harris  |

| AGENDA<br>ITEM | PAGE<br>NO. | MAXIMUM<br>DURATION | APPROX<br>START TIME<br>TIME LIMIT<br>PER DEBATE | SUBJECT  | PROPOSALS<br>(M = Motion; SEC = Seconder;<br>Am = Amendment<br>S = Statement; Q = Question;<br>REC = Recommendation to be<br>determined)          |
|----------------|-------------|---------------------|--|--|---|
| 18.            | 6           | 30 mins             | 4.30   | <b>Motion by Councillor Charles<br/>Matthew</b>  | (M) Mathew<br>(SEC) Field-Johnston<br>(AM) Fenton<br>(SEC)<br>(AM) Sudbury<br>(SEC) Johnston<br>S J Sanders<br>S Price<br>S Phillips<br>S Buckley |
| 19.            | 6           | 20 mins             | 4.50   | <b>Motion by Councillor Yvonne<br/>Constance</b> | (M) Constance<br>(SEC) Sames<br>(AM) Sudbury<br>(SEC) E Smith<br>S Haywood<br>S Turnbull<br>S Harris  |

| AGENDA ITEM | PAGE NO. | MAXIMUM DURATION | APPROX START TIME<br>TIME LIMIT<br>PER DEBATE | SUBJECT  | <b>PROPOSALS</b><br><b>(M = Motion; SEC = Seconder;</b><br><b>Am = Amendment</b><br><b>S = Statement; Q = Question;</b><br><b>REC = Recommendation to be</b><br><b>determined)</b> |
|-------------|----------|------------------|---|--|--|
| 20.         | 6        | 30 mins          | 5.10  | <b>Motion by Councillor Nick Field-Johnson</b> | (M) Field-Johnson<br>(SEC) Fenton<br>(AM) Buckley<br>(SEC) Webber<br>(AM) Hibbert-Biles<br>(SEC)<br>S Lygo<br>S Price<br>S Hadley  |
| 21.         | 7        | 30 mins          |   | <b>Motion by Councillor Suzanne Bartington</b> | (M) Bartington<br>(SEC) Fenton<br>S Mcilveen<br>S Buckley<br>S Leffman<br>S R Smith<br>S Sudbury<br>S R Smith<br>S Waine   |

| AGENDA ITEM | PAGE NO. | MAXIMUM DURATION | APPROX START TIME<br>TIME LIMIT<br>PER DEBATE | SUBJECT                                      | <b>PROPOSALS</b><br><b>(M = Motion; SEC = Seconder;</b><br><b>Am = Amendment</b><br><b>S = Statement; Q = Question;</b><br><b>REC = Recommendation to be</b><br><b>determined)</b> |
|-------------|----------|------------------|---|--|--|
| 22.         | 7        | 25 mins          |   | <b>Motion by Councillor Liz Brighouse</b>    | (M) Brighouse<br>(SEC) Azad<br>S Turnbull<br>S R Smith<br>S Lindsay-Gale<br>S Waine<br>S Harris  |
| 23.         | 8        | 30 mins          |   | <b>Motion by Councillor Deborah Mcilveen</b> | (M) Mcilveen<br>(SEC) Afridi<br>(AM) Corkin<br>(SEC)<br>S Afridi<br>S Azad<br>S Turnbull<br>S Brighouse<br>S Heathcoat<br>S Harrod<br>S Harris                                     |



## AMENDMENTS TO MOTIONS ON NOTICE

### Agenda Item 15 – Motion by Councillor Ian Hudspeth – Amendment to be moved by Liz Brighthouse

“This Council recognises the excellent work of all local government staff across Oxfordshire during the COVID-19 crisis. Councils have worked together in difficult times, showing that organisational barriers to joint working can be overcome.

All Councils have gone the extra mile in delivering services to our residents that prioritising *ing* the most vulnerable **people**. This has inevitably incurred additional costs – c. £90 million across all tiers.

All Councils acknowledge the additional Government funding to date, (**but this is not enough**) and we have a duty to respond to the national financial challenge ahead and to be open with residents. This Council is currently forecasting a deficit of c. £24 million for the financial year 2020/21 and a further deficit of c. £40 million for 2021/22.

All Councils ~~across Oxfordshire~~ are now considering how they can balance budgets. ~~and protect frontline services.~~ No Councillor ~~nor party~~ wants to see drastic cuts to vital Council services.

~~We, as a group of democratically elected leaders, should take the opportunity provided by~~ The devolution white paper **presents an opportunity to consider how** ~~to ensure that we provide the best possible public services for our residents~~ **can be best provided for Oxfordshire.**

This Council calls on the Leader ***to write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer highlighting the way Councils worked together in Oxfordshire and asking him to honour the Government promise to reimburse Councils for the additional expenditure incurred because of COVID 19 and to undertake an open and wide-ranging conversation with Oxfordshire County Councillors , local authority partners, residents and stakeholders to explore all options for a new future for Oxfordshire which is inclusive, protects public services, supports a vibrant local democracy and ensures a strong economy.***

### **Agenda Item 15 – Motion by Councillor Ian Hudspeth – Amendment to be moved by Ian Hudspeth**

“This Council recognises the excellent work of all local government staff across Oxfordshire during the COVID-19 crisis. Councils have worked together in difficult times, showing that organisational barriers to joint working can be overcome.

All Councils have gone the extra mile in delivering services to our residents that prioritise the most vulnerable. This has inevitably incurred additional costs – c. £90 million across all tiers.

All Councils acknowledge the additional Government funding to date, but we have a duty to respond to the national financial challenge ahead and to be open with residents. This Council is currently forecasting a deficit of c. £24 million for the financial year 2020/21 and a further deficit of c. £40 million for 2021/22.

All Councils across Oxfordshire are now considering how they can balance budgets and protect frontline services. No Councillor nor party wants to see drastic cuts to vital Council services.

We, as a group of democratically elected leaders, should take the opportunity provided by the devolution white paper to ensure that we provide the best possible public services for our residents.

This Council calls on the Leader to write to the Secretary of State requesting that ~~he its 2021 elections are held over until 2022~~ to allow sufficient time to undertake an open and wide-ranging conversation with our local authority partners, residents and stakeholders to explore all options for a new future for Oxfordshire. Our aims are clear: safeguard public services in the future, support a vibrant local democracy and ensure a strong economy.”

### **Agenda Item 18 – Motion by Councillor Charles Mathew – Amendment to by Councillor Ted Fenton**

“The recent decision by the Oxfordshire LEP to withdraw funding from the Loop Farm project (Duke’s Cut to Loop Farm Roundabout), a long-promised relief road to the A40 around Oxford, undermines sensible solutions to the current endless traffic jams on the A40 between Witney and the Oxford roundabouts. Given that the use of public money should be productive, Council asks Cabinet to review the unproductive plans presently being offered and adopt a long term strategy that will meet the needs of ~~travellers~~ **motorists** from afar and near for the next twenty years at least”

**Agenda Item 18 – Motion by Councillor Charles Mathew – Amendment to be moved by Councillor Pete Sudbury**

“The recent decision by the Oxfordshire LEP to withdraw funding from the Loop Farm project (Duke’s Cut to Loop Farm Roundabout), a long-promised relief road to the A40 around Oxford, undermines sensible solutions to the current endless traffic jams on the A40 between Witney and the Oxford roundabouts. Given that the use of public money should be productive, Council asks Cabinet to review the unproductive plans presently being offered and adopt a long term strategy that will meet the needs of travellers from afar and near for the next twenty years at least **and include a rail link to Witney and beyond.**”

**Agenda Item 19 – Motion by Councillor Yvonne Constance – Amendment to be moved by Councillor Pete Sudbury**

This Council is aware of the need for urgent action to reduce carbon emissions. The Government is now committed to the ambitious target of carbon neutrality by 2050, **a target described by the Committee on Climate Change (CCCUK) as "feasible but technically challenging"**. Given the scale of the challenge ahead in retrofitting existing buildings to deliver this target, it is imperative new developments are built now to the highest possible energy standards **i.e. zero-carbon or better**.

Oxfordshire is committed to deliver 100,000 houses by 2031. These homes must be ~~low~~ **zero-carbon**, energy and water efficient and climate resilient. ~~The committee on Climate Change~~ CCCUK recognises the cost of building to these standards is not prohibitive. Getting the design and build right from the outset is vastly cheaper than "locking in" carbon and forcing retrofit at a later date.

We strongly welcome the government's consultation on the Future Homes Standard, ~~which seeks to deliver homes with significantly lower carbon emissions~~ **but we believe the climate emergency requires new homes to be zero carbon as soon as possible**. ~~We note the standard is planned for introduction from 2025, with an interim uplift to building regulations in 2020.~~

Council asks the Leader and Cabinet Member for Environment to write to the Secretary of State requesting that the Government ensure that ~~the full ambition of these proposals is delivered and that the future homes standard~~ **all new homes (with no exemptions) be built to zero carbon standards within the shortest possible timescales, and in any case by the beginning of 2022, with an interim uplift later this year** We also urge the government to set these standards as a ‘minimum’ rather than a ‘ceiling’ standard, leaving open the opportunity for ~~higher standards to come forward~~ **local councils and neighbourhood plans to introduce higher standards**. ~~We also urge government to bring forward the introduction of this standard before 2025, by which time large numbers of Oxfordshire’s new homes will already have been built.~~

**Agenda Item 20 – Motion by Councillor Nick Field-Johnson – Amendment to be moved by Councillor Hilary Hibbert-Biles**

“We need to end sewage pollution and make our rivers clean and fit for ~~bathing and~~ recreation once again. We have *in this Country* a "clean beach policy" - we now need a clean river policy (such as a Blue flag approach for our rivers so that they can *become* clean and healthy once again).”

Oxfordshire County Council therefore ~~asks~~ *requests* the Leader of the Council to call on Oxfordshire MPs to insist that HM Government *bans and* takes *strong* action ~~to ban~~ *against* the dumping of raw and untreated sewage into our rivers and to support a clean river policy including the reintroduction of ~~bathing~~ quality status in our rivers.”

**Agenda Item 20 – Motion by Councillor Nick Field-Johnson – Amendment to be moved by Councillor Paul Buckley**

“We need to end sewage pollution and make our rivers clean and fit for bathing and recreation once again. We have a "clean beach policy" - we now need a clean river policy (such as a Blue flag approach for our rivers so that they can be clean and healthy once again).”

Oxfordshire County Council therefore asks the Leader of the Council to ~~call on Oxfordshire MPs to insist~~ *write to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, to ask* that HM Government takes action to ban the dumping of raw and untreated sewage into our rivers and to support a clean river policy including the reintroduction of bathing quality status in our rivers.”

**Agenda Item 23 – Motion by Councillor Deborah Mcilveen – Amendment to be moved by Councillor Ian Corkin**

This Council Notes:

The disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on *Black, Asian & Minority Ethnic* (BAME) communities, and the significant contribution of BAME individuals to the frontline COVID-19 response;

- The increase in hate crime towards people from BAME communities in Oxfordshire in recent years;
- ~~The impact of the Hostile Environment on the ‘Windrush generation’ and others who have the right to live in this country;~~
- ~~Structural Racism is still an everyday reality for~~ *very many* people from ~~Black, Asian and other minority~~ *BAME* and refugee communities

- ***The excellent track record of this council in championing those with protected characteristics.***

This Council also notes that:

- BAME communities are underrepresented in Oxfordshire County Council’s workforce, and that the Council’s Equality Policy and Strategy 2018-22 identifies the need to address this;
- Thousands of local people have expressed **deep** concerns about the existence of structural racism **in all its many forms** as part of **the wave of Black Lives Matters** protests, vigils and events that have taken place in recent weeks across the county **following the killing of George Floyd in Minneapolis;**
- Communities across Oxfordshire are united by a desire to live happy, healthy and productive lives, and recognise that reducing inequalities helps all communities to thrive;
- ~~The County Council Equalities Strategy for employment, service delivery and participation needs to be updated.~~

This Council therefore **resolves to:**

1. Pledges to make Oxfordshire an Anti-racist County, **working ever closer with our BAME communities, to listen to their concerns and identify the actions required to address inequality and tackle injustice;**
2. ~~Will~~ Work with and listen to people experiencing racism and **ensure inclusive renewal lies at the heart of our recovery plans;**
3. ~~Develop and implement an anti-racist~~ **Co-produce a sector leading anti- racist equality & inclusivity** strategy. ~~for employment, service delivery and participation; and~~
4. ~~will~~ Work with local authorities, public bodies, employers, trade unions and community groups **all stakeholders** to achieve this.

This page is intentionally left blank

### Jamie Hartzell

My name is Jamie Hartzell. I am a resident of Oxford City, and am presenting to you a petition in support of item 21 on your agenda. The petition calls on all councils within Oxfordshire to commit **now** to doubling tree cover by 2045. I am also running a project led by the Lord Lieutenant of Oxfordshire, to explore how we can double tree cover in the county.

I cannot understate the amount of public support for this issue. The petition has just under 2,500 signatories, including a number of members in this meeting. 700 people signed the petition in its last 2 days.

Cherwell District Council already voted this through, last January. Not one single councillor voted against the motion. And the City is also supporting the call.

Trees matter to us all. They provide shade, a habitat for wildlife and increase biodiversity. They help prevent flooding and soil erosion, cut noise and clean the air. They produce wood and food. They provide space for recreation. And most of all they help fight climate change, by capturing carbon dioxide emissions in the most natural way possible.

If we are to stand any chance of meeting our 2050 carbon neutral targets, we have to plant trees. Increasing tree cover is already central Government policy. And last November the council committed to make climate action a top priority in all decision making, and to lead action to manage land to capture carbon. The motion before you is simply the next step on that journey.

I must insist on the urgency of this matter. The carbon in the atmosphere is rising, and trees take a long time to grow. Every delay means we are less likely to meet our net zero targets. We first asked to debate this motion back in January. If we fail to vote on this motion today, that will be another two months lost.

So how can such a doubling be achieved? It's not a matter of covering the county with conifer plantations. It has to be the right trees in the right place. For the last six months my colleagues and I have been working on producing a 'tree opportunity map' for Oxfordshire. This will identify the best opportunities for tree planting, whilst also recognising competing land uses. This project has

2  
the support of all councils in the county, private landowners and Oxford University.

I would like to discourage you from thinking only of rows and rows of saplings inside plastic tubes, spread across our green and pleasant lands. Trees can in fact take many different forms.

Think of the difference between a broadleaf woodland, a community orchard or a tree in a city street. Each has a different value and is suited to a different habitat. But they are all trees.

So yes we can expand existing woodlands. But we can also add hedgerows back into our fields; or plant fruit trees in our back gardens. And we can explore the potential for agroforestry, where trees are grown alongside crops or livestock. This will all contribute to a rich and diverse landscape.

All this can only happen with the support of private landowners. To this end, we are using the mapping process as a way to engage with the full range of stakeholders with an interest in how land is used. Our aim is to create one single master plan that all parties agree on, and are then more likely to implement.

It is clear that the time for trees has come. The Government has already committed to an additional 75,000 acres of trees a year across the UK. So let's get ahead of the game and make sure that as many as possible of those 70 million trees are planted right here in Oxfordshire!

Thank you.

## **Dr Liz Sawyer**

Councillors, two months ago I spoke to your Cabinet on behalf of Oxfordshire Liveable Streets, to urge you to take the brave but necessary steps and implement far-reaching changes to allow walking and cycling in Oxford in preparation for the end of lockdown.

These have been a long two months. Your cabinet has taken some bold steps, committing to two, maybe three, bus gates to protect Oxford city centre from the worst impacts of excessive car numbers. OLS is delighted and impressed with your commitment to implement these bus gates, and we both applaud and support your decision to do so.

Unfortunately, there is still so much to be done. This is just the beginning. Oxfordshire was at the very bottom of the pack in winning only half of the potential £600,000 allocated to it by central government for active travel. Only a handful of other councils failed to this extent. Oxfordshire risks being left behind nationally, struggling in the coming decades to deal with the problems of congestion and pollution that exacerbate poor public health and deprivation, while many other regions will surge ahead - economically, socially, and culturally – by putting these problems firmly behind them. We ask that you prioritise winning the full £2.3m of tranche 2 funding by working with those individuals and organisations that are committed to and share the government's ambitions to promote active travel and support public health, and who anticipated the failure of the tranche 1 bid.

We urge you to put this cultural change at the forefront of your policy-making decisions, in order to allow Oxfordshire to rebuild its economy after Coronavirus.



Oxford's largest organisations, even Oxford University itself, have appealed to you to do what other authorities are implementing, and that the government has mandated: bike lanes along arterial routes that are segregated from traffic, continuous, and safe, so that people can switch to active travel and leave their cars at home. Shortly, Councillor John Sanders will ask you to implement Low Traffic Neighbourhoods, and we ask you to support this motion. Afterwards, Councillor Yvonne Constance, the member for the environment and transport, will ask you to ask the government to bring forward standards for environmentally friendly new housing. Please imagine how their residents will travel to and from these 100,000 new houses that she specifies, and consider how, if you do not provide good quality infrastructure for walking and cycling from the very beginning for those houses, you will be locking in precisely the carbon dependency she asks you to avoid. As the local authority, you have the power and the agency to achieve these changes.

Change never comes easily, especially changes of habit. You may already be feeling under pressure from people who are opposed to the bus gates, who feel that they cannot possibly change their behavior. You may even be asking yourself how you can get to your usual destinations once the gates are in place, and may feel reluctant to change your own habits. But change is possible, as the interventions in Waltham Forest in London have proved: there was resistance from a vocal minority, but over a year habits changed, people's health improved, businesses flourished, and their councilors have been re-elected with increased majorities. Councilors there are proud of the fact that they have saved people's lives due to improved air quality, and through showing the moral courage and commitment to see the changes through until the full benefits were felt, and the resistance evaporated. Like in Waltham Forest, the silent majority in Oxford will change their habits, and support your efforts to improve the city for everyone. We ask you to show the courage and determination that your peers in Waltham Forest, and in cities and counties nationwide, are currently demonstrating.

Finally, consider the principles behind central government's funding stipulations: by putting public health and active travel front and centre, you will protect Oxfordshire's economic recovery and long-term sustainability. The government, and the city's own businesses, are urging you to be ambitious and to be bold. You have the authority to bring in Connecting Oxford Plus, low traffic neighbourhoods, and to pedestrianize streets. We urge you to make these changes without delay.

Thank you.

## **Mr Patrick Coulter**

I'm Patrick Coulter and I'm speaking on behalf of Headington Liveable Streets, Headington Action and Headington Neighbourhood Forum,

We warmly welcome Councillor John Sander's motion set out in Item 16 that the Council adopts a policy of supporting Low Traffic Neighbourhoods. Our focus is Headington but our experience is shared by neighbourhoods and communities across Oxford and Oxfordshire.

For the past 20 years our community in Headington has sought traffic management measures to limit traffic volumes and speeds through our neighbourhoods. In particular we seek the removal of through traffic from residential areas. Now as a consequence of the present crisis the benefits of active travel are manifest.

Low traffic neighbourhoods offer opportunities for people to walk and cycle in safety and to enjoy pollution and noise free local environments. The cost is minimal in terms of their huge social benefits. They require only minor levels of infrastructure in the form of planters, markings and signage. But they have the capacity to transform our neighbourhoods for the better.

Once through traffic is removed there are opportunities to create an environment where people can use streets and pavements as social spaces once again. Where communities are permeable and not divided and restricted by unnecessary traffic. Where children can walk and cycle to school in safety. The evidence of the benefits of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods is overwhelming.

Undoubtedly there will be some opposition on the ground of inconvenience to motorists. However motorists are also cyclists and pedestrians who live in neighbourhoods. We have asked residents in areas where through traffic has been blocked off and without exception measures which were at the time controversial are now considered essential. No one wished that their streets open to through traffic again.

For our community in Headington our Neighbourhood Plan, which contains policies for removing neighbourhood traffic, was endorsed through referendum by 85% of those taking part. There have been many petitions and campaigns over recent years. The most recent survey undertaken locally by the City Council shows that the key issue arising from the current crisis is the need for Active Travel measures.

So we now share a common project to help us improve our communities through provision of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods. We urge you to endorse Councillor Sander's motion.

Thank you.

**QUESTION ON NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

**Question from Mr Chris Henderson to Councillor Lorraine Lindsay-Gale**

On 10th May the Government released its roadmap for exiting lockdown, at which point it became clear that Libraries would be allowed to open to the public from the 4th July. Local authorities around the Country worked towards this date. Neighbouring Buckinghamshire, for example, established a select and collect service from 22nd June and had their entire library network open on 6th July.

Oxfordshire in contrast seemed totally unprepared. A decision to phase re-opening was made in early May but it remains unclear upon what basis. Despite a late change in timetable with the opening date for the first tranche of libraries brought forward from the 31st July to the 13th July there are at present only plans to have 11 sites open by 20th July with no date given for the rest of the network (at time of writing this question).

Members of Library staff, keen to provide a service to their public, were repeatedly told they should say absolutely nothing about re-opening to the public who pay their wages or to their Library Friends Groups with veiled threats of repercussions for anyone who stepped out of line.

No information was available on the County website until 7th July, in marked contrast to almost every other local authority.

Can the Cabinet Member explain what exceptional circumstances exist in Oxfordshire that make it so difficult to re-open their library service?

**Answer**

Oxfordshire County Council is in step with other local authorities in taking a planned approach to reopening its public libraries and public facilities in a prioritised way, making sure all staff and our communities are safe when they return to our buildings.

Public Library services across the UK are taking a slightly different approach to reopening their services. Some library services have not yet reopened, some libraries have opened some of their libraries and some have offered a click and collect service only.

Derbyshire for example have reopened a very small number of its libraries initially with residents having to book an appointment to visit their library, Cambridge / Peterborough reopened less than 1/4 of its libraries. Dorset will continue a click and collect service for the foreseeable future. Kent has reopened 12 of its 99 libraries for a click and collect service. Milton Keynes and Wiltshire don't yet have a date for their libraries to reopen.

We are pleased that our planning will deliver a return to some of the things our residents value and have missed over the last few extraordinary months. While some library authorities are just planning a click and collect service, our priority is to get people back into libraries in a safe and socially-distanced way, so that they can choose their own books and access the range of other services that our libraries offer.

They will be able to browse, select their own materials, check these items out and of course return the items to the library. All returns will do 72 hours in quarantine. Customers will be able to use the public computers, and for our vulnerable residents libraries will provide the bus pass and blue badge validation service. With visits restricted to 30 minutes, we are maximising the opportunity for all members of our community to access our libraries.

The first set of libraries opened yesterday; something I am sure you will join with me in celebrating. And I can reconfirm we will continue a very measured programme to open subsequent libraries in a planned and carefully controlled way.

During lockdown our library staff have been very busy behind the scenes supporting frontline customer services including:

- Making calls to vulnerable residents shielding
- Supporting Registration services with critical document distribution
- Marshalling traffic when the Household Waste Recycling Centres re-opened

I am proud to say that the Library service has also enhanced its ebook provision by £20,000, and has been delivering story times, a creative writing series, book clubs, Lego clubs, poetry competitions, origami sessions, podcasts, online homework and study resources, our digital summer programme and of course our summer reading challenge. 882 people joined online between April-June.

The Service have issued various social media and print press releases advising the public that we are working on a phased re-opening. Library staff have been supported in responding to online queries.

It would be inappropriate of me to comment in detail on internal staffing matters however please be assured that my senior managers have thoroughly reviewed information shared with staff both verbally and in writing and can confirm our staff have been kept fully updated with plans for reopening and key messages they can share with members of the public and friends of the library groups. They are disappointed to receive your allegations of behaviour they do not recognise.

Our focus now must be to get our staff into the libraries set to reopen our doors to Oxfordshire residents in the weeks to come. As of yesterday

**The following libraries are open:**

- Oxfordshire County Library with new enlarged lifts...
- Abingdon
- Thame

- Witney
- Bicester
- Didcot

The following libraries will reopen on the week commencing 20 July 2020

- Banbury
- Cowley
- Carterton
- Henley
- Kidlington

Dates for the reopening of libraries elsewhere in Oxfordshire will be published in due course.

### **Question from Mr Peter Barnett to Councillor Yvonne Constance**

Following the disappointing allocation of Tranche 1 Emergency Active Travel Funds (EATF) from DfT and, while I understand the laudable intention of OCC to spread the funds in the bid evenly across the county, will OCC commit to fully involve and consult, not just county councillors, as in the EATF Tranche 1 bid, but also the various cycling and other expert groups such as Cyclox and Build Back Better - Oxford, in the development of the bid for EATF Tranche 2 funding, and further will OCC commit that these groups will actually see the EATF Tranche 2 bid before it is submitted so that further mistakes are not made.

This page is intentionally left blank

**QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL**

**ANNEX 2**

Questions are listed in the order in which they were received. The time allowed for this agenda item will not exceed 30 minutes. Should any questioner not have received an answer in that time, a written answer will be provided.

| <b>Questions</b>   | <b>Answers</b>  |
|--|---|
| <p><b>1. COUNCILLOR MIKE FOX-DAVIES</b></p> <p>Could you please update me on the Cycle route between Wantage and Harwell Campus, as part of the Science Vale Cycle route, detailing the scope and timescale please.</p>  | <p><b>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>The route allows cyclists travelling from Wantage to Harwell Campus to avoid the A417 and A4185 reducing journeys shared with road traffic by over 2 miles.</p> <p>Users benefit from a much improved, widened and surfaced (with Type 1 Limestone) paths, appropriate for this unique rural setting. The old wooden bridge, over Ginge Brook, will be replaced with a 20m-long galvanised steel bridge with wooden deck and parapets. There will also be improvements to two newly dedicated bridleways.</p> <p>Works started 26 May with completion by October 2020.</p> |
| <p><b>2. COUNCILLOR NEVILLE HARRIS</b></p> <p>Please advise the name of the main contractor to be employed for the work required to complete the Didcot Northern Perimeter Road together with confirmation of its final route. Please also provide an estimate of the time that will be needed to complete the work required and details of the proposed planned traffic diversions?</p> | <p><b>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>We are in the process of going through the procurement process to secure a contractor. The final route will be confirmed once the transport model for the area has been completed to ensure that it meets the needs of the (yet to be confirmed) housing numbers for Didcot and the surrounding areas.</p> <p>Further information such as traffic management plans and future phases of works will be communicated and uploaded to the website as soon as they have been finalised.</p>  |

| Questions   | Answers  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>3. COUNCILLOR NEVILLE HARRIS</b></p> <p>Didcot's Northern Perimeter Road is still not complete and the wait for its completion now exceeds 40 years. Please confirm the commencement date for the work required to complete what has been designated Phase Three of Didcot's Northern Perimeter Road?</p> | <p><b>COUCILLOR IAN HUDSPETH, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</b></p> <p>Significant design work on the NPR3 has been undertaken and Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) has secured a proportion of the funding required to design and build the road from housing developments in the area. South Oxfordshire District Council has also secured some funding from Government to help fund the road.</p> <p>Design work on NPR3 was put temporarily on hold while OCC had a transport model built for Didcot and the surrounding area. The model is now available to use to test different options for the design of the junctions that form part of the NPR3 scheme. When this testing is complete, we will be able to proceed to the next stage of the design work, including working up a planning application to allow us to seek permission to build the road.</p> <p>The alignment of the road has not changed since the public consultation was carried out in April 2016, although the design and exact positioning of the northernmost roundabout is still to be confirmed, depending on the outcome of transport modelling work.</p> <p>At the moment, it is not possible to provide a precise timescale for the expected construction of the road. NPR3 is dependent on Ladygrove East to contribute towards the funding required to build the road and provide a large portion of the land that the scheme requires. It is expected that SODC will forward fund the road (until such time that it can recoup the money from the Ladygrove East development).</p> <p>In respect of delivery timing, the county council also needs to be mindful of the operation of the road network in Didcot and the impact that could result from the simultaneous construction of NPR3 and the HIF schemes. Therefore, as design work progresses on all schemes, we will work with our network management team to plan when is best to deliver the works.</p> |



| <b>Questions</b>  | <b>Answers</b>  |
|---|---|
| <p><b>4. COUNCILLOR SUZANNE BARTINGTON</b></p> <p>The local cycling and walking infrastructure plan (LCWIP) for Oxford received widespread praise as leading the way on planning for proper provision for cycling and walking when it was submitted in late 2019, accompanied with a bid for £300 million to the Department for Transport. The LCWIP for Bicester has been drafted and the plan for Didcot is underway supported by our Active and Health Travel Officer. What is the broader plan for LCWIPS and Active Travel with other market towns across Oxfordshire?</p> | <p><b>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>The Council is considering extending LCWIPs to other towns as funding and other opportunities arise. With the co-operation of Cherwell District Council, we are already developing an LCWIP in Kidlington.</p>   |
| <p><b>5. COUNCILLOR SUZANNE BARTINGTON</b></p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council has recently recruited an Active Travel Hub lead, following a £0.5M investment for an active travel hub in the most recent Council budget. What will be the responsibilities of the Active Travel Hub lead and how will this support locking-in benefits of cycling uptake observed during the COVID-19 lockdown?</p>  | <p><b>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>The Council has appointed an active travel hub lead whose responsibility will be to embed active travel throughout Oxfordshire. This will entail ensuring that all relevant Council policies, programmes and schemes support active travel. The post commences at the beginning of August and it is envisaged that the postholder will be involved in the prioritisation and implementation of active travel recovery schemes.</p> |
| <p><b>6. COUNCILLOR SUZANNE BARTINGTON</b></p> <p>The Peep O Day Lane cycleway (running from Abingdon Marina to Drayton) has recently been</p>  | <p><b>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>It is great to hear such positive feedback on the use of Flexipave and i-glo discs. We will also be using this on Science Vale Cycle Network route 3D</p>  |

| Questions  | Answers   |
|--|---|
| <p>resurfaced within the most recent phase Science Vale Cycling Network project which aims to provide better cycle connectivity between the employment centres at Harwell, Oxford, Milton Park and Culham Science Centre and the towns of Abingdon, Didcot, and Wantage. The surface used for Peep O Day Lane has received widespread praise from users, given it is porous reclaimed rubber with luminous side-markers. Are there any future plans to deploy this excellent surface across additional cycleways in Oxfordshire?</p> | <p>(Milton Park to Sutton Courtenay) and 7A (Abingdon to Culham Science Centre).</p> <p>We will also look at how this surface could be incorporated into Oxfordshire County Council's cycling design standards, which are being reviewed this year. These would then be incorporated into our Local Transport and Connectivity Plan.</p>  |
| <p><b>7. COUNCILLOR LIZ LEFFMAN</b></p> <p>On June 25th the BBC aired a news item which showed that much of the plastic waste that people in the UK separate into their recycling bins is going to Turkey, where it is being burnt in the open air rather than being recycled. Can Councillor Constance assure this Council that Oxfordshire's waste plastic is not ending up being handled in this way, but is being recycled for reuse as our residents expect it to be?</p>   | <p><b>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>The County Council has direct control over materials collected at the Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs) with the District Councils responsible for recycling materials collected at the kerbside. All Oxfordshire Authorities require contractors to provide details of every facility that our waste is sent to on an ongoing basis and report these to the Environment Agency as required.</p> <p>We use appropriately licensed facilities or brokers through contractors who can process the materials sent to them. However, materials are sold on as commodities, sometimes several times and this can be in the UK, Europe or beyond subject to market influences. Unfortunately, as waste moves beyond our contracted initial destination, we lose visibility and control and therefore cannot say with absolute certainty that Oxfordshire's waste is not being exported to locations of concern.</p> <p>Within the current system all local authorities, the Environment Agency and</p> |

| Questions   | Answers  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>the UK government have limited visibility to track waste beyond the UK borders and rely on the regulation of those industries to assess the markets they sell the material into. This issue is a national problem requiring a national solution, which is being addressed in the governments national Resources and Waste Strategy 2018. An important additional factor is the lack of infrastructure to process recyclables in the UK. This is also a national issue and until addressed will see some recyclables continue to be sent abroad.</p> <p>As individual authorities, and a waste partnership, we are engaged with Government, national groups and the waste industry to reform the waste tracking system, provide greater visibility to the councils of how its recycled waste is used, and develop UK recycling infrastructure.</p> |
| <p><b>8. COUNCILLOR MARK CHERRY</b></p> <p>Could I have written confirmation of the current schedule for all streetlights in Banbury Ruscote to be changed from halogen to LED, and are there any plans for electric car chargers to be installed in Banbury Ruscote?</p> | <p><b>COUNCILLOR LIAM WALKER, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS DELIVERY AND OPERATIONS</b></p> <p>The conversion from Halogen to LED streetlights will take place on some assets in the area mentioned within the next few years. Our current approach is to prioritise replacement of luminaires and columns that physically failing on major traffic routes. This is where the bigger energy savings would be made.</p> <p>Regarding plans for electric vehicle chargers, The County Council in partnership with the District Councils are currently working on the strategy and design standards for electric vehicle chargers. We are yet to finalise plans for specific locations.</p>   |
| <p><b>9. COUNCILLOR MARK CHERRY</b></p> <p>Warwick Road and Edmonds Road continue to deteriorate and so far, are not looking like any major resurfacing work is going to be carried out in the next few years. As the members for</p>                                     | <p><b>COUNCILLOR LIAM WALKER, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS DELIVERY AND OPERATIONS</b></p> <p>Warwick Road from Orchard Way to Southam Road lights is currently on our future programme for delivery in year 2024/25. It was reassessed last year (with no evidence to suggest a change in priority). Edmonds Road has not been assessed. I have asked officers to schedule one and report back.</p>  |

| <b>Questions</b>   | <b>Answers</b>  |
|--|---|
| environment including transport, could you tell me if this situation be reconsidered?  |   |
| <p><b>10. COUNCILLOR MARK CHERRY</b></p> <p>You will be aware that the section 106 and section 278 works were completed by Bloor homes contractors MV Kelly in the locality north Oxfordshire Academy School ,A422 Stratford Road although Road works including resurfacing work and new puffin crossing did not include funding for a vitally needed 20 MPH speed limit by the school for safety concerns.</p> <p>I have put this request into the relevant officers for consideration for the active travel fund which criteria includes 20MPH zone. Could the cabinet member inform me if funding will be forthcoming for a 20MPH zone by north Oxfordshire Academy School?</p> | <p><b>COUNCILLOR LIAM WALKER, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS DELIVERY AND OPERATIONS</b></p> <p>I can confirm that the request for a 20mph zone outside the North Oxfordshire Academy in Banbury will be assessed within the Tranche 2 of the Active Travel Measures. We will need the criteria for the funding from the Department for Transport in order to assess all the options being put forward and then prioritise schemes against the confirmed funding allocation.</p> |
| <p><b>11. COUNCILLOR JUDITH HEATHCOAT</b></p> <p>In my Division recently, on the A417 there was a burst sewerage main which regurgitated raw sewerage on to the street, into gardens of residents, and also in the carpark of a local nursery establishment. The little ones were sent home. Skanska responded to the emergency and closed the road; Thames Water were immediately on the scene and OFRS offered</p>   | <p><b>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>We recognise that this is a huge problem, not just in Oxfordshire, but nationwide. So, with this in mind we will be getting in touch with Thames Water to look at how we can coordinate joint messaging to help raise better awareness.</p>  |

| Questions  | Answers   |
|--|---|
| <p>support to householders. The burst was caused by a resident flushing completely unsuitable items down their toilets. Non-disposable nappies, non-disposable wipes, baby buds, non-disposable sanitary wear and believe it, or believe it not, children's toys. Can I ask that we contact Thames Water to see if there is anything, we can do together to promote the correct disposal around these sorts of items, there doesn't appear to be one trade or professional body that covers all the different aspects of the water system. There needs to be a higher profile and encouragement by ourselves, the utilities to education our residents but, most of all a higher profile and publicity to ensure that work is done with manufacturers to stop them promoting items as flushable or disposable when they clearly are not.</p> |   |
| <p><b>12. COUNCILLOR MICHAEL WAINE</b></p> <p>What is the current status of the South-East Bicester Relief Road, is it just a line on a plan or is it actively seen as the vital component enabling Bicester's growth?</p>   | <p><b>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>At Cabinet Member Decisions in March 2016, the following recommendations were approved:</p> <p>The Cabinet Member is RECOMMENDED to:</p> <p>(a) note the responses received as part of the consultation;</p> <p>(b) safeguard Route Option 2 (Southern alignment) through agreement with Cherwell District Council as part of Cherwell Local Plan Part 2 (CLP Part 2).</p> <p>OCC did subsequently write to Cherwell District Council asking for the route to be safeguarded but the Local Plan Part 2 was not progressed.</p> |

| Questions  | Answers  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>The project was put on hold awaiting the outcome of Bicester Town Garden work on a proposals for a new motorway junction and the outcome of the Oxford-Cambridge Expressway. Work on the scheme does need to be progressed as part of a planned review of the A41 through Bicester, which will feed into the area transport strategy within the Local Transport &amp; Connectivity Plan (LTCP) and Cherwell District Council's Local Plan Review.</p> <p>The A41 forms part of the peripheral road network in Bicester which plays a key role in the transport strategy for the town. The peripheral routes strategy is expected to remain integral with the increasing focus on active and healthy travel through the LTCP as it will enable the local travel network to concentrate on sustainable modes. With the number of developments that have or are being delivered along the corridor, as well as the background growth along this strategic link, the A41 through Bicester is becoming heavily congested and the south east link road remains a vital component at this stage.</p> |
| <p><b>13 .COUNCILLOR SUSANNA PRESSEL</b></p> <p>Why did it take 4 months for the government to start sharing with us granular data on who has tested positive for Covid-19? (I'm aware that the full Test-Trace-Isolate system started only in June, but we should surely have been given all the Pillar 2 data as well from February or March onwards, in a timely, reliable and comprehensive manner?)</p> | <p><b>COUNCILLOR LAWRIE STRATFORD, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE &amp; PUBLIC HEALTH</b></p> <p>The NHS Test and Trace system services are commissioned and operationally overseen by Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC). They are the owners of the data that is associated with these services. The Councillor will need to ask DHSC regarding their decisions on sharing data locally.</p>  |

| Questions  | Answers   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>14. COUNCILLOR SUSANNA PRESSEL</b></p> <p>Why do you think the government was initially slow to speak to us, to headteachers and to the unions about how to get all children back to school safely?</p>  | <p><b>COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LINDSAY-GALE, CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION &amp; CULTURAL SERVICES</b></p> <p>I cannot comment on the government's approach, but I can comment on engagement between our officers and officials from the Department for Education (DfE).</p> <p>Officers from the Children, Education and Families Directorate have a weekly virtual meeting with Department for Education officials. This provides an opportunity for officers to share good practice, respond to questions and offer advice to officials based on local experience. Officers continue to meet with Headteacher Chairs of Local Partnership each week. This means that there can be a good process of engagement with Department for Education officials.</p>  |
| <p><b>15. COUNCILLOR EMMA TURNBULL</b></p> <p>What proportion of Oxfordshire's vulnerable young people, particularly those with EHC plans, have not had regular access to an education setting during lockdown; how many are still waiting for DfE equipment, such as laptops; and what interventions have been made to address the lack of provision?</p> | <p><b>COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LINDSAY-GALE, CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION &amp; CULTURAL SERVICES</b></p> <p>All schools have remained open for children of Critical Workers and those who are deemed as vulnerable, this includes those who have EHCPs. Only two special schools had to close (Kingfisher Academy and Fitzwarren Academy – both in the Propeller Academy Trust). Less than 5% of maintained schools closed and then only for deep cleaning for a day or in some cases two. When places for eligible children have been required by parents and their schools have been closed, the County Council's emergency brokerage team was able to find a temporary place in another school or setting for all that sought an alternative place bar one Early Years child.</p> <p>Regarding interventions when a lack of provision has been available, the affected cohort has been a small number of permanently excluded children who had yet to be placed via the In Year Fair Access process. These children have received education through online tutoring services commissioned by the County Council.</p> |

| Questions  | Answers   |   |                               |  |                                  |  |                               |  |                               |
|--|---|---|-------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
|  | <p>Specifically, for children with EHCPs, attendance during the week before May half term break (the last week before 1<sup>st</sup> June when all primary schools opened more widely) was</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td data-bbox="931 368 1518 440">LA mainstream schools only<br/>EHCP cohort</td> <td data-bbox="1525 368 1957 403">- 131 pupils 8.5% of possible</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="931 440 1518 512">LA special schools only<br/>EHCP cohort</td> <td data-bbox="1525 440 1989 475">- 134 pupils – 11.3% of possible</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="931 512 1518 584">LA mainstream and special schools<br/>EHCP cohort</td> <td data-bbox="1525 512 1957 547">- 265 pupils 9.7% of possible</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="931 584 1518 655">All Oxfordshire schools incl. independent<br/>EHCP cohort</td> <td data-bbox="1525 584 1957 619">- 302 pupils 8.9% of possible</td> </tr> </table> <p>Should any parent of a child with an EHCP be seeking a return to school place and requires support, Special Needs Officers are on hand to provide this service. During lockdown, officers have participated in two open virtual events for parents of children with special educational needs. Barriers to return to school were not raised by individual parents during these events, with in excess of 100 parents participating in each, but the advice was offered to be shared with parents not attending these events to contact their Special Needs Officers if issues arise.</p> <p>During the week before half term 3567 pupils with EHCPs, with critical worker parents or deemed as vulnerable attended school which is 3.86% of the Oxfordshire school population – compared with 2.70% nationally.</p> <p>Since 1<sup>st</sup> June, the data below indicates take up of return to school wider opportunities for children deemed vulnerable and with EHCPs.</p> | LA mainstream schools only<br>EHCP cohort | - 131 pupils 8.5% of possible | LA special schools only<br>EHCP cohort | - 134 pupils – 11.3% of possible | LA mainstream and special schools<br>EHCP cohort | - 265 pupils 9.7% of possible | All Oxfordshire schools incl. independent<br>EHCP cohort | - 302 pupils 8.9% of possible |
| LA mainstream schools only<br>EHCP cohort                | - 131 pupils 8.5% of possible   |   |                               |  |                                  |  |                               |  |                               |
| LA special schools only<br>EHCP cohort                   | - 134 pupils – 11.3% of possible  |   |                               |  |                                  |  |                               |  |                               |
| LA mainstream and special schools<br>EHCP cohort         | - 265 pupils 9.7% of possible   |   |                               |  |                                  |  |                               |  |                               |
| All Oxfordshire schools incl. independent<br>EHCP cohort | - 302 pupils 8.9% of possible   |   |                               |  |                                  |  |                               |  |                               |



| Questions   | Answers  |       |       |       |       |       |       |        |       |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |        |       |           |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |            |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |      |                            |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |                   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
|---|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|------|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
|   | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="9">Number of children attending Oxfordshire schools</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>'1Jun</th> <th>'2Jun</th> <th>'3Jun</th> <th>'4Jun</th> <th>'5Jun</th> <th>'8Jun</th> <th>'9Jun</th> <th>'10Jun</th> <th>11Jun</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Keyworker</td> <td>2450</td> <td>3311</td> <td>3651</td> <td>3621</td> <td>3200</td> <td>4045</td> <td>4377</td> <td>3979</td> <td>4140</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vulnerable</td> <td>527</td> <td>743</td> <td>869</td> <td>900</td> <td>814</td> <td>952</td> <td>1015</td> <td>993</td> <td>1037</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vulnerable - social worker</td> <td>442</td> <td>563</td> <td>654</td> <td>632</td> <td>583</td> <td>709</td> <td>736</td> <td>670</td> <td>704</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vulnerable - EHCP</td> <td>310</td> <td>408</td> <td>431</td> <td>428</td> <td>421</td> <td>526</td> <td>540</td> <td>496</td> <td>600</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>   |       |       |       |       |       |       |        |       |  |  | Number of children attending Oxfordshire schools |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | '1Jun | '2Jun | '3Jun | '4Jun | '5Jun | '8Jun | '9Jun | '10Jun | 11Jun | Keyworker | 2450 | 3311 | 3651 | 3621 | 3200 | 4045 | 4377 | 3979 | 4140 | Vulnerable | 527 | 743 | 869 | 900 | 814 | 952 | 1015 | 993 | 1037 | Vulnerable - social worker | 442 | 563 | 654 | 632 | 583 | 709 | 736 | 670 | 704 | Vulnerable - EHCP | 310 | 408 | 431 | 428 | 421 | 526 | 540 | 496 | 600 |
|   | Number of children attending Oxfordshire schools   |       |       |       |       |       |       |        |       |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |        |       |           |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |            |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |      |                            |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |                   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
|   | '1Jun  | '2Jun | '3Jun | '4Jun | '5Jun | '8Jun | '9Jun | '10Jun | 11Jun |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |        |       |           |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |            |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |      |                            |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |                   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Keyworker   | 2450   | 3311  | 3651  | 3621  | 3200  | 4045  | 4377  | 3979   | 4140  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |        |       |           |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |            |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |      |                            |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |                   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Vulnerable  | 527  | 743   | 869   | 900   | 814   | 952   | 1015  | 993    | 1037  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |        |       |           |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |            |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |      |                            |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |                   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Vulnerable - social worker  | 442  | 563   | 654   | 632   | 583   | 709   | 736   | 670    | 704   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |        |       |           |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |            |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |      |                            |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |                   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Vulnerable - EHCP   | 310  | 408   | 431   | 428   | 421   | 526   | 540   | 496    | 600   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |        |       |           |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |            |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |      |                            |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |                   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| <p><b>16. COUNCILLOR EMMA TURNBULL</b></p> <p>How many Home-to-School transport journeys were cancelled for eligible pupils who were still entitled to attend school during lockdown?</p> | <p>THE DfE funded I.T equipment (laptops and routers) are for those children who are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Care leavers</li> <li>• Have a Social Worker</li> <li>• Are in Y10 and 'disadvantaged'</li> </ul> <p>The County Council is responsible for ordering the laptops for care leavers and those pupils with Social Workers.</p> <p>In the case of Y10s deemed 'disadvantaged', Academies order them direct from the DfE and OCC order for the maintained secondaries. OCC, therefore, only ordered for Carterton Community College and the delivery was made to the school on 25<sup>th</sup> June.</p> <p>Whilst gathering the information from schools about numbers required, it was widely reported that individual schools have loaned their own computers to pupils.</p> <p>Children's Social Care is arranging wider delivery of the laptops to Care Leavers and pupils deemed 'disadvantaged' this week ending 10<sup>th</sup> July 2020.</p> <p><b>COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LINDSAY-GALE, CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION &amp; CULTURAL SERVICES</b></p> <p>Regarding Home to School transport provision for pupils entitled to this service there has been transport available throughout the period of lockdown. Where pupils were attending school by virtue of either being deemed as vulnerable or as child of a parent/carer defined as a critical worker, transport</p> |       |       |       |       |       |       |        |       |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |        |       |           |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |            |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |     |      |                            |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |                   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |

| Questions  | Answers   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>has been made available. This has also been the case for children accessing places in a different school for any reason through the school place brokering service.</p> <p>It is not possible to give figures of any cancelled individual journeys because schools (Mainstream and Special) have been frequently changing the requirements for transport to accommodate the needs of pupils on site.</p> <p>Although there are monthly records of the number of pupils being transported (and Direct Travel Payments made) which could be compared against the number being transported pre COVID this would not show that the same children have been transported in any month.</p>   |
| <p><b>17. COUNCILLOR EMMA TURNBULL</b></p> <p>How many vulnerable children have the multi-agency teams been unable to contact within the statutory timeframe during lockdown, and what have been the primary reasons for this?</p> | <p><b>COUNCILLOR STEVE HARROD, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN &amp; FAMILY SERVICES</b></p> <p>Since April we have</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• received 1403 contacts into the MASH of which 75% were dealt with on time, 83% of the high need cases were on time. We have taken actions to improve the timeliness of partner’s information-sharing and anticipate that the high need will return to 90+% on time in the next month</li> <li>• within these contacts there have been 427 child protection enquiries undertaken</li> <li>• 83% of our ICPCs have been on time (last national average 79%)</li> <li>• started 1601 social care assessments – with 93% of the caseload being work with on time</li> <li>• each week we have routinely visited between 600 and 700 children we care for, those the subject of a child protection plan and those the subject of a child in need plan</li> <li>• all children open to social care are risk assessed weekly and RAG rated. All ‘red’ children are seen face-to-face and all others are seen via videocalls to statutory timescales. PPE is used on home visits.</li> </ul> |

| Questions   | Answers  |
|---|--|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>all staff with underlying health conditions and all staff from minority ethnic groups are risk assessed in respect of their participation in face-to-face work. Staff work flexibly to ensure all children's visits take place</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>18. COUNCILLOR GLYNIS PHILLIPS</b></p> <p>The Cabinet meeting 16 June 2020 was advised that although the Council has received £27.2m from government that there was a shortfall of £37.3m for 2020/2021. It would be helpful if the Cabinet member could advise how the shortfall will be met and share his deliberations around setting an emergency budget?</p> | <p><b>COUNCILLOR DAVID BARTHOLOMEW, CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE</b></p> <p>Thank you for asking this important question and giving me the opportunity to provide an update on the financial impact of Covid-19 on the Council.</p> <p>The figure you refer to was an early estimate of the impact on 20/21. This estimate was subsequently revised down to £62.9m in the May return to MHCLG. After Government funding of £27.2, this gave a nett shortfall of £35.7m. Since then, a revised base case has been produced further revising down the impact to £50.9m, which translates to £23.7m nett.</p> <p>On 2 July the SoS announced additional funding, but at the time of writing Oxfordshire's allocation has not been confirmed, although officers have produced an estimate of the likely amount. Should you wish to ask a follow-up question, I may be able to be more precise at Full Council on 14 July.</p> <p>Whatever the exact amount, it is clear that the existing Budget will require substantial revision. Cabinet Members are currently working with officers to identify the changes that have to be made. These will be reviewed during the course of July to be followed by an Extraordinary Cabinet Meeting in August. Recommendations for Budget revisions will then be put to Full Council in September.</p> |
| <p><b>19. COUNCILLOR GILL SANDERS</b></p> <p>I am being asked by my constituents as to why Oxfordshire has lost £300,000 of the First</p>   | <p><b>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>The Emergency Active Travel Fund was intended to enable walking and cycling as lockdown restrictions were eased through 'swift and meaningful</p>   |

| Questions  | Answers   |
|--|---|
| <p>Tranche funding from the government's Active Travel Fund that had been earmarked for Oxfordshire County Council. Will the cabinet member explain how it was that the county was unable to meet the government's criteria? Will she admit that the additional £300,000 that the council has decided to make up the shortfall will come out of county funds that might better have been spent on other front-line services?</p> | <p>plans to reallocate road space to cyclists and pedestrians, including on strategic corridors. Oxfordshire was given an indicative allocation of £597,000 for tranche one. The conditions we were asked to comply with included spending the money within eight weeks, and we were given 1 week to submit our proposal.</p> <p>In developing the Oxfordshire proposal, officers started by reviewing the outputs of the recently undertaken active travel member survey to ensure that our bid reflected their priorities. We then shortlisted these based on the measures we believed were consistent with the grant conditions and those that were aligned with the priorities of the district and city councils. We also ensured that the needs of the entire county were considered. In addition to new temporary measures, we also proposed that we would add to any money from Department for Transport (DfT) by reprioritising our maintenance programmes, and also sought other funding to enable more to be done, including the use of developer's contributions. This process was designed to ensure that we developed a package of measures that would best meet the needs of Oxfordshire's residents and communities as lockdown restrictions were eased.</p> <p>When we received formal notification of funding, we were advised that DfT had decided to award authorities either 25%, 50%, 75% or 100% of their allocation. In some cases, authorities could receive more than their indicative allocation. This was not stated in the original grant conditions.</p> <p>Oxfordshire received 50% of its indicative allocation. Feedback from DfT, suggested that they didn't feel all of our measures would achieve the meaningful shift to cycling and walking. They said that "we did not see sufficient evidence of this in your proposal and noted that a number of measures were around maintenance of existing lanes and repainting of existing cycle lanes which is not the primary purpose of the fund, so were not able to agree to the full indicative allocation". We suspect the approach of looking across Oxfordshire as a whole rather than concentrating on main</p> |

| Questions  | Answers  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>urban areas may have also had a bearing. This does seem to have been an issue across the country, with many counties receiving approximately 50% of their allocation, and many urban metropolitan areas receiving either 100% or 111% of their allocation.</p> <p>As set out above, the Active Travel Fund was just one of a number of funding sources that we are using to deliver this programme, and I can confirm that all the measures we identified for the tranche one programme will be still delivered. It is clear from the feedback from DfT that any additional funding we could have received from them would have had to be spent on measures that are in addition to what is already planned, and so wouldn't have reduced the financial pressure to deliver our current programme.</p> <p>We will be looking to increase our funding in tranche two, for which our indicative allocation is £2.3m, and we will liaise closely with DfT to ensure we maximise our chances to achieve that. We have not yet received any information from DfT on tranche 2, but are told that it is imminent.</p> |
| <p><b>20. COUNCILLOR DAMIAN HAYWOOD</b></p> <p>I am pleased that the Cabinet member has agreed to implement the full £600k of work identified in tranche 1 even though our bid was not fully successful, we have only received 50%, but this is £300k which we didn't need to spend. So, my question is why does the cabinet member think they were not provided with the full allocation?</p> | <p><b>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>The Emergency Active Travel Fund was intended to enable walking and cycling as lockdown restrictions were eased through 'swift and meaningful plans to reallocate road space to cyclists and pedestrians, including on strategic corridors. Oxfordshire was given an indicative allocation of £597,000 for tranche one. The conditions we were asked to comply with included spending the money within eight weeks, and we were given 1 week to submit our proposal.</p> <p>In developing the Oxfordshire proposal, officers started by reviewing the outputs of the recently undertaken active travel member survey to ensure that our bid reflected their priorities. We then shortlisted these based on the</p>  |

| Questions | Answers  |
|-----------|--|
|           | <p>measures we believed were consistent with the grant conditions and those that were aligned with the priorities of the district and city councils. We also ensured that the needs of the entire county were considered. In addition to new temporary measures, we also proposed that we would add to any money from Department for Transport (DfT) by reprioritising our maintenance programmes, and also sought other funding to enable more to be done, including the use of developer's contributions. This process was designed to ensure that we developed a package of measures that would best meet the needs of Oxfordshire's residents and communities as lockdown restrictions were eased.</p> <p>When we received formal notification of funding, we were advised that DfT had decided to award authorities either 25%, 50%, 75% or 100% of their allocation. In some cases, authorities could receive more than their indicative allocation. This was not stated in the original grant conditions.</p> <p>Oxfordshire received 50% of its indicative allocation. Feedback from DfT, suggested that they didn't feel all of our measures would achieve the meaningful shift to cycling and walking. They said that "we did not see sufficient evidence of this in your proposal and noted that a number of measures were around maintenance of existing lanes and repainting of existing cycle lanes which is not the primary purpose of the fund, so were not able to agree to the full indicative allocation". We suspect the approach of looking across Oxfordshire as a whole rather than concentrating on main urban areas may have also had a bearing. This does seem to have been an issue across the country, with many counties receiving approximately 50% of their allocation, and many urban metropolitan areas receiving either 100% or 111% of their allocation.</p> <p>As set out above, the Active Travel Fund was just one of a number of funding sources that we are using to deliver this programme, and I can confirm that all the measures we identified for the tranche one programme will be still delivered. It is clear from the feedback from DfT that any additional funding</p> |

| Questions   | Answers  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>we could have received from them would have had to be spent on measures that are in addition to what is already planned, and so wouldn't have reduced the financial pressure to deliver our current programme.</p> <p>We will be looking to increase our funding in tranche two, for which our indicative allocation is £2.3m, and we will liaise closely with DfT to ensure we maximise our chances to achieve that. We have not yet received any information from DfT on tranche 2, but are told that it is imminent.</p>   |
| <p><b>21. COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS</b></p> <p>Given this Council's declaration of a Climate Emergency, will the Cabinet member confirm that the Officers comments in it's One response reply to planning applications are consistent with our Carbon Neutral aims?</p> | <p><b>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>The council is currently reviewing its response to planning applications to ensure that comments fully reflect our Climate Emergency commitments. We are proactively working with Districts and City partners on ensuring climate action is given high priority in the Oxfordshire Plan 2050 and responding to local and neighbourhood plans. Our response to the Future Homes Standard consultation asked the government to go further in setting stretching standards for residential housing development.</p>  |
| <p><b>22. COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS</b></p> <p>How much of the Apprentice Levy was not spent in the year 2019-2020?</p>   | <p><b>COUNCILLOR DAVID BARTHOLOMEW, CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE</b></p> <p>The Apprenticeship Levy was introduced in 2017. Oxfordshire County Council's Apprenticeship Levy pot can only be spent on apprenticeship training, not on salaries or support costs. This pot of funding is generated by a monthly charge of 0.5% on the council's pay bill. The funding is available for 24 months from when it is paid into the pot. Funding with the shortest availability period is applied to expenditure first. Course fees are drawn down from the pot on a monthly basis over the period of the course rather than upfront. If funding remains unspent after 24 months is 'expires' and is removed from the pot. In 2019/20 £309,754.11 expired.</p> |

| Questions   | Answers  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>We offer a wide range of apprenticeships across 29 frameworks including Business Admin and Management, as well as specific career paths such as those in Civil Engineering and Legal, ranging from Level 2 (GCSE) to Level 7 (Masters). There were 224 active apprenticeships during 2019/20, of these more than 50% were permanent staff undertaking CPD, of these 108 were new apprenticeships commencing in 2019-20, and 19 of these commenced during Q4. The total amount paid to the levy during 2019-20 was £1,172,488. Approximately 42% of this was funded by Schools. £733,527 has been committed to apprenticeships within this period, although only 20% of apprenticeships were within Schools.</p> <p>The key point is that the funding is managed on a rolling basis rather than a straight-forward annual allocation.</p>  |
| <p><b>23. COUNCILLOR JANE HANNA</b></p> <p>Can the leader report on the success of his lobbying efforts since April to provide Oxfordshire with the real time and granular data necessary to find and combat Covid 19 within the County and the time lines for this access and can the leader share anonymous data on Covid 19 hotspots with the rest of the Council and the public so that communities can move forward with confidence and trust in the knowledge that Oxfordshire is Covid secure?</p> | <p><b>COUCILLOR IAN HUDSPETH, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</b></p> <p>Up until late on Thursday the published data was for pillar 1, but the government has now changed this to show the positive cases from all testing routes including pillar 2. This is a welcome development which is the result of continued and robust lobbying to improve of the data available to our local public health teams. This will enable us to closely monitor the number of COVID cases to ensure that we can provide a prompt response to limit community transmission of the virus. I re-emphasise this data is shared with local teams in order to manage and prevent outbreaks.</p> <p>The data is also now starting to become available at a more granular post code level. As I am sure you will appreciate this data is highly sensitive and comes with extremely strict conditions. It is not to be shared wider as doing so can relatively easily breach patient confidentiality. In Oxfordshire we have signed up to the required data sharing agreement process and are now working with the base data to make it usable.</p> |



| Questions   | Answers   |
|---|---|
|   |   |
| <p><b>24. COUNCILLOR JANE HANNA</b></p> <p>Can the leader report on whether he is lobbying for the Oxfordshire public health team to have decision making power over the siting of testing centres across Oxfordshire given he confirmed these decisions were made at national level without understanding of where there have been infection outbreaks and deaths and intelligence within local communities relevant to choice of site?</p>  | <p><b>COUCILLOR IAN HUDSPETH, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</b></p> <p>The siting of the regional testing units is not a matter for local determination. However, I can assure you through the COVID-19 Health Protection Board, we have considered our local testing capacity through a combination local labs and regional testing centres while taking into consideration of the clinical appropriateness.</p>   |
| <p><b>25. COUNCILLOR JANE HANNA</b></p> <p>Would the leader convene a meeting of the Chairs of HOSC, Performance scrutiny and Audit and Governance to consider conducting a rapid forward looking review to hear experiences from County Councillors about the impact of the Covid 19 response so far on the health and well-being and engagement with local wards as well as the impact of rapid changes in governance on the inclusion of Councillors and the local communities they represent?</p> | <p><b>COUCILLOR IAN HUDSPETH, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</b></p> <p>I believe in strong independent scrutiny committees and would never suggest what they investigate or scrutinise as that is the responsibility of the committees. However, I would remind everybody that we are not out of the pandemic. Our officers have been working extremely hard since before lock down. I'm not sure if we should be asking hard pressed officers to carry out additional work when especially at a time of uncertainty.</p> |
| <p><b>26. COUNCILLOR JENNY HANNABY</b></p> <p>Given access to Covid testing is key to reducing infection and saving lives in the community</p>  | <p><b>COUCILLOR IAN HUDSPETH, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</b></p> <p>The policy and guidance for the discharge of patients from Hospitals during the pandemic has been the responsibility of the NHS and Department of</p>  |

| <b>Questions</b>  | <b>Answers</b>  |
|---|---|
| <p>why were residents and staff in care homes and nursing homes put in danger by discharge of patients from hospitals without knowing whether they had tested negative from Covid 19 and does the leader know whether the relevant policy documentation and guidance used by the acute hospitals is confidential or available to County Councillors and the public?</p> | <p>Health and Social Care, Specific guidance regarding hospital discharge was published on the 19<sup>th</sup> March 2020 and is publicly available via the DHSC website. Officers within the Council and the NHS have followed all policies and amendments and updates are they were issued. The policy specific to testing patients prior to discharge to care homes was implemented from the 15<sup>th</sup> April and since then all patients being transferred to care homes are tested for COVID before discharge.</p>  |
| <p><b>27. COUNCILLOR JENNY HANNABY</b></p> <p>Does the leader agree that had testing occurred prior to patients being discharged high levels of infection would have been avoided and many people and professionals would have avoided the devastation from the excess death toll during the first wave of Covid 19?</p>  | <p><b>COUCILLOR IAN HUDSPETH, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</b></p> <p>The officers in the Council have advocated testing of people before discharge from hospital into care homes. Testing is one aspect of reducing transmission of infection in the community, but it is not the only intervention that reduces spread. Effective infection control and social distancing are also essential tools in the fight against COVID-19.</p> <p>There now is testing of patients on discharge in to care homes. Fixating on historical testing policies and apportioning blame is not constructive at this time. There is now more local input and response to COVID being handed to us which is welcome. This allows us to use our local knowledge and relationships to meet local response needs as we move to the next stage in the pandemic. Our focus is on the local planning to keep the spread of COVID down in the County.</p> |
| <p><b>28. COUNCILLOR JENNY HANNABY</b></p> <p>Care Homes have reported that the Target agreement with County has not been increased in real terms or kept in line with government pay</p>   | <p><b>COUCILLOR IAN HUDSPETH, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</b></p> <p>This council values the relationship with its providers but as you might expect needs to balance the available resources. We have paid an additional 10% each month to our providers, as well as a number of additional activities,</p>  |

| <b>Questions</b>   | <b>Answers</b>   |
|--|--|
| <p>increases. Can the leader give assurances that discussions will take place to agree payments for services that reflect actual cost of delivery, and that the County will address the public interest of the sustainability of placements in care homes to ensure that all residents in Oxfordshire have an opportunity for appropriate placement based on need and that decisions to discharge patients to home settings rather than residential settings will be grounded in the public interest of caring for the most vulnerable in society balanced but not driven by cost and that procurement is scrutinised?</p> | <p>paying to plan making a sustainability fund available. We have also ensured the practical support is there for homes through our care home cell, access to weekly calls and dedicated support for infection control and PPE.</p>  |
| <p><b>29. COUNCILLOR ROZ SMITH</b></p> <p>Does the Cabinet member for finance have any concerns regarding the payments operation via the ContrOCC system within Children's Services?</p>   | <p><b>COUNCILLOR DAVID BARTHOLOMEW, CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE</b></p> <p>The ContrOCC system is the financial part of the Integrated Children's Services system.</p> <p>The finance system makes payments based on the receipt of information from the Social Care side of the system.</p> <p>As with any new system there is a period of stabilisation and transition to business as usual. There are business processes spanning operations and support services that are being reviewed for opportunities for improvement.</p> <p>In relation to the payment operation, this has recently moved into the social care payment team and standardised payment processes are being followed across both Adult and Children's Services.</p> |

| Questions   | Answers   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>30. COUNCILLOR PETE SUDBURY</b></p> <p>I've been fairly shocked by what appears to be the ineptitude of PHE right from the beginning of this crisis. The latest howler is that nobody in Leicester had a clue anything was wrong until last Thursday, due to the fact that half the testing is kept secret. I have also seen, on the news, officers from various local authorities expressing (remarkably calmly) their frustration with PHE only sharing postcode, not name, address, place of work, anything that might enable a proportionate and targeted local response. So, my question is whether you have considered setting up a test, track and trace system using your local team, which approach seems to have been effective in Ceredigion? Right now, when case numbers are (probably) low, would seem like a good time to start something like this, preparing for a putative "second wave".</p> | <p><b>COUNCILLOR LAWRIE STRATFORD, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE &amp; PUBLIC HEALTH</b></p> <p>Up until very recently the published data was for pillar 1, but the government has now changed this to show the positive cases from all testing routes including pillar 2. This is a welcome development which is the result of continued and robust lobbying to improve of the data available to our local public health teams. This will enable us to closely monitor the number of COVID cases to ensure that we can provide a prompt response to limit community transmission of the virus. I re-emphasise this data is shared with local teams in order to manage and prevent outbreaks.</p> <p>The data is also now starting to become available at a more granular post code level. As I am sure you will appreciate this data is highly sensitive and comes with extremely strict conditions. It is not to be shared wider as doing so can relatively easily breach patient confidentiality. In Oxfordshire we have signed up to the required data sharing agreement process and are now working with the base data to make it usable.</p> <p>The concept of tracking and tracing has now received public attention and the awareness of this activity is at an all-time high.</p> <p><u>This is not a new concept or activity</u> in fact it has been going on discretely and largely unnoticed in the County for many years. There are long established and robust systems and plans in the County to respond to monitoring and preventing the spread of communicable diseases in the County.</p> <p>I welcome the increased involvement of local government in monitoring and responding to COVID-19 in Oxfordshire. The PH team and the local partners have an understanding of the Oxfordshire population and what we need to do in order to respond to identified cases and limit spread of COVID-19. Local partners are working together through the newly set up COVID-19 Health Protection Board and have developed a Local Outbreak Control Plan which</p> |

| Questions   | Answers   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>will strengthen on the existing outbreak plans, so that we are prepared for any second wave if it does arrive as we expect later in the year.</p> <p><b>However, we need the assistance of public in following the social distancing guidance.</b> The best way to manage an outbreak is to prevent one in the first place. The pandemic is far from over, we are not relaxing our vigilance and do not want to lose the effects of the sacrifice and hard work of everyone so far. It is important to emphasise that this prevention message not just for areas where there are cases but for whole of Oxfordshire.</p> <p>I hope this assures you that we have put in systems and process in place to manage and detect outbreaks, but it's really important that everyone in Oxfordshire also follows the key prevention message and stays alert at all time.</p>   |
| <p><b>31. COUNCILLOR TED FENTON</b></p> <p>Can the Cab Member confirm the current position on DfT's Active Travel Tranche 2 funding? We understand that an 'indicative allocation' of £2.38 million has been announced. What are the criteria for this spend? Are there similar deadlines which affected the Tranche 1 spending and you confirm that this fund will be distributed to support projects across the whole county?</p> | <p><b>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>The Department for Transport have not yet announced the guidance and criteria for Tranche 2 funding. Officers are informed that an announcement is 'imminent'. We are confident that the schemes will be related to improving access for cyclists and pedestrians and sit well with our overarching longer-term Active Travel ambition.</p> <p>As a consequence, in preparation, we are exploring a number of key themes including Local Traffic Neighbourhoods, School Streets, use of 20 mph, and mapping across Oxfordshire all remaining measures put forward by Members, key stakeholders and the general public, to enable the development of some focussed (locality based or key route) schemes across Oxfordshire.</p> <p>On receipt of the letter, we propose to liaise closely with DfT colleagues to ensure that we understand fully their ambition and will develop a proposed timetable to ensure delivery to timescale. We will use DfT criteria along with</p> |

| Questions   | Answers  |
|---|--|
|   | our own assessment/prioritisation framework to identify agreed schemes for further development, costing and consultation. Finally, our expectation is that we will seek Member approval on final schemes prior to DfT submission.  |
| <p><b>32. COUNCILLOR JAMILA AZAD</b></p> <p>We are locked down in Coved-19 and planning to go back to our normal life activities in near future. In my Division the pavements are narrow and there are no cycling lanes. It is very difficult for public to keep the social distance and at the same time wearing face masks is not compulsory.</p> | <p><b>COUNCILLOR LAWRIE STRATFORD, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE &amp; PUBLIC HEALTH</b></p> <p>It is recognised that it can be difficult to maintain social distancing at all times. Whilst outside, there are other measures that people can take to reduce the risk of transmission of the virus. These include avoiding being face to face with another person, washing your hands regularly, and avoiding crowds. The link below gives more detailed advice on how to stay safe outside the home.</p> <p><a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/staying-safe-outside-your-home/staying-safe-outside-your-home">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/staying-safe-outside-your-home/staying-safe-outside-your-home</a></p> |
| <p><b>33. COUNCILLOR JAMILA AZAD</b></p> <p>Some parents are worried about sending their children to schools because of rising cases of Coronavirus cases and other risks in small classrooms and narrow corridors in School. What is County Council doing to counter parents' concerns, so they are happy to send their children to School?</p>    | <p><b>COUNCILLOR LAWRIE STRATFORD, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE &amp; PUBLIC HEALTH</b></p> <p>Throughout the response to COVID19 schools have remained open and officers in the Council from public health and the education team have meet weekly with headteachers to provide support and advice in safely managing the school setting using the national guidance. New guidance was published on 3<sup>rd</sup> July to enable schools to plan for September for classroom layouts and movement around the school. Each school will continue to liaise with their parent community about measures put in place in their individual settings.</p>   |