



County Council

3 November 2020

Agenda

*If you wish to view proceedings, please click on this [live stream link](#).
However, that will not allow you to participate in the meeting.*

Declarations of Interest

The duty to declare.....

Under the Localism Act 2011 it is a criminal offence to

- (a) fail to register a disclosable pecuniary interest within 28 days of election or co-option (or re-election or re-appointment), or
- (b) provide false or misleading information on registration, or
- (c) participate in discussion or voting in a meeting on a matter in which the member or co-opted member has a disclosable pecuniary interest.

Whose Interests must be included?

The Act provides that the interests which must be notified are those of a member or co-opted member of the authority, **or**

- those of a spouse or civil partner of the member or co-opted member;
- those of a person with whom the member or co-opted member is living as husband/wife
- those of a person with whom the member or co-opted member is living as if they were civil partners.

(in each case where the member or co-opted member is aware that the other person has the interest).

What if I remember that I have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest during the Meeting?

The Code requires that, at a meeting, where a member or co-opted member has a disclosable interest (of which they are aware) in any matter being considered, they disclose that interest to the meeting. The Council will continue to include an appropriate item on agendas for all meetings, to facilitate this.

Although not explicitly required by the legislation or by the code, it is recommended that in the interests of transparency and for the benefit of all in attendance at the meeting (including members of the public) the nature as well as the existence of the interest is disclosed.

A member or co-opted member who has disclosed a pecuniary interest at a meeting must not participate (or participate further) in any discussion of the matter; and must not participate in any vote or further vote taken; and must withdraw from the room.

Members are asked to continue to pay regard to the following provisions in the code that *“You must serve only the public interest and must never improperly confer an advantage or disadvantage on any person including yourself”* or *“You must not place yourself in situations where your honesty and integrity may be questioned.....”*.

Please seek advice from the Monitoring Officer prior to the meeting should you have any doubt about your approach.

List of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests:

Employment (includes *“any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain”*.), **Sponsorship, Contracts, Land, Licences, Corporate Tenancies, Securities.**

For a full list of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and further Guidance on this matter please see the Guide to the New Code of Conduct and Register of Interests at Members’ conduct guidelines.

<http://intranet.oxfordshire.gov.uk/wps/wcm/connect/occ/Insite/Elected+members/> or contact Glenn Watson on **07776 997946** or glenn.watson@oxfordshire.gov.uk for a hard copy of the document.


If you have any special requirements (such as a large print version of these papers or special access facilities) please contact the officer named on the front page, but please give as much notice as possible before the meeting.

To: **Members of the County Council**

Notice of a Meeting of the County Council

Tuesday, 3 November 2020 at 10.30 am

Virtual



Yvonne Rees
Chief Executive

October 2020

Committee Officer: **Deborah Miller**
Tel: 07920 084239; E-Mail: deborah.miller@oxfordshire.gov.uk

Due to the current guidelines regarding social distancing this meeting of the County Council will be held remotely. Normally requests to speak at a public meeting are requested by 9 am on the preceding day to the published date of a meeting. However, during the current situation and to facilitate these new arrangements we are asking that requests to speak are submitted by 9am four working days before the meeting i.e. 9 am on Wednesday 28 October together with a transcript of your presentation emailed to deborah.miller@oxfordshire.gov.uk

If you wish to view proceedings, please click on the live stream link on the front page of the Agenda. However, that will not allow you to participate in the meeting.

In order to comply with the Data Protection Act 1998, notice is given that this meeting will be recorded. The purpose of recording proceedings is to provide an aide-memoire to assist the clerk of the meeting in the drafting of minutes.

AGENDA

1. Minutes (Pages 1 - 42)

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 8 September 2020 (CC1) and to receive information arising from them.

2. Apologies for Absence

3. Declarations of Interest - see guidance note

Members are reminded that they must declare their interests orally at the meeting and specify (a) the nature of the interest and (b) which items on the agenda are the relevant items. This applies also to items where members have interests by virtue of their membership of a district council in Oxfordshire.

4. Official Communications

5. Appointments

To make any changes to the membership of the Cabinet, scrutiny and other committees on the nomination of political groups.

6. Petitions and Public Address

This Council meeting will be held virtually in order to conform with current guidelines regarding social distancing. Normally requests to speak at this public meeting are required by 9 am on the day preceding the published date of the meeting. However, during the current situation and to facilitate these new arrangements we are asking that requests to speak are submitted by no later than 9am four working days before the meeting i.e. 9 am on 28 October 2020. Requests to speak should be sent to Deborah.miller@oxfordshire.gov.uk together with a written statement of your presentation to ensure that if the technology fails then your views can still be taken into account. A written copy of your statement can be provided no later than 9 am 2 working days before the meeting.

Where a meeting is held virtually and the addressee is unable to participate virtually their written submission will be accepted.

Written submissions should be no longer than 1 A4 sheet.

7. Questions with Notice from Members of the Public

8. Questions with Notice from Members of the Council

9. Report of the Cabinet (Pages 43 - 48)

Report of the Cabinet Meetings held on 15 September 2020 and 13 October 2020 (CC9).

10. Committee Dates (Pages 49 - 56)

A schedule of meeting dates proposed for the 2021/22 Council Year is attached.

The schedule has been drawn up to reflect the various rules about frequency of meetings set out in the Council's Constitution. Attention is drawn to the following proposed changes to previous patterns:

Bring forward April Council in 2021 to 23 March to avoid the restricted period before the elections. Bring forward February Council in 2022 to 8 February to aid District Council budget setting.

Following discussion with Political Group Leaders it is proposed that whilst meetings of full Council are being held virtually their start time should be brought forward to 10.00am.

Council is RECOMMENDED to:

- (a) ***agree the schedule of meeting dates for 2021/22 and in particular to agree to waive Rule 2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules to allow the April 2021 meeting of full Council to be held on 23 March 2021 and the February 2022 Council meeting to be held on 8 February 2022;***
- (b) ***agree that Council meetings start at 10.00am.***

MOTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

WOULD MEMBERS PLEASE NOTE THAT ANY AMENDMENTS TO MOTIONS WITH NOTICE MUST BE PRESENTED TO THE PROPER OFFICER IN WRITING BY 9.00 AM ON THE MONDAY BEFORE THE MEETING

11. Motion by Councillor Liz Leffman

“With the closure of schools for an entire term due to the Covid pandemic, restricted access to leisure facilities, and reduced support for their emotional and mental health, the lives of young people in Oxfordshire have been severely disrupted over the past six months. Many young people from disadvantaged backgrounds will have suffered disproportionately and 16-24 year olds are most vulnerable to the resulting economic downturn.

A year ago, this council acknowledged the importance of youth services and agreed to a county-wide review. A partial Youth Study is now being commissioned. Although the outcome of this study will not be known for several weeks, this Council recognises that the need for a well-funded, county-wide youth offer has never been greater, and commits to creating a Youth Strategy for Oxfordshire as soon as possible.

This Council asks the Director for Children’s Services to establish an internal team to work in partnership with voluntary organisations, ensuring that our young people are

provided with a youth offer that supports their learning, their physical development, their mental well-being and their employment prospects. This council commits to ensuring that young people in our County receive the informal education and support that they need to recover from the effects of the Covid pandemic so that they can flourish.”

12. Motion by Councillor Charles Mathew

“The decision, last autumn now, by the Oxfordshire LEP to withdraw the funding from the Loop Farm project (Duke’s Cut to Loop Farm Roundabout), a long-promised relief road to the A40 round Oxford, undermines sensible solutions to the endless traffic jams on the A40 between Witney and Oxford roundabouts. Given that the use of public money should be productive.

Council asks Cabinet to review the plans presently being offered and adopt a long-term strategy that will meet the public’s needs for the next twenty years at least and should include serious consideration of a rail link from Carterton, Witney and Eynsham to Oxford.”

13. Motion by Councillor Liz Brighthouse

“The impact of COVID 19 has exposed the enormous inequalities in our County and the senseless death of George Floyd followed by demonstrations across our County have highlighted the injustices and inequalities experienced by many. In particular, there have been calls for changes to the National Curriculum which reflects our past rather than our present or future needs.

Until 1988 Oxfordshire, as the Local Education Authority was responsible for what was taught in Oxfordshire Schools. When that ended, the responsibility went to the Secretary of State for Education advised by a National Curriculum Council, this was revised by Labour. In 2010 Michael Gove, as Secretary of State for Education in the Coalition Government, abolished it completely and took power to himself advised by Dominic Cummings.

Now is the time to consider whether this is the most inclusive or effective way of determining what our children learn. The CBI and the TUC think that the National Curriculum is inappropriate for the needs of industry and the life chances of future employees. We see cries from those demonstrating in the streets that it is not inclusive and diverse. Now is the time for change.

This Council asks the Leader of the Council to seek support from the LGA and the CCN to lobby Central Government to bring forward proposals to devolve responsibility for the Curriculum to Local Government within a framework agreed by an Advisory Council made up of Local Authorities CBI, TUC, Teachers, Faith Groups, EHRC.”

14. Motion by Councillor Suzanne Bartington

“Increasing tree cover is recognised as one of the most effective strategies to tackle the climate crisis, given the critical role of trees for absorbing and storing carbon. Additional benefits of appropriate tree species in suitable locations include mitigating flood risks, improving air quality, providing protected wildlife and contributing to improved mental health. Our Government has pledged to plant 30 million trees each year until 2024, and it is estimated that doubling UK woodland cover could absorb 10% of UK annual greenhouse emissions.

In July 2019 this Council declared a climate emergency and committed to achieving carbon net-zero status by 2030. Currently, trees cover 9% of Oxfordshire's land area, compared with an EU average of 35%. We therefore call upon the Cabinet Member for Environment to:

1. Recognise the critical role of existing tree preservation and planting for effective climate action and consider developing a Trees and Woodland Strategy.
2. Set a target for increased tree cover in Oxfordshire, and explore the viability of doubling coverage by 2045
3. Undertake a survey to identify existing tree cover and suitable sites for new trees (with consideration for habitat protection, land-use and biodiversity)
4. Work collaboratively with District, Town and Parish Councils, civic and commercial partners to deliver tree planting initiatives, considering maintenance responsibilities.
5. Influence developer schemes to ensure tree planting is undertaken, supported by relevant planning agreement contributions.
6. Write to the SoS for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs to request additional local authority funding to support tree-planting and maintenance.”

15. Motion by Councillor Bob Johnston

“Council asks the Cabinet Member for Environment that full consideration be given to cyclists and pedestrians when future schedules are drawn up for grass cutting and vegetation management.

Along with vision splays, verges next to footpaths and cycle tracks must be given greater priority and cut earlier and more frequently than at present.

Other flower-rich highway verges where these priorities do not apply must be cut only once a year at the end of October when insects and birds have finished breeding. This will both maximise the potential for the County’s wildlife to thrive and prevent footways and cycle tracks becoming unpleasant to use, especially in wet weather.”

16. Motion by Councillor Emma Turnbull

“This Council notes that:

- Many young people from disadvantaged backgrounds undertake

apprenticeships. They are more likely to be in apprenticeships at lower levels, be paid lower salaries, and work at smaller companies.

- Due to the economic impact of Covid-19, employers are unlikely to be recruiting apprentices in the numbers we have seen recently, meaning there will be fewer apprenticeship vacancies available for young people to access and more competition for the fewer opportunities.
- New apprenticeships in Oxfordshire are already down by 30-60% on last year, depending on the sector, and are likely to drop significantly further.
- A rising number of Oxfordshire's young people are not in education, employment or training.
- With young people unable to access face-to-face career guidance, networking events or work experience opportunities it will be harder for disadvantaged young people to access high quality information and skills needed to secure an apprenticeship or job.

This Council resolves to:

- Ensure all careers advice for young people produced by this Council is fully accessible online and has a particular focus on those from disadvantaged backgrounds and ask OxLEP and other partners to do the same.
- Create a post-16 study and training fund to attract financial support for young people from lower socio-economic backgrounds and invite contributions from county councillor's priority fund and partner organisations.
- Ask the Leader and Chief Executive to write to central government recommending that social mobility and widening opportunity should be an explicit criterion in a review of the Apprenticeship Levy."

Pre-Meeting Briefing

There will be a pre-meeting briefing on **Monday 2 November 2020 at 10.15 am** for the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Group Leaders and Deputy Group Leaders.

OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting held on Tuesday, 8 September 2020 commencing at 10.30 am and finishing at 4.03 pm.

Present:

Councillor Les Sibley – in the Chair

Councillors:

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

The Council considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda and Schedule of Business for the meeting and decided as set out below. Except insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda, reports and schedule, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.

38/20 MINUTES

(Agenda Item 1)

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 14 July 2020 were approved and signed as an accurate record.

39/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(Agenda Item 3)

Councillor Emily Smith declared a personal non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 17 by virtue of her position as Director of OxLEP;

Councillor Jenny Hannaby declared a personal non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 18 by virtue of her positions as Chairman of a Wantage Care Home and Chairman of Wantage Hospital League of Friends;

Councillor Alison Rook declared a personal non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 18 by virtue of her position as Director and Trustee of Vale House Alzheimer's Home;

Councillor Jane Hanna declared a personal non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item by virtue of her position as CEO of a health charity Sudep Action.

40/20 OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS

(Agenda Item 4)

Council paid tribute and held a minute's silence in Memory of former Leader of Council Keith Mitchell and former County Councillor Maureen Hastings.

Council received an update from the Chairman on COVID19. It congratulated and paid tribute to staff and the community on their tremendous efforts and response during the Coronavirus pandemic.

41/20 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda Item 6)

Council received a public address from Mr Ashley Smith on behalf of Windrush Against Sewage Pollution in support of the Motion by Councillor Nicholas Field-Johnson.

42/20 QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

(Agenda Item 8)

34 questions with Notice were asked. Details of the questions and answers and supplementary questions and answers will be set out in the Annex to the minutes.

In relation to Question 2, Councillor Heathcoat undertook to provide Councillor Emily Smith with a written answer clarifying whether over half of the money had been paid into the scheme has gone back to be Treasury and therefore had not been spent on training and education in Oxfordshire.

In relation to question 6, Councillor Walker invited Councillor Webber to email him with any particular concerns regarding the linking up of reporting tools.

In relation to question 7, Councillor Lindsay-Gale undertook to provide Councillor Hanna with a full written response, which had been omitted to her original question.

In relation to question 10, Councillor Lindsay-Gale undertook to provide Councillor Buckley with a written response detailing what was going to happen to the additional grant from government to compensate for additional costs from Covid.

In relation to Question 12, Councillor Constance undertook to provide Councillor Emily Smith with a written answer to explain why Bicester and Whitney scored higher than Abington or any other market town, together with the lists of projects that missed out on inclusion in the Tranche 2 bid, to help Seek alternative funding.

In relation to Question 18, Councillor Stratford undertook to provide Councillor Hannaby with a copy of the plans referred to in the answer, together with an explanation as to what monitoring would be taking place in relation supporting the vulnerable.

In relation to Question 20, Councillor Constance undertook to provide Councillor Phillips with a written answer detailing what the section 106 monies received from the Neilson site had been used on.

In relation to Question 2, Councillor Lindsay-Gale undertook to provide Councillor Turnbull with a written answer detailing school attendance figures for the first week of September in Oxfordshire.

In relation to question 24, Councillor Constance undertook to provide Councillor Sudbury with a written response detailing the projected emissions cuts in this decade and if they did not meet the 45% target, some detail about how and what the council and its partners were going to do to meet it.

In relation to question 25, Councillor Constance undertook to provide Councillor Pressel with a written answer to the question of when the Thames towpath was to be prioritised and by whom.

In relation to Question 27, Councillor Lindsay-Gale undertook to ask the Regional Schools Commissioner to provide Councillor Pressel with the answer she required.

In relation to Question 29, Councillor Constance undertook to provide Councillor Fawcett with a written answer detailing whether there was any evidence to suggest that repainting the cycle lanes improved safety or encouraged more cycling.

In relation to Question 31, Councillor Constance undertook to provide Councillor Leffman with a written response detailing how much of the emitted carbon at Ardley was recycled and how much ended up in the atmosphere.

In relation to Question 32, Counsellor Constance undertook to meet with Councillor Roberts, Councillor Liam Walker, Lee Turner and the new officer to discuss the matter further.

In relation to Question 33, Councillor Constance undertook to provide Councillor Roz Smith with a written answer detailing whether there was a remedial budget for the access to Headington works.

43/20 REPORT OF THE CABINET

(Agenda Item 9)

Council received the report of the Cabinet.

44/20 UPDATE REPORT FROM THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL FOLLOWING A MEETING OF OXFORDSHIRE LOCAL AUTHORITY LEADERS AND THE CHAIR OF OXFORDSHIRE LEP WITH SIMON CLARKE MP (MINISTER OF STATE -HOUSING, COMMUNITIES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT) ON THE 7TH SEPTEMBER.

(Agenda Item 10)

The business included at Item 10 of the agenda had been added to update Members on the outcome of a meeting due to be held 7 September 2020 with the Minister of Housing, Communities and Local Government. That meeting had been postponed due to a clash of urgent parliamentary business and therefore there was no update to give. The Chairman therefore, in the interests of the efficiency of Council business, exercised his powers as Chairman under Article 1, paragraph 4.2 of the Constitution having consulted the Monitoring Officer to postpone the item until a meeting with the Minister had occurred.

45/20 APPOINTMENT OF MONITORING OFFICER

(Agenda Item 11)

Following the appointment in May of Steve Jorden as the Interim Monitoring Officer it was necessary for the Council to make a permanent appointment to this statutory role. The Council had before it a report which set out the procedural requirements in making such an appointment.

RESOLVED: (on a motion by Councillor Sibley, seconded by Councillor Howson and carried nem con) to agree that Anita Bradley be appointed as the Council's Monitoring Officer with effect from her taking up the role of Director of Law & Governance.

46/20 REVISED BUDGET 2020/2021

(Agenda Item 12)

Council had before it the Revised Budget 2020/21 which was considered by Cabinet on 18 August 2020 and sets out the financial impact of the Council's

response to the COVID-19 pandemic and the additional funding that had been received from central government.

Councils had a legal duty to balance their budgets each year and act to avoid the possibility that expenditure might exceed available income in any year. This meant that Oxfordshire County Council, like other councils across the country, had no option but to take significant cost-saving measures to address this unavoidable funding shortfall. The report set out the actions required to address the risk of overspend and reflected the additional costs incurred by the Council in the response phase.

The revised budget would provide a balanced budget for 2020/21 that included budgets to meet the additional costs of COVID-19 to enable effective budget management.

Under the Council's Financial Regulations, Council approval was required for any virement greater than £1m that involves a major change in policy (as assessed by the Section 151 officer) requires Council approval. The virements required as part of the Revised Budget 2020/21 fell within this definition. However, the Revised Budget for 2020/21 did not change the calculation of the Council Tax Requirement or Basic Amount of Council Tax for 2020/21 approved by Council in February 2020 as required under the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

Councillor Hudspeth moved and Councillor Bartholomew seconded the recommendations as set out in the report and on the face of the Agenda. In seconding the report, the Cabinet Member for Finance, Councillor Bartholomew thanked Directorates and the Finance Team for all their hard work.

Following a lengthy debate, the motion was put to the vote and was carried by 32 votes to 30.

RESOLVED: (by 32 votes to 30) to:

- (a) approve the savings set out in Annex 1;
- (b) approve the revised revenue budget for 2020/21 set out in Annex 2.

47/20 TREASURY MANAGEMENT 2019/20 OUTTURN

(Agenda Item 13)

Council had before it a report (CC13) which set out the Treasury Management activity undertaken in the financial year 2019/20 in compliance with the CIPFA Code of Practice. The report included Debt and Investment activity, Prudential Indicator Outturn, Investment Strategy, and interest receivable and payable for the financial year.

Councillor Bartholomew moved and Councillor Carter seconded the recommendations as set out in the report and on the face of the Agenda. In

moving the recommendations, Councillor Bartholomew paid tribute to the Treasury Management Team for the excellent report.

Following debate, the motion was put to the vote and was carried nem con.

RESOLVED: (nem con) to note the Council's Treasury Management Activity in 2019/20.

48/20 MOTION BY COUNCILLOR DEBORAH MCILVEEN

(Agenda Item 14)

Councillor McIlveen moved and Councillor Afridi seconded the following Motion:

"This Council notes:

- The disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on Black, Asian and 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 people from Black, Asian and other minority and refugee communities.

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 concerns about the existence of structural racism as part of the Black Lives Matters protests, vigils and events that have taken place in recent weeks across the county;
- 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 is being updated and this is integral to renewal and recovery for Oxfordshire.

This Council therefore:

1. Pledges to make Oxfordshire an Anti-racist County
2. Will work with and listen to people experiencing racism;

3. Develop and implement an anti-racist strategy for employment, service delivery and participation; and
4. Will work with local authorities, public bodies, employers, trade unions and community groups and any other stakeholders to achieve this.”

Following debate, the motion was put to the vote and was carried by 51 votes to 0, with 10 abstentions.

RESOLVED: Accordingly.

49/20 MOTION BY COUNCILLOR TIM BEARDER

(Agenda Item 15)

Councillor Bearder moved and Councillor Fawcett seconded the following Motion:

“Council recognises the frustration and disappointment that residents in South Oxfordshire feel after their Local Plan was taken out of the district councils hands and forced through to the Examination in Public by the Secretary of State following the May 2019 elections .

Despite assurances from Mr Jenrick and the local MP, John Howell, that changes could be made during the Examination in Public, the Inspector has announced that he is minded to pass the plan largely as it is - even with STRAT13, which the County Council’s officers expressed concerns over in relation to transport impacts.

Given the Secretary of State said in a recent interview that he wants to introduce changes to the planning system that allow local people to protect environmentally sensitive land like Green Belt, and SSSI to "hand it onto the next generation", this council calls on the leader to write to the Secretary of State for Housing Communities and Local Government, to ask that he respects the outcome of any vote by SODC's elected Councillors on whether to adopt the plan.”

Following debate, the Motion was put to the vote and was lost by 34 votes to 25, with 2 abstentions.

50/20 MOTION BY COUNCILLOR NICHOLAS FIELD JOHNSTON

(Agenda Item 16)

Councillor Field-Johnson moved and Councillor Walker seconded the following Motion:

“We need to end sewage pollution and make our rivers clean and fit for 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 again become clean and healthy).”

Oxfordshire County Council therefore requests the Leader of the Council to write to Oxfordshire MPs and the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, to ask that HM Government takes urgent action to ban the dumping of raw and untreated sewage into our rivers and to support a clean river policy including the reintroduction of quality status in order to re-establish the high quality of water in our rivers.”

Councillor Tim Bearder moved and Councillor Leffman seconded the following amendment as shown in bold italics below:

“We need to end sewage pollution and make our rivers clean and fit for 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 again become clean and healthy).”

Oxfordshire County Council therefore requests the Leader of the Council to write to Oxfordshire MPs and the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, to ask that HM Government takes urgent action to ban the dumping of raw and untreated sewage into our rivers, ***to block any attempt to weakening of the protections provided to our rivers by the EU’s water framework directive*** and to support a clean river policy including the reintroduction of quality status in order to re-establish the high quality of water in our rivers.”

Following debate, the amendment was put to the vote and was lost by 38 votes to 28.

The Substantive Motion was then put to the vote and was carried nem con.

51/20 MOTIONS BY COUNCILLOR CHARLES MATHEW, COUNCILLOR JANE HANNA, COUNCILLOR BOB JOHNSTON AND COUNCILLOR LIZ BRIGHOUSE
(Agenda Item 17)

The time being 4.05 pm, these Motion were considered dropped in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 15.1.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing

QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

| Questions | Answers |
|--|--|
| <p>1. COUNCILLOR EMILY SMITH</p> <p>How have Children in Care, where the Council is the corporate parent, fared in public examinations in 2020 and is there any evidence of disadvantage as a result of an assessment only process?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR STEVE HARROD, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES</p> <p>Please see attached for response.</p> |
| <p>2. COUNCILLOR EMILY SMITH</p> <p>What progress has been achieved in reducing the unspent apprenticeship Levy collected from primary schools in Oxfordshire in view of the change in rules relating to Level 7 apprenticeships?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR JUDITH HEATHCOAT, DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>Between 1st July 2019 and 30th June 2020, we had a levy pot of £1.165m.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The school's contribution to that is between 40-44%.• During the period we had £179,500 of new starts/enrolments onto programmes from Schools.• But the total spend for Schools during the period was £622,000 and a total of 61 people were on programme. The difference in the figures of £179,500 and £622,000 is due to people in effect "rolling on and rolling off" the apprenticeships because they start and finish at different times. So for example, you could have people who make up part of the £622k who are actually on programme for a month of that 1 year period as they come to the end of their programme where as others may have been on for the full 12 months or anywhere in between! <p>With regards to the changes in terms of Level 7 apprenticeships, these higher-level leadership schemes currently either attract an MA, MSc or MBA qualification (it is the provider who decides which one they will offer). It is our understanding that it is only the MBA offer that will be withdrawn. If this is the case, then there is likely to be no change as the current provision is for a</p> |

| Questions | Answers |
|---|---|
| | <p>master's in educational leadership not an MBA. We are currently clarifying this with the provider regarding the qualification that they will offer with this standard. The L7 qualification itself is not being withdrawn.</p> <p>We are also currently sourcing a new provider for Teaching Assistants and we already have provision for the teaching degree (although there is limited demand for this as schools don't benefit from having their own significant in-house programme; it is more resource efficient for them to recruit NQTs who have completed their PGCE).</p> |
| <p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member confirm that around half of the money that has been paid into the scheme by schools and the Council has gone back to Treasury and therefore not been spent on training and education for employees in Oxfordshire?</p> | <p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Councillor Smith I shall come back to you on that because I do not believe that that is commented on within the answer that I have given you. So, I will come back to you on that.</p> |
| <p>3. COUNCILLOR BOB JOHNSTON</p> <p>It appears that in the run up to the bid for Tranche 2 many Officers, especially in Highways concentrated solely on that bid. They were consequently completely unavailable to advise Councillors in respect of queries about casework.</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>As a result of COVID, it has been necessary to reprioritise our activities to ensure that the council is doing everything it can to enable our residents to travel safely as lockdown restrictions are eased. This includes the Active Travel programme, which comprises a wide range of initiatives and not just the Emergency Active Travel fund from the Department for Transport.</p> <p>Some lower priority activities have been paused or delayed, however we will still deliver all of our planned activities this year. I am not aware of any complaints we have received as a result of this reprioritisation, however please contact your area highways team if you have any concerns.</p> |

| Questions | Answers |
|--|---|
| <p>4. COUNCILLOR LIZ LEFFMAN</p> <p>Given the short time frame for Tranche 2 of the Active Travel programme, why did the Cabinet member for Environment choose not to include 'shovel ready' schemes, such as the B4044 Eynsham to Botley cycle path, in this council's submission?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>We did consider the B4044 scheme, but it was ruled out as it didn't meet the timescales or the funding criteria for this particular fund. The schemes need to be delivered by the end of March 2021 and as the B4044 cycle improvements would require land, planning permissions, which would take time to complete, the design and construct on this would not be achievable.</p> <p>Also, Oxfordshire was allocated £2.3m that it could apply for and the cost of the B4044 would not have fallen within this budget. It was considered whether a section could be delivered, but it was felt this would not be meaningful enough.</p> |
| <p>5. COUNCILLOR RICHARD WEBBER</p> <p>How often during the Covid crisis is mail collected from County Hall and distributed to its recipient? How long does it take for this to happen?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR DAVID BARTHOLOMEW, CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE</p> <p>All incoming post to County Hall is sorted daily by Facilities Management (FM) into the relevant post trays/departments.</p> <p>Nominated service team members come to County Hall and sort their incoming post trays. Post is scanned or posted on to relevant team members at a time scale to suit the demands and needs of their service.</p> <p>Some teams have arranged for the Oxford Employment Service to collect post from County Hall, in some cases daily, to be delivered by the in-house service to a forwarding address or scanned and distributed via the Employment Service.</p> <p>Some services have arranged Royal Mail redirections to alternative addresses.</p> |

| Questions | Answers |
|---|---|
| | Elected member post is handled in the same way as before the pandemic - being set out by FM to Members' home addresses on a Friday. |
| <p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Thank you, Councillor Bartholomew, I am reassured by your answer. In your second paragraph, you say that things are going to happen to suit the demands and needs of the service, and I think you might have also said the residents – would you not agree that that was an unfortunate omission.</p> | <p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>The way that we handle post is clearly designed to work to the best interest of members, staff and residents so I am happy to clarify and confirm that.</p> |
| <p>6. COUNCILLOR RICHARD WEBBER</p> <p>The excellent Fixmystreet facility, in the main, works well for issues affecting roads. What happens to footpath enquiries from members of the public entered on Fixmystreet?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR LIAM WALKER, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS DELIVERY & OPERATIONS</p> <p>Thank you. The relevant officer will allocate enquiries reported on fixmystreet to the technical officer overseeing the particular area where an issue is reported. They will then investigate and submit any potential defects for repair to the programme of works and update the website accordingly (and the person who posted the issue) to ensure that everyone is aware of the progression of the enquiry. There are some cases where the issues are on private land and need to be reported to the landowner. This information is also relayed through updates on the website.</p> |

| Questions | Answers |
|--|--|
| <p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Thank you, Councillor Walker for your reply here. I have had a number of anxieties over the apparent dislocation of our various reporting tools for example, if something is reported on the roads it is often closed as an issue without any explanation to the original complainant when it should have been properly passed on to the pathways tool to be dealt with. I think it is simply a question of linking-up the various tools which on their own are working fine, but they do not connect with one another, and that was the thrust of my question, and I hoped you might please look at that.</p> | <p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Thank you for your question. It is the same team so whether it is a footpaths or the roads it doesn't make too much difference, it can still go through the same process. If it is a particular issue feel free to email me, I can investigate it. I announced yesterday, our superuser programme, so I encourage Councillor Webber to sign-up to the schemes, so that you can go out and mark up these potholes and these defects on the footpaths and get them fixed so much quicker.</p> |
| <p>7. COUNCILLOR JANE HANNA</p> <p>Would the Cabinet Member list the percentages of exclusions by secondary schools in each locality area by BAME groupings for each of the last three years that data are available?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LINDSAY-GALE, CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION AND CULTURAL SERVICES</p> <p>Please see attached spreadsheet containing this data for a full response.</p> |
| <p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Thank you, could the Councillor please confirm that the statistics for the rate of exclusion of black and mixed-raced children is therefore higher than white children for 2018-19 and 2019-20 and given the current day impact of COVID-19 on BAME children and families whether the Council is collecting data from schools on which schools</p> | <p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Thank you very much for the question Councillor Hanna, and I have got an apology to make there should have been a commentary with the table of statistics. I have some information here. You are right – 16.4% of the total population of Oxfordshire come from BAME backgrounds, 5.7% of permanent exclusions are of children from BAME families. This is the reverse of the national trend where children from BAME families are 3.5 times are more likely to be permanently excluded than children from white families. For the</p> |

| Questions | Answers |
|---|---|
| <p>are providing individual risk assessments for their BAME pupils.</p> | <p>last full year of available data pupils from BAME families in Oxfordshire are 4 times more likely to be on a fixed term excluded arrangement than pupils from white families. This compares with 3 times more likely nationally. Nationally children from Roma and traveller families and black families are more like to be excluded that children from Chinese and Indian families are the least likely to be excluded. Our Education Services are fully engagement with the equalities work undertaken in CEF. Inclusion is a priority for us, and we are looking to second a Headteacher to work with use and help us to better understanding the issues and to find appropriate solutions to this situation. We are aware it is not good enough and we want to improve.</p> |
| <p>8. COUNCILLOR PAUL BUCKLEY</p> <p>Never before have I seen such distress and rage in emails from some city residents as I have from those whose daily or weekly family routine, unavoidably requiring a car (for multiple school drop-offs of young children, conveying elderly relatives, etc.), are threatened by one of the two Oxford inner city 'bus-gates' recently proposed by OCC. In spite of the misleading name, no bus alternative to these car journeys will be available. Will Cllr Constance agree now (a) to acknowledge the genuine needs of these residents by aborting the current proposal (or exempting city residents) immediately, and (b) coming back, when COVID anxiety about buses has diminished, with a realistic resident-friendly scheme to reduce car use and help families move to public transport, if cycling or walking are not practicable for them?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>I am very aware of the strong views about the proposed temporary bus gates, both for and against. Over 7200 people responded to our recent online survey seeking views on the scheme. No further work is planned on the temporary bus gates until after Cabinet has considered the scheme (in October) and made a decision on the next steps.</p> <p>If Cabinet decides the project should proceed to the next stage, further technical work will be carried out.</p> <p>For information, experimental TROs are continuously monitored whilst in place, and can be amended or removed at any time in response to public and stakeholder feedback.</p> |

| Questions | Answers |
|--|--|
| <p>9. COUNCILLOR PAUL BUCKLEY</p> <p>A widely felt anxiety about the two Oxford inner city bus-gates recently proposed by OCC is that, by forcing many residents undertaking journeys around Oxford needing use of a car to travel via the ring-road, they will worsen already extreme congestion at Wolvercote and Cutteslowe roundabouts. At a briefing on 'Congestion Management' held on 13 September 2019, Cllr Constance assured Councillors that, before any further Oxford bus gates are implemented, traffic modelling would be used to fully assess their likely impact on the ring road and its roundabouts, and then there would be further public consultation in the light of those predictions. So, could she please tell Council: what are the predicted percentage increases in peak-time traffic levels at the Wolvercote and Cutteslowe roundabouts, that will be caused by these bus gates?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>Traffic modelling would of course be carried out before any permanent scheme is introduced and made available as part of future public consultations. Traffic modelling for a temporary, experimental scheme may not be appropriate because no traffic model exists that reflects the current COVID-19-influenced baseline, and in any event the purpose of an experimental scheme is to test proposals on the ground, rather than in a model.</p> |
| <p>10. COUNCILLOR PAUL BUCKLEY</p> <p>What was the cost of school transport between the start of the current financial year and the end of the summer term (both SEND and non-SEND transport) compared with the figure included in the budget passed by Council in February?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LINDSAY-GALE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>The table below shows the actual year to date Transport expenditure for the period ending 31st August 2020 (beginning of the financial year to the end of the summer term). As the spend on our financial system is presented in arrears, it is difficult to present a profiled budget, so in order to show a reasonable comparator the previous year's spend for the same period is also shown. It shows, that over this period costs have reduced by just under £1.1m, largely due to the reduced payments made to providers whose activity</p> |

| Questions | Answers | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|--|--|---------|-------|-----|------|------|--------|--|------|-----------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|------------|----------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|-------|-----------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|---------|--|--|--|--|--|--|---------|-------|-----|------|------|--------|--------------------|------|-----------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|----------|---------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|-----------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| | <p>ceased as a result of the Pandemic, in line with the Governments PPN Notice.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="7">2019/20</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Service</th> <th>April</th> <th>May</th> <th>June</th> <th>July</th> <th>August</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>SEND</td> <td>- 842,105</td> <td>199,651</td> <td>1,403,093</td> <td>3,214,551</td> <td>4,024,284</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mainstream</td> <td>- 18,419</td> <td>364,897</td> <td>1,036,518</td> <td>2,281,526</td> <td>2,411,087</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>- 860,524</td> <td>564,548</td> <td>2,439,611</td> <td>5,496,077</td> <td>6,435,371</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="7">2020/21</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Service</th> <th>April</th> <th>May</th> <th>June</th> <th>July</th> <th>August</th> <th>Y2D Cost Reduction</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>SEND</td> <td>- 266,638</td> <td>293,079</td> <td>1,102,160</td> <td>2,040,674</td> <td>3,390,744</td> <td>- 633,540</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mainstream</td> <td>- 50,476</td> <td>242,521</td> <td>777,004</td> <td>1,445,650</td> <td>1,951,421</td> <td>- 459,666</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>- 317,114</td> <td>535,600</td> <td>1,879,164</td> <td>3,486,324</td> <td>5,342,165</td> <td>- 1,093,206</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p># this excludes the income loss from the shared seat scheme</p> | 2019/20 | | | | | | | Service | April | May | June | July | August | | SEND | - 842,105 | 199,651 | 1,403,093 | 3,214,551 | 4,024,284 | | Mainstream | - 18,419 | 364,897 | 1,036,518 | 2,281,526 | 2,411,087 | | TOTAL | - 860,524 | 564,548 | 2,439,611 | 5,496,077 | 6,435,371 | | 2020/21 | | | | | | | Service | April | May | June | July | August | Y2D Cost Reduction | SEND | - 266,638 | 293,079 | 1,102,160 | 2,040,674 | 3,390,744 | - 633,540 | Mainstream | - 50,476 | 242,521 | 777,004 | 1,445,650 | 1,951,421 | - 459,666 | TOTAL | - 317,114 | 535,600 | 1,879,164 | 3,486,324 | 5,342,165 | - 1,093,206 |
| 2019/20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Service | April | May | June | July | August | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEND | - 842,105 | 199,651 | 1,403,093 | 3,214,551 | 4,024,284 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mainstream | - 18,419 | 364,897 | 1,036,518 | 2,281,526 | 2,411,087 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | - 860,524 | 564,548 | 2,439,611 | 5,496,077 | 6,435,371 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2020/21 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Service | April | May | June | July | August | Y2D Cost Reduction | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEND | - 266,638 | 293,079 | 1,102,160 | 2,040,674 | 3,390,744 | - 633,540 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mainstream | - 50,476 | 242,521 | 777,004 | 1,445,650 | 1,951,421 | - 459,666 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | - 317,114 | 535,600 | 1,879,164 | 3,486,324 | 5,342,165 | - 1,093,206 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>I am thankful to Councillor Lindsey-Gale for her answer and her data there, which shows that a saving was made because of COVID. I understand that there has been a Government grant to compensate for additional expense arising from COVID. Could you explain what is going to happen to that in these circumstances?</p> | <p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>I don't have the detail here so can I get back to you with a written reply.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>11. COUNCILLOR JANE HANNA</p> <p>As funding for youth services fell seriously short during 2019/2020 and as risks to youth have worsened since the Covid 19 pandemic, can Councillor Harrod provide an update of how much of the Youth Opportunities Fund for the 2019/2020 and 2020/2021 budget years has</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR STEVE HARROD, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES</p> <p>A total of £999,800 of funding was agreed and allocated to Youth Organisations, this is all forecast to be spent between July 2020 to end June 2021.</p> <p>The £200k allocated in this financial year's budget to develop an up to date assessment of what young people want and need from youth services, which</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Questions | Answers |
|---|--|
| <p>actually been spent and is forecast to be spent on youth services in these two financial years; can he provide a detailed account of how approval has been given to reverse the 2020 budget decision of this Council to ring fence £200,000 for work aimed at enabling improved future provision; and can he explain where this leaves the ability of the Council now to plan future services and to be an effective advocate to government for increased local authority funding to ensure vital improvements to youth services during 2021/2022.</p> | <p>was always considered a generous budget, has not been removed, just reduced to £25k. A specification for this work has been prepared within this new financial envelope under the following timeline, which has obviously been affected by the pandemic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request for quotation issued: July 2020 • Deadline for quotes: September 2020 • Supplier appointed: October 2020 <p>The ability of the Council to plan future services is not impacted. The appointed consultants will be supported by officers in their on-going ‘business as usual’ assessment of provision. Furthermore, there is a lot of good existing information available about numbers and needs. There are strong ‘umbrella’ groups within the Voluntary sector that can provide insight on what is currently available and there is some great national work on what good youth provision would look like. The gap is probably around what young people want and therefore the need for consultation is significant as there is a lack of up to date information in this regard.</p> <p>These funds were never earmarked to support lobbying and advocacy, but to carry out consultation with young people, most of which will now be conducted online because of the pandemic, which is less costly, and our expectation is that we will receive initial feedback before Christmas 2020, with the final report by March 2021. Whilst this detail will clearly not be available in time to incorporate it into the 2021/22 budget, we will endeavour to make some provision for it, but this will be within the constrained financial position for the Council overall.</p> |

| Questions | Answers |
|--|---|
| <p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Could Councillor Harrod please confirm that there will be no robust business case in the budget this year supporting spending for Youth Services for next year – thank you.</p> | <p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Thank you for that, the business case is being worked on even as we speak, despite the fact that we have not spent the £200,000 allocated we have been able to achieve, or we will be able to achieve the desired outcome by only spending the £25,000, so nothing has changed on that. The only thing that has changed is the amount of money that we spent on it. The original £200,000 was far too generous figure and we have been able to do for considerably less.</p> |
| <p>12. COUNCILLOR EMILY SMITH</p> <p>There is much disappointment in my division that the extensive range of active travel measures suggested for Abingdon by local members and the Town Council were not included in the County Council's bid for Tranche 22 of the Active Travel funding. Please can you share with members the criteria and scoring system used to make the decision to spend the funding in Witney and Bicester as opposed to Abingdon or any other market towns around the county so that we can understand the reasons for this decision? And please can you share a full list of projects and measures submitted and considered, so that we can understand which schemes came close to inclusion and might be eligible for funding from other sources?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>Criteria for the Emergency Active Travel Fund Tranche 2 (T2) bidding was very specific in its requirements. In summary, the bidding process required that T2 bids should be on bus routes, create continuous high-quality cycle routes, either by segregation or point closures, demonstrate ambition, and be deliverable within six months. Another major factor was alignment with LCWIP (local cycling and walking infrastructure plan) schemes. The DfT allocation was on the basis of bus journeys in the census and Oxford has 49 per cent of all bus journeys to work in Oxfordshire.</p> <p>Additionally, members in Oxford were more supportive of the ambitious measures required in the guidance, such as introducing point closures on roads to reduce traffic to create low traffic neighbourhoods.</p> |

| Questions | Answers | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---------|---------|---------------------------------------|---------|---------|--------------------|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| <p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Yes, thanks for this information but I don't really feel that it answers my question fully. Please can the Cabinet Member explain why Witney and Bicester scored higher than Abingdon or any other market town in this case and please can we have that list of the projects suggested that just missed out on inclusion in the Tranche 2 bids, so that we can help seek alternative funding.</p> | <p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Thank you. I don't have that information here, I was of course not aware of that aspect of the question. Partly the reason no doubt for the selection of the projects that did go forward was their deliverability and we did try to emphasise that in the public information. But I will get back to you on the question of the criteria and of course I also restate that officers continue to look for the funding for the outside Oxford City projects and we hope to get back to Councillors before too long on that.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>13. COUNCILLOR EDDIE REEVES</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member for Children and Families identify the total savings anticipated for this part of the CEF directorate that can be achieved in the current financial year?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR STEVE HARROD, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES</p> <p>The Children's Social Care in year savings for 2020/21 agreed by Cabinet as and proposed to Council in September are:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Saving</th> <th>Budgeted Amount at February 2020</th> <th>Forecast Saving at August 2020</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Reconnecting Families</td> <td>£0.833m</td> <td>£0.833m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Review of 3rd Party Spend</td> <td>£0.750m</td> <td>£0.605m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Supported Lodgings</td> <td>£0.120m</td> <td>£0.120m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Service Redesign</td> <td>£0.300m</td> <td>£0.300m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>£2.003m</td> <td>£1.858m</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The reduction in the savings on 3rd Party Spend compared to the budget have been due to the Covid-19 pandemic and therefore this shortfall was addressed as part of the in-year budget changes agreed by Cabinet and proposed to Council in September.</p> | Saving | Budgeted Amount at February 2020 | Forecast Saving at August 2020 | Reconnecting Families | £0.833m | £0.833m | Review of 3 rd Party Spend | £0.750m | £0.605m | Supported Lodgings | £0.120m | £0.120m | Service Redesign | £0.300m | £0.300m | Total | £2.003m | £1.858m |
| Saving | Budgeted Amount at February 2020 | Forecast Saving at August 2020 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reconnecting Families | £0.833m | £0.833m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Review of 3 rd Party Spend | £0.750m | £0.605m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supported Lodgings | £0.120m | £0.120m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Service Redesign | £0.300m | £0.300m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | £2.003m | £1.858m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Questions | Answers | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------|-------------------------------|---------|-----------------------|---------|------------|---------|---------------------------------|---------|---|---------|------------------------|---------|------------------------------------|---------|---|---------|-------------------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|---|---------|--------------|----------------|--|-----------------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------|---------|--------------------------|---------|---------|----------------------|----------------|----------------|
| | <p>The Children's Social Care in year savings for 2020/21 agreed by Cabinet as and proposed to Council in September are:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Saving</th> <th>In Year Savings</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Family Safeguarding</td> <td>£0.903m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Looked after and Leaving Care</td> <td>£0.200m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Moving into Adulthood</td> <td>£0.155m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Youth Fund</td> <td>£0.175m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vacancy Management – Early Help</td> <td>£0.240m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Education, Employment and Training Services</td> <td>£0.050m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Inspection Preparation</td> <td>£0.010m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vacancy Management – Youth Justice</td> <td>£0.021m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vacancy Management – Children with Disabilities</td> <td>£0.294m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Troubled Families Grant</td> <td>£0.129m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unaccompanied Children Grant</td> <td>£0.171m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Savings Third Party and Business Administration Grant – exceeded forecast</td> <td>£0.162m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>£2.510m</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>In summary, total savings for the Children's Social Care services for 2020/21 are:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Savings Planned</th> <th>Expected Delivery</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Savings agreed in February</td> <td>£2.003m</td> <td>£1.858m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Savings proposed in year</td> <td>£2.510m</td> <td>£2.510m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Savings</td> <td>£4.513m</td> <td>£4.368m</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Saving | In Year Savings | Family Safeguarding | £0.903m | Looked after and Leaving Care | £0.200m | Moving into Adulthood | £0.155m | Youth Fund | £0.175m | Vacancy Management – Early Help | £0.240m | Education, Employment and Training Services | £0.050m | Inspection Preparation | £0.010m | Vacancy Management – Youth Justice | £0.021m | Vacancy Management – Children with Disabilities | £0.294m | Troubled Families Grant | £0.129m | Unaccompanied Children Grant | £0.171m | Savings Third Party and Business Administration Grant – exceeded forecast | £0.162m | Total | £2.510m | | Savings Planned | Expected Delivery | Savings agreed in February | £2.003m | £1.858m | Savings proposed in year | £2.510m | £2.510m | Total Savings | £4.513m | £4.368m |
| Saving | In Year Savings | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Family Safeguarding | £0.903m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Looked after and Leaving Care | £0.200m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moving into Adulthood | £0.155m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Youth Fund | £0.175m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Vacancy Management – Early Help | £0.240m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Education, Employment and Training Services | £0.050m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inspection Preparation | £0.010m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Vacancy Management – Youth Justice | £0.021m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Vacancy Management – Children with Disabilities | £0.294m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Troubled Families Grant | £0.129m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Unaccompanied Children Grant | £0.171m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Savings Third Party and Business Administration Grant – exceeded forecast | £0.162m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | £2.510m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Savings Planned | Expected Delivery | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Savings agreed in February | £2.003m | £1.858m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Savings proposed in year | £2.510m | £2.510m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Savings | £4.513m | £4.368m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Questions | Answers |
|---|---|
| <p>14. COUNCILLOR TED FENTON</p> <p>Are there any plans for the customer service centre to return to normal working?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR IAN CORKIN, CABINET MEMBER FOR COUNCIL BUSINESS & PARTNERSHIPS</p> <p>The Customer Service Centre (CSC) at Oxfordshire County Council has been working very successfully from home since lockdown. Including extending operating hours and establishing a proactive calling service for Oxfordshire residents who were shielding during lockdown. During this time the CSC staff have continued to offer 'normal' service to residents albeit from home with remote working technology.</p> <p>In line with current business guidance, the CSC can work from home and will continue to do so for the foreseeable future. However, the CSC management team are continuously reviewing the position, taking into account the individual wellbeing of the team members and latest corporate information. Our hours of operation and services offered remain as they were pre-Covid.</p> |
| <p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Thank you very much for the answer. I was just wondering to what extent that is a sustainable position and has it had an effect on performance?</p> | <p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Thank you for the question Councillor Fenton. You have seen the written answer and in fact the performance of the team has been exceptional since the period, so it has been a very volatile period for Customer Services. During April and May inbound call volumes were reduced substantially during the lockdown period but in June, they began to come back and in July the last figures I have at the moment we are back to normal and that is 15,000 in bound calls, 9,000 out bound calls and 5,500 emails. But the high-level Key Performance Indicators that go along with that is customer satisfaction is 92% against a target of 85%. 98% of callers are satisfied with the experience of the adviser that they spoke to, and first contact resolution, which is really important in stopping things ping ponging around the organisation 85% against the target of 75% and I just remind Members that that was during a time when our 24/7 shielding line handled 3,100 in bound calls, 1,234 emails out bound and made just short of 11,500 out bound calls and just over 7,000 out bound emails to those residents who were clinically extremely vulnerable.</p> |

| Questions | Answers |
|--|--|
| | So, I think it has been an extraordinary period for our Customer Services organisation, but I think it has come through it very well and its performance has continued to improve during its disbursed model. |
| <p>15. COUNCILLOR NICK FIELD-JOHNSON</p> <p>I am most disappointed that most of the Active Travel Phase 2 money has been spent on projects in City of Oxford and not in the rural areas and other parts of the County. As you know transport is a vital need in our villages, but they seem to have been ignored.</p> <p>Could you explain what were the DfT criteria that resulted in proposing that all the Active Travel Tranche 2 moneys be spent on projects in the City of Oxford?"</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>Emergency Active Travel Fund Tranche 2 (T2) bidding guidance was very precise and stringent in its requirements. In summary, the bidding process required that T2 bids should be on bus routes, create continuous high-quality cycle routes, either by segregation or point closures, demonstrate ambition, and be deliverable within 6 months. Another major factor was alignment with LCWIP (local cycling and walking infrastructure plan) schemes.</p> <p>The DfT allocation was on the basis of bus journeys in the census. Oxford has 49% of all bus journeys to work in Oxfordshire.</p> <p>Additionally, members in Oxford were more supportive of the ambitious measures required in the guidance, such as introducing point closures on roads to reduce traffic to create low traffic neighbourhoods.</p> |
| <p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>The Active Travel Fund clearly only benefited the City. In future, can we spend time on these bids to make sure that it will benefit the whole county including the rural part of the county, rather than just the City of Oxford?</p> | <p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Thank you, Councillor Field-Johnson. We have repeated over and over again that we did not control the criteria for the selection of these projects, and it is a good opportunity for me to repeat that publicly. When we tried to spend money outside Oxford City in Tranche 1 we had our allocation reduced by half. We do try to spread it evenly unfortunately, the department in this case really had very narrow, very tight criteria that drove the spend to Oxford City.</p> |
| <p>16. COUNCILLOR JENNETTE MATELOT</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR IAN CORKIN, CABINET MEMBER FOR COUNCIL BUSINESS & PARTNERSHIPS</p> |

| Questions | Answers |
|---|---|
| <p>Given the importance of digital infrastructure, especially during the Coronavirus pandemic, could the cabinet member for digital infrastructure update me on the position of the Better Broad for Oxfordshire programme?</p> | <p>Thank you for your question Cllr Matelot. The Better Broadband for Oxfordshire contract was concluded on 19th of August. 79,146 premises were connected against a target of 79,102. Oxfordshire now has 98% of premises able to access superfast broad band, against a target of 90%. Take up is currently 74.6%, against an initial sliding assumption of 20 to 50%. Over 110,000 Oxfordshire residents or businesses are enjoying a service they would not otherwise have, and all maintained primary schools in the county now have access to superfast broadband courtesy of the programme. The contract was delivered below budgeted costs and will earn more than the funding invested by OCC via an innovate gainshare agreement, which will be used to invest in further digital infrastructure schemes.</p> |
| <p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>The better broadband project finished in August and was very successful, does that mean our job is done now or is there more to do?</p> | <p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Thank you, Councillor Matelot. There is definitely more to do, so we have created a brilliant platform, but sad to say it is already on fire I am afraid and to support the economic recover in Oxfordshire and to support the current and future knowledge economy that we are so good at and that has such an important part to play for the future, we have got to press on now from superfast to Giggerbid and 5G and to that end we have secured, the team have worked really hard and proactively on this we have secured £6.3 million from DEFRA to supply full fibre to premises for 1,000 rural businesses, constant engagement with the commercial sectors, secured Banbury as Open Reaches first fill fibre town, the Department of Digital Cultural Media and Sport funding applications are underway for up to 300 public sector buildings to get as full fibre and they can act as a spine and a network for others and we are actively engaged in bidding for the £5 billion announced at the time of the election for the outside/in programme and I happy to say that 5G roll-out starts in Oxford this Autumn, so great starting point is what it is really but we are really engaged in getting to the next level now.</p> |
| <p>17. COUNCILLOR JENNY HANNABY</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR LAWRIE STRATFORD, CABINET MEMBER FOR</p> |

| Questions | Answers |
|---|--|
| <p>The Coronavirus Pandemic has had tragic consequences for many Oxfordshire people. It has exposed the fault lines in many aspects' social life, nowhere more so than Adult Social care where the virus has exacted a heavy toll on many of our most vulnerable residents especially in care homes.</p> <p>Savings will be taken on reduction of hub beds which will have a financial impact on some of our care homes, can council be assured meaningful conversations will be had with care home providers in Oxfordshire to ensure the open book approach will be used to negotiate contracts for care of our most vulnerable council are responsible for and that the costs of care will be met in full.</p> | <p>Thank you Councillor Hannaby for your question, the cost of care has regularly been raised between the council and providers not always to the satisfaction of either party. We have discussed with our care providers carrying out an independent 'Fair Cost of Care' exercise for both care homes and for home care. This exercise has commenced and will be completed by year end. In relation to reducing hub beds it is important to recognise that the reduction relates to stopping the payment for beds that have not been used or are not needed moving forward.</p> |
| <p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>When confidence returns in the care home sector, will the cost of care be met in full after the fair cost exercise has been carried out?</p> | <p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>I don't think it is appropriate to talk about the outcome before we have finished the review. As soon as we are able to communicate information to Members and the public we will.</p> |

| Questions | Answers |
|---|---|
| <p>18. COUNCILLOR JENNY HANNABY</p> <p>Our officers have worked with the vulnerable residents in need of care packages through the assessment process, residents have had the ability to influence and help shape their care services and make choices how their monies can be better spent locally to enable them to live a more fulfilled lifestyle. Can we be assured residents will keep this right and will not be forced into accepting packages driven by reductions in funding.</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR LAWRIE STRATFORD, CABINET MEMBER FOR</p> <p>Thank you again Councillor Hannaby for your question, as you know we always work with people to ensure that any support is based upon their assessed needs as well as where possible balancing preferences. The council has a responsibility to meet assessed needs, but you will appreciate that it also has a responsibility to manage its resources effectively. Within ASC we are committed to supporting people to remain in as much control of their support as they want and is possible. We will however ensure that we maximise the resources available within Oxfordshire that the council has invested in. It is important that we support the transformation of our offer to vulnerable people within Oxfordshire whilst maintaining robust financial control, a difficult balance but one we believe we have maintained with our plans. I must remind Cllr Hannaby and all members that we must deliver a balanced budget.</p> |
| <p>19. COUNCILLOR JENNY HANNABY</p> <p>The Secretary of state for health and Social Care said recently “How we care for our most vulnerable citizens is the true litmus test of whether we are a civilised society” we need a new system of social care, a statement the leader of County Council has said many times here in Council and in his LGA role, as spokesman for Adult Social Care. Actions need to be taken in pursuit of a better and safer care service. How does the leader of the council believe taking £4.283 million out of County Budget helps bring this about for our growing number of vulnerable and needy residents in Oxfordshire?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR IAN HUDSPETH, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>Thank you Councillor Hannaby for your question, I am pleased to see your acknowledgement of my work lobbying for a sustainable positive strategy for Adult Social Care including a robust sustainable financial settlement. This remains our utmost priority and I will continue my work on our collective behalf. That said the impact on council finances as a result of Covid is significant and whilst grateful for the financial support received from government, we do need to do more to ensure the council remains financially stable. The Director of Adult services (as have all our directors) sought to minimise the impact of the savings and has used all available funding streams as well as ensuring that the focus has been on maximising resources we already pay for. It is important that we support the transformation of our offer to vulnerable people within Oxfordshire whilst maintaining robust financial control, a difficult balance but one we believe we have maintained with our plans.</p> |

| Questions | Answers |
|--|--|
| | I must remind Cllr Hannaby and all members that we must deliver a balanced budget. |
| <p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>What happens if the Government reject calls for more funding and the demand, which I am sure will increase? How will Adult Social Care need to be funded, as you say at the end of your replay that Council must deliver a balanced budget.</p> | <p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Obviously, the Council as all Councillors it is not just me or the Cabinet or the administration it is all Councillors have a duty to deliver a balanced budget, so therefore, we are always looking and monitoring to see where expenditure is at the moment. It is important today to make sure we get that balance budget in place so that as we move to the winter, we have the ability and robust financial soundness robustness so if there is second spike or flu, we can cope with it and can manage. Obviously if demands do increase, we will have to look at that as we move forward. It is important to make sure that we give ourselves the best opportunity to provide all that care and funding for the residence of Oxfordshire.</p> |
| <p>20. COUNCILLOR GLYNIS PHILLIPS</p> <p>May I have an update on the progress of implementing a safe pedestrian/cyclist crossing at the bottom of Collinwood Road in Risinghurst? A costed shovel ready plan has been produced and I can see no evidence of the County Council prioritising the implementation this plan. Pre application discussions have taken place in connection with the potential development on the former Neilson site. Have discussions taken place for any s106 or CIL funding being designated for this crossing which would provide a new pedestrian and cycling route?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>A plan and costings for the crossing has been developed by the county council. Beyond this initial feasibility design work, currently the proposal does not have any funding identified against it, either through S106, CIL monies or any other means. Any additional or alternative funding required to deliver the measure would need to be identified, for example through a Government funding bid.</p> |

| Questions | Answers |
|---|---|
| <p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>My question is why isn't the S106 funding from the pre-planning application discussion about approximately 400 houses on the former Neilson site – why that money isn't going to be used for the much-needed crossing for pedestrians and cyclists. At a previous Cabinet meeting Councillor Constance said she would support me in using S106 to get this crossing funded and I am really struggling to understand why this money isn't going to be used for this safe crossing?</p> | <p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>The only answer I can give you at this stage is that the funding appears to be committed elsewhere. But you are quite right to remind me that I do support your crossing. I very much recognise its importance in that area, but funding the crossing is not the same thing as needing one. We will investigate again, and I will come back to you with what has happened to S106 money from the 400 houses at Neilson's. That might be the most informative information I can give you.</p> |
| <p>21. COUNCILLOR EMMA TURNBULL</p> <p>During the summer holidays, the County Council's Twitter feed shared the gov.uk back-to-school guidance, but (as of 26 August) had not produced any targeted local content aimed at reassuring parents and pupils about returning to school in September, e.g. showcasing the safety measures being arranged by local schools. What has the Cabinet Member and Education Team been doing to help reassure parents that it is safe to send their children back to school, and why was social media messaging not a priority?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LINDSAY-GALE, CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION & CULTURAL SERVICES</p> <p>There has been steady messaging for parents throughout the summer, a reassuring message re 'back to school' has been posted on OCC Facebook and Twitter feeds every Tuesday throughout August. Our education transport team have been providing updates and specific information for individual parents as needed throughout the summer. We also had an extensive communications plan for the last week in August.</p> <p>With regard to parental communications it included:</p> <p>A letter from the Cabinet Member to all Oxfordshire MPs, County, Ward and Division Councillors, Chief Execs and Chairs of the City and District Councils, urging them to support their local schools and share positive messaging with parents via their own social media platforms.</p> <p>A reassuring letter jointly signed by The Director of Public Health and Director of Children's Services was sent to all parents last week, via their school.</p> |

| Questions | Answers |
|--|---|
| | <p>Parents of children who were eligible for school transport were sent a personal hard copy letter, detailing the transport arrangements for the return to school this week. There were two letters, one for mainstream and one for SEND transport. It was not possible to send this information before last week, given the need to respond to changes in guidance at short notice.</p> <p>Key 'back to school' messages were put on all parent/public facing OCC web pages last week, supporting the #backtoschool campaign from the Department for Education. The Family Information Service have been providing advice and guidance for parents and families throughout the summer.</p> <p>In addition to communication with parents, the education team have continued to provide significant amounts of information and guidance to headteachers and schools in preparation for the start of the new term.</p> |
| <p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Thank you for the update on the Back to School problems. I wondered what indication the Cabinet Members has from schools and colleges about attendance in week 1 and if you haven't had that when you are likely to get these figures?</p> | <p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Thank you for the question, yes, we are aware that the attendance has been very good we are very pleased about that. I have a comms strategy which has been developed by the Education Department and I can send it to you with pleasure, Councillor Turnbull if that would be of interest.</p> |
| <p>22. COUNCILLOR EMMA TURNBULL</p> <p>How many children have had their home-to-school transport arrangements changed due to Covid? How many have not been provided with an alternative method of transport?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LINDSAY-GALE, CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION & CULTURAL SERVCIES</p> <p>Approximately 383 children have had their Home to School transport arrangements changed. Officers have liaised with schools and identified any changes to our current network to offer continued transport for children entitled to home to school transport. A total of 40 additional routes have been required mainly to ensure children from more than one school or school site</p> |

| Questions | Answers |
|--|--|
| | <p>do not travel on the same transport. Taxi journeys for SEN pupils have been altered to ensure only pupils from the same household travel together</p> <p>Communications about home to school transport and other modes of transport/travel have been sent to all parents</p> <p>At present all pupils entitled to home to school transport and those relying on spare seats being available are catered for.</p> <p>Officers have been preparing contingency plans in the event that government guidelines change further.</p> <p>The above figure can be broken down to 337 mainstream children and 46 SEN children. It relates only to children we transport (by whatever means).</p> |
| <p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>I think you may have already spoken to Councillor Buckley about this and you are going to be providing the information about the funding. Could I have the information because that is what I was going to ask about as well</p> | <p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>OK fine, will do.</p> |
| <p>23. COUNCILLOR EMMA TURNBULL</p> <p>Will the county's schools and universities have regular access to testing (whenever anyone presents with Covid symptoms), and what level of outbreak would trigger a whole or part school/college/university closure?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR LAWRIE STRATFORD, CABINET MEMBER FOR</p> <p>Schools and Universities in the County will have access to testing services as part of the Oxfordshire system response to COVID-19. The decision to close an education facility is an action that would be a consideration depending on the nature of a local outbreak and is not taken without full consideration of the context and circumstance of an outbreak. Under the Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions) (England) (No. 3) Regulations 2020 the issuing of a Direction to close an educational establishment lies only with the Secretary of State for Health and cannot be issued locally.</p> |

| Questions | Answers |
|---|---|
| <p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>I just wondered what work the Cabinet Member has been doing to oversee and monitor the work of the University's Task and Finish Group to prepare us for winter and make sure students, staff and local residents are protected from another COVID spike?</p> | <p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Thank you for the question. We are working with all agencies regarding concerns locally about students returning to universities and the rise in that age group. It is concern but we are working closely and to try an ensure that the appropriate and adequate test facilities are available.</p> |
| <p>24. COUNCILLOR PETE SUDBURY</p> <p>The IPCC warned in 2018 that limiting global warming to 1.5C "will require rapid, far-reaching and unprecedented changes in all aspects of society" and The Council declared a climate emergency in 2019. The head of the UN recently reiterated that a 45% reduction in climate emissions from current levels is required by 2030. How do the County's current plans address those levels of emission reduction, especially in Transport and Buildings for (a) the Council itself (b) the County as a whole, and how does the current profile of spending cuts impact on either of those?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>The council has committed to be carbon neutral (reducing emissions to net-zero) by 2030 for its own measured operational footprint. This includes around 140 corporate buildings OCC staff occupy to deliver services, our owned and leased in fleets, our highways assets including streetlighting and our staff business mileage.</p> <p>In the County, the Council is a signatory to the Countywide Energy Strategy which targets a 50% reduction in emissions by 2030 on a 2008 baseline. This is a challenging target given the County's growing population.</p> <p>The Council has recognised that work in hand to independently assess a sample of our operational buildings, together with significant opportunities for material changes in the way the council will deliver services going forward following Covid-19, will impact our Property Strategy. It has therefore been recognised that postponing spend on the property element of the climate action plan until 21/22 will optimise our effective use of this funding.</p> |
| <p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>I would like to thank Councillor Constance for her answer. My request was very specifically about</p> | <p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Thank you, I will have to get officers to give us exact statistics but we do know that we have raised our ambition and from a net zero by 2050 to a net zero by</p> |

| Questions | Answers |
|---|---|
| <p>this decade from now until 2030 and the IPCC and UN and I are very clear that is the critical decade and pick are own baseline at 2008 may be convenient but it doesn't tell us whether we will meet the challenge in the next decade – could she possibly provide me with the projected emissions cuts in this decade and if they do not meet the 45% target could she please give me some idea as to how the Council and its partners intend to up their game to hit that.</p> | <p>2030 so we are doubling our target in our own estate. The question of carbon reduction in the wider region is a matter being addressed at a regional basis by EEH and their carbon reduction and carbon transport in the EEH transport strategy out for consultation at the moment. You will be interested to read that. The movement towards zero carbon is wide, its deep and is including all partners, but I will get back to you on what the expected targets measurement wise are within our own estate.</p> |
| <p>25. COUNCILLOR SUSANNA PRESSEL</p> <p>The east riverbank along the Thames towpath above Osney Bridge behind Abbey Road was beautifully reinforced by the County Council about 10 years ago. It is part of the Thames Path and classed as highway. Unfortunately, in some places the timber has rotted or been damaged, and the bank has eroded or been scoured out. It is now quite dangerous in places and I fear that an accident could happen any day. This stretch of towpath is now popular and well-used, especially by people exercising or avoiding public transport. If the temporary bus gates go in, it will be even more heavily used.</p> <p>Please can it be repaired urgently?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>It is accepted this section of the Thames Path receives high levels of use by local people and those commuting into Oxford from Wolvercote and beyond and that this is likely to continue in present circumstances. This section of Thames towpath is well known to us and was previously repaired using a technique called willow spilling which was promoted by the Environment Agency at the time but has had mixed results in this location and in places is now failing. This stretch of Thames towpath behind Abbey Road was put forward as a potential scheme to be funded by the DfT Covid Recovery programme under Tranche 2, unfortunately it was not possible to include this project in the final programme.</p> <p>Officers continue to monitor the condition of the bank and are working with Oxford City Council, who now own this land, and the Thames Path National Trail team, to remove encroaching vegetation and move use away from the river edge to reduce the risk this poses to the public. ODS are continuing to undertake regular safety inspections of the Thames Path through Oxford as part of their normal routine when checking lifebelt stations. They report back to Officers on any specific issues and on that basis, we are satisfied this route remains safe for the public to use for the time being.</p> |

| Questions | Answers |
|---|---|
| | <p>This stretch of riverbank has been added to the list of potential schemes to be funded through the Infrastructure Operations capital programme and its priority will be assessed alongside other potential projects.</p> |
| <p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>I wondered please, who will decide on the prioritisation and when?</p> | <p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>The answer is simple that I don't know but thank you for raising the question it is clearly one that needs attention and I will address it.</p> |
| <p>26. COUNCILLOR SUSANNA PRESSEL</p> <p>I hope we can assume that the Cabinet member is working with the bus companies, to ensure that when the bus gates are introduced in Oxford there will be more public transport and/or new routes to serve the many people who will be leaving their cars at home, when they are not able to walk or cycle?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>Cabinet will decide on 23rd October whether to progress the temporary city centre bus gates. Oxford city centre is already very well served by bus routes, the reliability and attractiveness of which could be enhanced by the bus gates. If Cabinet decides to progress the scheme in October there would be further discussions with bus operators about the opportunities for any bus service improvements arising from this.</p> |
| <p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Money has quite rightly been spent on rural bus services this year, but we need better buses in the City as well especially if the bus gates come in. For the sake of those that can't walk or cycle please will Councillor Constance do her best to restore services like the No 17 bus and/or a responsive bus service like pick-me-up.</p> | <p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Thank you for your question, my sentiments entirely. In all the excitement over cycle lanes and more cycling I am the one who endlessly reminds the public and the enthusiasts that there is a big proportion of this population that doesn't cycle, can't cycle or won't cycle. I am one of them. We really do need to improve the bus service in Oxford City as well as in rural areas. The first improvement we have to make is to deal with congestion in Oxford City. It is a bit opportunity for me to make that point again and I do it whenever I have the opportunity. Pick-me-up was not viable because of the congestion in Oxford City. Each time we speak of the possibility of managing congestion we meet a howl of disapproval. So, I am very grateful for your question we</p> |

| Questions | Answers |
|---|--|
| | are addressing it, we are addressing it at every level that we can and our consultations for connecting Oxford which is a major programme for congestion management will be going out in the Autumn. |
| <p>27. COUNCILLOR SUSANNA PRESSEL</p> <p>In April Gavin Williamson promised that “disadvantaged” school children would get free laptops from the government. At the end of August, it was reported that only one third of the children identified had received them. Please can you tell us the figure for Oxfordshire and whether the offer also ensures that all these children also have adequate broadband access?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LINDSAY-GALE, CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION & CULTURAL SERVICES</p> <p>The first phase of The Department for Education (DfE) scheme for providing laptops / tablets and routers was launched in 19 April 2020 to help children and families access remote education during the coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak.</p> <p>The council was responsible for bidding for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • care leavers (delivered by the Virtual School to eligible pupils) • Children who have a Social worker (Delivered by Social Workers or schools to families). We received: Routers 190 – laptops 1470. • Year 10 pupils in maintained secondary schools who are ‘Disadvantaged’ – this is a small number of pupils at Carterton Community School – all were delivered before the end of the summer term. 7 routers and 42 Laptops. <p>The school library service helped to deliver laptops to schools.</p> <p><u>Note:</u> Bidding for disadvantaged Year 10 students in academies was a matter for each academy or academy trust and the council had no involvement.</p> <p>There is another round of bidding opening shortly, schools will be expected to deal directly with the DfE, therefore OCC will have no involvement.</p> |

| Questions | Answers |
|---|---|
| <p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Although we have no direct involvement, I would expect us to have this information at our fingertips. For instance, in case we need to lobby the Government on behalf of the schools in Oxfordshire. So please can you ask the Regional Schools Commissioner to give us the answer to my question, and, can you tell us whether everyone who needed equipment was provided with it. You just say what you received; it may have been less than what was required because it was nationally much less.</p> | <p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Yes, thank you very much for the question Councillor Pressel. We have worked extremely hard in the County to ensure that everyone who needed a laptop has received one. As you will see, we work through the Social Workers and the schools to make sure that they went to the right places. Yes, I recognise the national scheme hasn't been quite as good as they hoped, and I will do what you ask to see if I can get that information for you.</p> |
| <p>28. COUNCILLOR NEIL FAWCETT</p> <p>On what date was it decided which areas of the County would be included in the bid for tranche 2 funding from the Government's Active Travel Fund and on what date were those County Councillors representing areas not included in the bid informed that their area was not to be included.</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>The proposed schemes for submission were agreed week commencing July 27th with high level presentation to Performance Scrutiny Committee on July 30th. The final plans for submission were then developed and shared with the Cabinet Member for the Environment August 5th and an all Member briefing held on August 10th, where all proposals were shared.</p> |
| <p>29. COUNCILLOR NEIL FAWCETT</p> <p>What evidence informed the decision that repainting dashed line cycle lanes in different parts of the County would a) make cyclists safer, or, b) encourage more people to cycle?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>The question of cyclist safety is complex. Around 75% cyclist casualties occur at junctions. The most thorough study of infrastructure and cyclist safety was undertaken for the DfT by Transport Research Laboratory in 2010. The safety review found no evidence of cyclist safety benefits or equally safety disbenefits from cycle lanes. It should be noted that similar conclusions were</p> |

| Questions | Answers |
|--|--|
| | <p>reached for off road cycle tracks because of the increased risk at junctions.</p> <p>On the other hand, in terms of encouraging cyclists, the Oxfordshire Cycle Survey 2019 (OCS19) showed that cyclists perceive cycle lanes as much more attractive than roads without cycle lanes. The OCS19 identified 2 groups of cyclists – those who prioritised directness and those who prioritised segregation from traffic (quiet cyclists).</p> <p>OCS19 showed that 82% of direct cyclists were positive about cycle lanes (like or don't mind) and 54% of quiet cyclists were positive (like or don't mind). In terms of what they replace, roads without cycle lanes, only 34% of direct cyclists were positive and 11% of quiet cyclists were positive. It should be noted that in Oxford, 58% of cyclists were in the direct group and 42% in the quiet group.</p> |
| <p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>The question was not about the evidence for painted cycle lanes it was whether there was any evidence that spending money repainting the cycle lanes would make any difference to cycle safety or encourage more people to cycle, because picking up on earlier questions the purpose of the funding was to increase the amount of cycling and I can't understand how repainting areas for example cycle give way signs up and down Audlett Drive in Abingdon actually would encourage a single extra person to cycle or feel safer. So, the question was what was the evidence that spending a considerable amount of the County's money repainting existing cycling lanes would make any difference not the principle of having them in the first place.</p> | <p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>I don't have the answer to that question, I will find out for you. There was of course a general intention to improve where we could the lining and signing for cycling as part of Tranche 1 and maybe the Audlett Drive works had been included in that. But I will get the detail for you.</p> |

| Questions | Answers |
|--|--|
| <p>30. COUNCILLOR LAURA PRICE</p> <p>What is the total number of FTE posts that are being either held or removed through the latest budget cuts and which of these posts relate to new positions which have been created as part of the transformation agenda and our redesigned Directorate teams?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR JUDITH HEATHCOAT, DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>Dear Councillor Price, thank you for your question. As a result of the in-year budget savings proposals no posts are being lost from the establishment. We have a mixture of delayed and held recruitment. In many cases the delay has been caused at least in part to Covid, recruitment was almost non-existent in March and April and curtailed in May.</p> <p>Posts being permanently deleted from the establishment tend to be done so on the basis of a business case or planned piece of change (for example a full service redesign of the type undertaken as part of a 'transformation' review) or when they become vacant and are reviewed as part of the usual process of review by the recruiting/senior manager prior to recruitment.</p> <p>We publish our headcount on a quarterly basis and set out a year on year comparison. The next report will be received by Cabinet at their meeting on the 15th September. The report will not directly set out FTE posts held as a result of in-year budget savings and how new posts relate to these as our establishment data is not collated in this way. By way of comparison there were 4047.39 FTEs on our establishment in quarter 1 of 2019/20 and 4108.33 in quarter 1 of 20/21.</p> |
| <p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Yes my question did specifically ask for the number of held posts as well and I wasn't given those figures so I would like to receive the total number of posts that have been collectively put forward by the different directorates that are being held as part of the £15m cuts, and then specifically which of those posts which are being</p> | <p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Thank you very much Councillor Price. Your question is exceedingly complex. I felt that the answers given to you do answer the question that you had raised. Because as a result of the budget saving proposals no posts are being lost. We also went on to talk about recruitment and how the effect of COVID had on us in March, April and May, the answer then went on further to the head count on a quarterly report that we do. So, I genuinely do believe that I have supplied the information that you wanted as at today and the</p> |

| Questions | Answers |
|---|---|
| <p>held related to positions that form part of our transformation agenda. Because I think that it is important that we understand what the impact of our transformation agenda is taking the decision to have these significant in-year budget cuts.</p> | <p>situation that we currently have. Can I also say that I speak to the workforce report which gives staffing data and it covers the apprenticeship number it covers the workforce and trends and if you want it in detail you can see it on the net. So, I believe that the information that you have requested has been given to you within the answer.</p> |
| <p>31. COUNCILLOR LIZ LEFFMAN</p> <p>A legal challenge has recently been launched by campaigners against the government's decision to exclude incinerator emissions from the post-Brexit carbon-emissions trading scheme. Carbon that is emitted from the incinerator at Ardley is filtered, but can Cllr Constance please let us know what happens to those filters after use and how the carbon that they filter is processed?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>We are aware of the legal challenge and have liaised with Viridor as operator of the Ardley energy recovery facility (ERF) and our residual waste treatment contractor.</p> <p>Emissions from the waste combustion process are filtered in a flue gas treatment system before release into the atmosphere. Carbon arises from the process in two ways. Firstly, it is produced from the waste that is burnt and this is released from the chimney after the combustion gases have been cleaned.</p> <p>Secondly, carbon plays a key part in cleaning the combustion gases. Powdered activated carbon is added to the flue gas treatment system to remove traces of dioxins, furans and heavy metals. It is this added carbon that is then filtered out and collected as air pollution control residues (APCr). This is sent for treatment at facilities operated by O.C.O Technology at Avonmouth and Suffolk, where it is recycled via a chemical process known as accelerated carbonation. This produces an aggregate used in construction.</p> <p>We shall be monitoring the progress of the legal challenge.</p> |

| Questions | Answers |
|---|--|
| <p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Thank you very much for your very detailed reply Councillor Constance. I wondered if you know what proportion is recycled and what proportion ends up in the atmosphere.</p> | <p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Simple answer is I don't know. I haven't asked the question of them. I do know that they meet all required targets and every possible exceedance is measured and reported centrally. I will get that information for you and I don't know how long that will take but certainly find out for you.</p> |
| <p>32. COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS</p> <p>Our Highways officer has agreed that historically, owing to a Berkshire traffic order, North Hinksey Parish is also covered by the parking enforcement that should be provided by the County. Even though the contract with Conduent started on the 1st April, the OCC website still says that problems outside the City are for the relevant District Authority. This is not the case for North Hinksey and can the cabinet member assure me that this change will be clarified with Conduent?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>In regard to boundaries, Conduent are only able to enforce North Hinksey Lane as far as Yarnells Road however, the signs and lines urgently need attention to enable enforcement. A new technical officer has been appointed and a review of this area will be undertaken as a matter of course. The remainder of North Hinksey, including the village, falls under the jurisdiction of the District Council (Vale of White Horse).</p> |
| <p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>I am afraid I was very disappointed by this answer as its an area I have been working on for the last 5 years at the Botley Traffic Advisory Committee. It is inaccurate. The lines of all work have been done and there are other areas within North Hinksey that should be being enforced including a CPZ. So, my question is would she meet with me, Lee Turner and the new officer to discuss this matter further as Lee Turner has agreed we have evidence that the whole parish</p> | <p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Most interested to hear that, thank you very much. The answer must be yes, but I think this has passed onto Councillor Liam Walkers portfolio and I would suggest that we invite him to the meeting as well.</p> |

| Questions | Answers |
|--|---|
| should be enforced by the County. | |
| <p>33. COUNCILLOR ROZ SMITH</p> <p>For various reasons the Access to Headington Project has taken much longer to complete than originally planned but is now nearing completion. When will monitoring of the aims of the Access to Headington Project start?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>We carried out various traffic counts (including cycling and walking) in the relevant area before the scheme commenced and will repeat those once it is completed.</p> |
| <p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Thank you Councillor Constance for your answer I look forward to reading the results of the new monitoring to see what aims have been achieved in the Access to Headington project but I would ask if there a budget for any remedial works should those be proved necessary?</p> | <p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>I understand that remedial works are usually, can't guarantee in this case, are included as part of every works agreement. So, my expectation is that the answer is yes, but I will confirm for you. And I too am interested to know what impact Access to Headington has had after the spend of £17m on improving cycling priority – we really must expect a significant improvement – thank you for the question.</p> |
| <p>34. COUNCILLOR DAMION HAYWOOD</p> <p>For many years the City has received just 6% of the total County budget for roads maintenance. Is this fair, considering the vastly greater number of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles that use the City's pavements and roads, especially all the buses that do so much damage to the road surfaces?</p> | <p>COUNCILLOR LIAM WALKER, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY DELIVERY AND OPERATIONS</p> <p>The amount of budget allocation is clearly set out in the agreements OCC have with the City Council. The value of this sum is to cover routine maintenance and minor improvement schemes.</p> <p>The sum formed part of the discussions at the time of signing the agreement and did represent a split of costs based on previous spend in the city prior to the Agreement. The value is not solely based upon the footfall or vehicular traffic found in the boundaries of the city. The budget allocation for Highways Maintenance again covers off general maintenance and improvement schemes including some major improvements for specific projects. The City</p> |

| Questions | Answers |
|---|---|
| | <p>has benefitted from further investment from the general highways budget when schemes have exceeded agreed levels of intervention as set out in the agreement. City colleagues, through ODS, work closely with County colleagues to determine where this additional investment is available and appropriate. Works planned for and undertaken this year in the city are budgeted in the region of £775K, which includes works at Hythe Bridge Street, Worcester Street, George Street and Beaumont Street as well as Walton Street, valued at £537K.</p> <p>I am unclear as to where the figure of 6% has been determined as this is not a figure, I am familiar with and has formed part of any formal agreements.</p> |
| <p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Why are the variables footfall and vehicle traffic not the main indicators in determine budget allocation - all the evidence would suggest that they should be?</p> | <p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>There are lots of factors in short. Oxford City gets a good fair share of work at the moment, so I don't necessarily agree it doesn't. There are a lot of factors that go into deciding which roads get resurfaced I would invite you to come out to the rural areas and see the many frustrations that many of us have. This isn't just a City problem it is a funding problem for the whole of Oxfordshire.</p> |

Answer to question 1

Results for year 11 cohort are in the table below. The highlighted rows are national measures with 2019 comparative results in brackets. In terms of disadvantage, evidence is contrary with all key stages sitting public examinations gaining the best ever results for Oxfordshire children we care for. The results this year are in line with our targets and predications and possibly indicative of the challenges our children and young people face in actual timed examinations, where trauma related experience can be triggered and result in under performance. We are thrilled with results and destination data is also positive for the majority of our children and young people.

| Year 11 results 2020 | Percentage | PC excl recent UASCs | PC excl spec schools |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 9-5 in English & Maths | 17.3 | 17.3 | 20.0 |
| 9-4 in English & Maths | 28.8 | 28.8 | 32.5 |
| 9-4 in English | 38.5 | 38.5 | 45.0 |
| 9-4 in Maths | 32.7 | 32.7 | 37.5 |
| 5 9-5s inc English & Maths | 17.3 (3) | 17.3 (3.1) | 20.0 (4.1) |
| 5 9-4s inc English & Maths | 28.8 (14.9) | 28.8 (15.4) | 32.5 (20.4) |
| Attainment 8 | 13.5 | 13.5 | 15.0 |
| 1 or more GCSEs | 73 | 73 | 73 |
| Any Qualification | 73 | 73 | 76 |

Post 16 resit GCSE Maths and English Grades:

Maths: 48 sat **17% pass rate**. Awaiting 6 results (12.5%) - 2019 pass rate 8%
 Eng: 41 sat **29% pass rate**. Awaiting 2 results (4.9%) – 2019 pass rate – 13%

Post 16 A level results:

| Yr grp | A-levels | Results | Course for 2020 | Destination |
|--------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| 13 | RE/Politics/Sociology/Maths | A C C | Psychology | Reading University |
| 13 | English Lit/ English Lang/Drama | A*A B/New grades A* A A | English | Cambridge University |
| 15 | Chemistry/Physics/Maths | New CAG grades A B B | Chemistry | Aston |

| | | | | |
|----|------------------------|--|------------|--------------------|
| | | (previous calculated: B D C) | | University |
| 13 | History/Law/Psychology | New CAG grades A B B (previous calculated: B C C) | Psychology | Bristol University |

Post 16 level 3 (A-level equivalent) results:

| Yr grp | Level 1/2/3 | Subject | Results | Course for 2020-21 | Destination |
|--------|-------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|
| 15+ | 3 | Art and Design | Distinction | Art Degree | Kingston University |
| 14 | 3 | Electrical | Pass | Apprenticeship | Apprenticeship |
| 14 | 3 | Health and Social Care | Pass | Employment | Primary School |
| 15+ | 3 | Engineering | D*DD | Engineering Degree | Oxford Brookes |
| 15+ | 3 | Performing Arts | Pass | Employment | tbc |
| 15+ | 3 | Sport | PPP | Employment | tbc |
| 14 | 3 | Art and Design (2019 MK College) | Pass | Art and Design | Sheffield Hallam University. |
| 15+ | 3 | Access to HE Health Professionals | Distinction | Medical Science | Reading University |
| 15+ | 3 | Access Health Professionals | A*A*A* 138 UCAS Points | Paramedic Degree | Brookes University |
| 15+ | 3 | Music Foundation | Pass | Music | Brookes University |
| 15+ | 3 | Sports Science Foundation | Pass | Sports Science | Brookes University |

Higher Education accreditation:

2:1 in Health & Social Care from Nottingham Uni (planning an MA for 2021)

2:1 Film Studies at Aberystwyth Uni

MA in International Relations at Brookes (continuing onto PGCE)

2:2 in Youth & Community Work at Ruskin College

Foundation in H&SC at the Open University (continuing onto a degree in Criminology with the OU)

Music Foundation at Brookes (continuing onto degree programme at Brookes)

Sports Science Foundation at Brookes (continuing onto degree programme at Brookes)

Completion of first year BA at Oxford Brookes and transferring to Oxford University (Brasenose College) to study Philosophy, Politics and Economics

Divisions- N/A

COUNTY COUNCIL – 3 NOVEMBER 2020

REPORT OF THE CABINET

Cabinet Member: Deputy Leader of the Council

1. Workforce Report and Staffing Data - Quarter 1 - April - June 2020

(Cabinet, 15 September 2020)

Cabinet noted a report that provided a summary of HR activity and a snapshot of the workforce profile including headcount and full time equivalent (fte) comparison, ethnicity, age, apprenticeships, sickness, turnover and agency spend for the quarter ending 30 June 2020.

Cabinet Members: Deputy Leader of the Council and Adult Social Care & Public Health

2. Assumption of Powers in Relation to the Control and Prevention of Coronavirus - Oxfordshire County Council Responsibilities Under the Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restriction) (England) (NO.3) Regulations 2020

(Cabinet, 15 September 2020)

In July 2020 the government introduced new powers for local authorities to support local outbreak management.

Cabinet considered a report recommending that Oxfordshire County Council assumes responsibilities under The Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restriction) (England) (No.3) Regulations 2020 in order to ensure that any serious and imminent threat to public health in Oxfordshire was necessarily and proportionately addressed.

Cabinet agreed to assume responsibilities and delegated powers to the City and District Councils in accordance with the above regulations.

Cabinet Member: Adult Social Care & Public Health

3. Oxfordshire Safeguarding Adult's Board (OSAB) Annual Report

(Cabinet, 13 October 2020)

Cabinet noted the annual report of the OSAB on the work of the Board and of its partners, assessing the position of the partnerships in relation to safeguarding adults at risk within Oxfordshire.

Cabinet Member: Children & Family Services

4. Oxfordshire Safeguarding Children's Board (OSCB) Annual Report

(Cabinet, 13 October 2020)

The OSCB's remit is to co-ordinate and ensure the effectiveness of what is done by each agency on the Board for the purposes of safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children in Oxfordshire. Cabinet welcomed the annual report summarising the key achievements in the last year and providing an analysis of safeguarding arrangements.

Cabinet also noted two further supporting annual reports: the Performance, Audit & Quality Assurance Annual Report and the Case Review & Governance Annual Report.

N.B There is a virtual councillor briefing arranged for both Safeguarding annual reports on Wednesday 4 November at 9.30 -10.30 am.

Cabinet Member: Education & Cultural Services

5. SEND High Needs Funding

(Cabinet, 15 September 2020)

Cabinet considered a report that set out the background to how SEND (High Needs) top-up funding currently operates for Early Years settings and mainstream Primary and Secondary schools in Oxfordshire and seeking approval to a transfer of unallocated Dedicated School Grant funds agreed by School Forum to help support an increase in top-up funding to better meet the needs of children in these schools and settings. Cabinet agreed the transfer and confirmed that it would be a one-year top-up increase and would not be available in subsequent years.

Cabinet Member: Environment

6. Bicester Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP)

(Cabinet, 15 September 2020)

Cabinet approved The Bicester Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP), a detailed 15-year plan that sets out how to improve cycling and walking in Bicester, including the Bicester cycle network plans.

7. Emergency Active Travel: Temporary Bus Gates

(Cabinet, 13 October 2020)

Cabinet considered a report seeking a decision on the introduction of temporary bus gates in Oxford city centre as part of the council's transport response to the COVID-19 pandemic. The report outlined the results of an online survey of public and stakeholder opinion on the temporary bus gate proposals, along with an analysis of the costs, risks, and longer term strategic implications of the scheme.

Cabinet in welcoming the level of response received to the temporary bus gates (Oxford city centre) survey and the wider debate that this stimulated agreed not to proceed with the temporary bus gates both in recognition of the split of local opinion and in consideration of their likely impact upon the council's wider strategic transport strategy and resources, and to use the invaluable feedback received to inform the development of the council's wider transport strategy. Cabinet agreed to work with Oxford City Council and other partners to accelerate, where feasible, work on the council's wider transport strategy including the provision of bus gates as part of the Connecting Oxford programme, as well as the Zero Emission Zone, the active transport programme, and measures to improve bus journey times and encourage COVID-secure bus use.

8. Climate Action Response

(Cabinet, 13 October 2020)

Oxfordshire County Council declared a climate emergency in April 2019, pledging to be carbon neutral by 2030 for its own operations and estate. The climate emergency declaration was followed by a public commitment in November 2019 to prioritise action on climate change across the council's decision-making, services and activities.

Cabinet had before them a report that sought approval of the framework that has been developed to guide the council's approach to climate action and that provided an update on the joint work being done by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council in this area.

Cabinet approved the Climate Action Framework.

9. Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) within the Cherwell, South and Vale Districts

(Cabinet, 13 October 2020)

CPE is already in place in Oxford City and West Oxfordshire. Cabinet gave approval to make a formal application to the Department for Transport to implement CPE across the remaining districts.

10. England's Economic Heartland draft Transport Strategy Consultation; Response from Oxfordshire County Council (EEH Consultation Period - 14 July to 3 October)

(Cabinet, 13 October 2020)

Cabinet had before them a report setting out the context to the proposed OCC response to the draft EEH Transport Strategy. Cabinet endorsed the Oxfordshire County Council Response to the England's Economic Heartland Draft Transport Strategy.

Cabinet Member: Finance

11. Capital Programme Monitoring Report - June 2020

(Cabinet, 15 September 2020)

Cabinet had before them a report that set out the latest monitoring position for 2020/21 capital programme based on activity to the end of July 2020 and that provided an update on the latest ten-year capital programme to 2029/30.

Cabinet approved the updated capital programme to 2029/30.

12. Budget & Business Planning Report - 2021/22 - October 2020

(Cabinet, 13 October 2020)

Cabinet considered a report, and approved the Budget and Business Planning process for the forthcoming year that formed the context and background information ahead of and as part of the process which will culminate in Council setting a budget for 2021/22; a medium term financial strategy to 2025/26 and capital programme to 2030/31 and a Corporate Plan in February 2021.

Cabinet Member: Local Communities

13. Including Everyone: Equalities, Diversity and Inclusion Framework

(Cabinet, 13 October 2020)

Cabinet had before them an update of the council's equality policy undertaken in partnership with Cherwell District Council to align approaches in a joint policy. It reflected the serious inequalities within our communities highlighted by the Director of Public Health Annual Report, the Black Lives Matter movement and the disproportionate impacts of COVID-19.

The work supported delivery of the Council's 'Thriving Communities' vision due to the cross-cutting nature of equalities, diversity and inclusion. It also aligned with the Director of Public Health Report: 'Some are more equal than others'.

Cabinet approved the Including Everyone, Equalities, Diversity and Inclusion Framework and agreed the initial Including Everyone, Action Plan.

Cabinet Member: All Cabinet Members

14. Business Management & Monitoring Report

(Cabinet, 15 September and 13 October)

Cabinet noted reports setting out Oxfordshire County Council's (OCC's) progress towards Corporate Plan priorities for 2020/21 for the period of July 2020.

The reports contained three annexes:

- Annex A gave our current performance against targets and summarises progress towards overall outcomes set out in our Corporate Plan.
- Annex B set out the Leadership Risk Register which has been developed as part of the Council's work to strengthen risk and opportunities management.
- Annex C gave a financial update

IAN HUDSPETH

Leader of the Council

October 2020

This page is intentionally left blank

Divisions Affected – Not Applicable

COUNCIL – 3 NOVEMBER 2020

COMMITTEE DATES 2021/22

Report by Corporate Director of Commercial Development, Assets & Investment

RECOMMENDATION

Council is RECOMMENDED to:

- (a) agree the schedule of meeting dates for 2021/22 and in particular to agree to waive Rule 2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules to allow the April 2021 meeting of full Council to be held on 23 March 2021 and the February 2022 Council meeting to be held on 8 February 2022;**
- (b) agree that Council meetings start at 10.00am.**

Executive Summary

- 1. The report sets out in the Annex a calendar of meetings for 2020/21 for agreement.
- 2. The report also details a proposal to bring forward the start of Council meetings whilst they are meeting virtually.

2021/2022 Calendar of Meetings

- 3. The 2021/2022 calendar of meetings has been drafted on the basis of the considerations set out below:
 - Where possible no meetings take place during August
 - Wherever possible formal meetings will avoid Monday mornings.
 - Meetings so far as possible will avoid Partnership Meetings where set.

Council Meetings

4. Dates of Council are set down in the Council Procedure Rules:

Ordinary Meetings

- 3rd Tuesday in February (the budget meeting);
- 1st Tuesday in April;
- 2nd Tuesday in July;
- 2nd Tuesday in September;
- 1st Tuesday in November.
- 2nd Tuesday in December each year.

Annual Meeting

In an election year, the Annual Meeting is on the 2nd Tuesday after the day of retirement of Councillors, or on such other day within 21 days after the day of retirement as the Council shall fix. (The day of retirement is the fourth day after the day on which the election was held).

This structure is designed so far as possible to avoid the possibility of the Full Council meeting during school holidays.

The Cabinet

5. The Cabinet meets on the 3rd Tuesday of every month. Ordinarily meetings take place at 2 pm on a Tuesday. If that day happens to be a Council meeting, the Cabinet will meet the following Tuesday.
6. November meeting may be scheduled on the 4th week if CCN Conference clashes with Cabinet on 3rd Tuesday

Scrutiny Committees

7. Meet at least four times a year (with the ability to call more meetings if needed). Performance Scrutiny Committee dates to allow consideration of the Performance Management Report (where practicable) and budget.

8. Other Council Committees

- Audit & Governance Committee. There are 6 scheduled meetings a year. There must be a meeting in relation to the Statement of Accounts timed to comply with the current Accounts and Audit Regulations (**3rd week in July**).
- Planning & Regulation Committee meets every six weeks.
- Pension Fund Committee is **required** to meet every three months.
- Health & Wellbeing Board. There are 4 scheduled meetings (with the ability to call more meetings as needed). Meetings scheduled on Thursday to suit partner commitments.

9. Attention is drawn to the following proposed changes to previous patterns:
- Bring forward April Council in 2021 to 23 March to avoid the restricted period before the elections.
 - Bring forward February Council in 2022 to 8 February to aid District Council budget setting

Council Start Time

10. Following discussion with Political Group Leaders it is proposed that whilst meetings of full Council are being held virtually their start time should be brought forward to 10.00am. The end time would remain unchanged

STEVE JORDEN

Director for Commercial Development, Assets & Investment

Annex: Annex 1 – Schedule of Dates 2021/22

Background papers: Nil

Contact Officer: Sue Whitehead, Principal Committee Officer; [Tel:07393001213](tel:07393001213) Email: sue.whitehead@oxfordshire.gov.uk

October 2020

This page is intentionally left blank

Oxfordshire County Council Calendar of Meetings 2021/22¹

| Council | Cabinet | Cabinet Member Decisions for Leader, Deputy Leader, Finance, Local Communities, Highways Delivery & Operations and Council Business & Partnerships | Cabinet Member Decisions for Environment (including Transport) | Cabinet Member Decisions for Adult Social Care and Public Health | Cabinet Member Decisions for Children's & Family Services | Cabinet Member Decisions for Education & Cultural Services |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Tues 10.30am | Tues 2.00pm | Tues at 3.00 pm or on the rising of Cabinet | Thurs at 10.00am | Tues at 9.00am | Mon at 12.00pm | Wed at 10.00am |
| 2021 23 March ² 18 May – Annual Council 13 July 14 September 2 November 14 December 2022 8 February ³ 5 April 2022/23 17 May 2022 – Annual Council | 2021 20 April 25 May 22 June 20 July 21 September 19 October 16 November 21 December 2022 18 January 15 February 15 March 26 April | 2021 20 April 25 May 22 June 20 July 21 September 19 October 16 November 21 December 2022 18 January 15 February 15 March 26 April | 2021 29 April 27 May 1 July 29 July 2 September 14 October 18 November 23 December 2022 27 January 24 February 24 March 28 April | 2021 8 June 6 July 7 September 5 October 9 November 2 December 2022 11 January 2 February 8 March 26 April | 2021 19 April 21 June 19 July 27 September 18 October 22 November 13 December 2022 24 January 28 February 21 March 25 April | 2021 28 April 26 May 30 June 8 September 6 October 10 November 8 December 2022 12 January 9 February 9 March 6 April 11 May |

Oxfordshire County Council Calendar of Meetings 2021/22¹

| Performance Scrutiny Committee | Education Scrutiny Committee | Joint Oxfordshire Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee | Audit & Governance Committee | Planning & Regulation Committee | Pension Fund Committee | Health & Wellbeing Board | Remuneration Committee |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|---|---------------------------|
| Thurs 10.00am | Weds 1.00pm | Thurs 10.00am | Weds 2.00pm | Mon 2.00pm | Friday 10.00am | Thurs 2.00pm | Fri 4.00pm |
| 2021 3 June 15 July 9 September 11 November 9 December 2022 13 January 10 March 28 April | 2021 21 April 23 June 22 September 24 November 2022 2 February 6 April | 2021 22 April 24 June 23 September 25 November 2022 3 February 7 April | 2021 2 June 21 July 15 September 17 November 2022 19 January 16 March 11 May | 2021 19 April 7 June 19 July 6 September 18 October 29 November 2022 17 January 28 February 11 April | 2021 11 June 10 September 3 December 2022 4 March | 2021 17 June 7 October 16 December 2022 17 March | 2021 14 January |

Oxfordshire County Council Calendar of Meetings 2021/22¹

| Teachers Joint Consultative | Employees Joint Consultative | Fire Service Joint Consultative | Thames Valley Police & Crime Panel |
|--|---|---|---|
| Thurs 2.00pm | Thurs 2.00pm | Friday 10.00am | Fri, 10.00am |
| <p>2021</p> <p>8 July</p> <p>4 November</p> <p>2022</p> <p>3 March</p> | <p>2021</p> <p>10 June</p> <p>16 September</p> <p>25 November</p> <p>2022</p> <p>10 March</p> | <p>2021</p> <p>18 June</p> <p>17 September</p> <p>10 December</p> <p>2022</p> <p>11 March</p> | <p>2021</p> <p>18 June</p> <p>3 September</p> <p>19 November</p> <p>2022</p> <p>21 January</p> <p>8 April</p> |

Notes

¹ Dates are subject to change. The website will be updated and Members notified accordingly.

² April Council meeting brought forward to avoid purdah

³ February Council meeting brought forward to aid District Council budget setting

This page is intentionally left blank