

County Council

24 March 2026

Schedule of Business

County Hall, New Road, Oxford, OX1 1ND

www.oxfordshire.gov.uk Fax: 01865 783195 Media Enquiries 01865 815266

Agenda Annex

OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

MEETING OF COUNCIL – 24 MARCH 2026

SCHEDULE OF BUSINESS

ITEM / TIME	ITEM	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question;)
1 10:30	Minutes (Pages 11 to 17) To approve the minutes of the Council meeting held on 10 February 2026 (CC1) and to receive information arising from them.	
2	Apologies for Absence	
3	Declarations of Interest	
4 10:35 10 mins	Official Communications A list of events attended by the Chair since the February Council meeting is included in Annex 1. On 11 March, Oxfordshire County Council recognised outstanding members of the Oxfordshire Fire and Rescue Service through the annual Fire and Community Safety Service Awards. Congratulations to all those awarded medals for their service. The Chair was honoured to attend annual community Ramadan Iftar events at Mansfield College, Blenheim Palace, and the Oxford Academy. At the Oxford Academy, he spoke to a diverse audience on their chosen theme, 'Building Community Trust'. Thanks go to the Dialogue Society for hosting these events. The Chair would like to draw members' attention to his Birthday Charity Quiz, which will be held on Friday, 17 April at OXSRAD Sports Centre, Court Place Farm, Oxford OX3 0NQ. Raising funds for the Chairs chosen charities, OXSRAD, Abingdon RDA, and Oxford United in the Community,	

	<p>tickets are priced at £20 per person – includes a welcome drink, cheese and biscuits platter.</p> <p>Congratulations and sincere thanks go to County Hall Facilities Manager Tim Stimpson MBE on his 32 years of service to the Council including his valuable support for Chairs' fundraising events down the years; we wish him well for his retirement. If Members would like to join his retirement party, it will take place on Friday, 1 May, 4–7 pm in Common Hall (RSVP). If you cannot make it, please send any messages to clare.winterbourne@oxfordshire.gov.uk for inclusion in a memory book.</p>	
5	<p>Appointments</p> <p>Council is requested to approve the following change of membership:</p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council Joint Consultative Committee for Uniformed Members of the Fire Service - Councillor Fawcett to replace Councillor Hannaby</p>	
<p>6</p> <p>10:45</p> <p>25 mins</p>	<p>Petitions and Public Address</p> <p><i>Any person may address the Council on an item on the agenda subject to the provisions in CPR 10.2 of the Constitution</i></p> <p>Petitions – up to 3 minutes to speak (10.1.2(i)) - Up to 3 minutes for reply (10.1.4)</p> <p>Public Address – up to 3 minutes to speak (10.2.1)</p>	<p>Petitions</p> <p>Sarah Green - Haddenham to Thame Greenway</p> <p>Wendy Wilkinson - Broughton Road, Banbury</p> <p>James Sheard - 'Before 9 is fine' bus passes</p> <p>Lisa Smith – Keep Roundham crossing open</p> <p>Public Address</p> <p>Item 10 - The following two expert speakers will be taken at the start of the item:</p> <p>Laura Price</p>

		Sir Michael Marmot
7	Questions from Members of the Public	
11:10 15 mins	See Annex 2 for questions and responses. One supplementary question allowed for each. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sandi Adams 2. Peter West 3. Peter White 4. Yola Drage Brunelli 5. Bernadette Evans 6. Linda Elms 7. Nicholas Hardiman 8. Richard Parnham 9. Geoffrey Sutton 10. David Stares 	Cllr Roberts Cllr Gant Cllr Gant Cllr Gant Cllr Gant Cllr Gant Cllr Gant Cllr Gant Cllr Gant Cllr Gant
8	Questions with Notice from Members of the Council	
11:25 30 mins	See Annex 3 for questions and responses. One supplementary question allowed for each. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Greenaway to Gant 2. Cherry to Gant 3. Cherry to Gant 4. Malik to Gant 5. Gordon to Levy 6. Epps to Gaul 7. Withdrawn 8. Gaul to Gant 9. Gaul to Roberts 10. Henwood to Gant 11. Henwood to Gant 12. Henwood to Gant 13. Robertshaw to Bearder 14. Robertshaw to Bearder 15. Field-Johnson to Gant 16. Field-Johnson to Gant 17. Field-Johnson to Gant 18. Pressel to Gant 19. Pressel to Roberts 20. Pressel to Roberts 21. McLean to Gant 22. Kerr to Gant 23. Kerr to Roberts 24. Kerr to Gant 25. Fry to Gant 26. Fry to Gant 	

	<p>27. Fry to Roberts 28. Phillips to Gant 29. Garnett to Roberts 30. Garnett to Gant 31. Garnett to Gant 32. Evans to Higgins 33. Evans to Gant 34. Evans to Roberts 35. Snowdon to Roberts 36. Snowdon to Roberts 37. Snowdon to Gant 38. Epps to Gant 39. Crichton to Gant 40. Barlow to Gant 41. Barlow to Gant 42. Barlow to Gant 43. Jones to Roberts 44. Jones to Gant 45. Jones to Roberts 46. Walker to Gant 47. Walker to Leffman 48. Walker to Roberts 49. McLauchlan to Gant 50. McLauchlan to Gant 51. McLauchlan to Gant 52. Plumb to Gant 53. Plumb to Roberts 54. Plumb to Fawcett 55. Ashby to Hannaby 56. Ashby to Gant 57. Ashby to Roberts 58. Middleton to Gant 59. Middleton to Levy 60. Middleton to Roberts 61. Brant to Gaul 62. Mallon to Roberts 63. Fletcher to Gant 64. Fletcher to Gant 65. Baines to Gant 66. Baines to Gant 67. Baines to Gant</p>	
9	Report of the Cabinet (Pages 19 to 24)	
11:55 30 mins	<u>Leader (Cllr Leffman)</u> Page 19, Item 1 Devolution for Oxfordshire	Baines (1) Epps (1) Smith (1) Gordon (1) Middleton (1) Barlow(1)

	<p><u>Resources and Deputy Leader (Cllr Fawcett)</u> Page 19, Item 2 HR & Cultural Change - Quarterly Employee Data Report- Quarter 3 2025-26</p> <p><u>Adults (Cllr Bearder)</u> Page 20, Item 3 Oxfordshire Learning Disability Plan 2025 – 2035</p> <p>Page 20, Item 4 My Life My Choice Councillor Deal</p> <p><u>Place, Environment & Climate Change (Cllr Roberts)</u> Page 20: Item 5 Infrastructure Funding Statement 2024/25 and Section 106 Improvement Programme Update</p> <p>Page 21: Item 6 Updates to “Implementing Decide & Provide”</p> <p>Page 21: Item 7 Movement and Place Plans – Science Vale</p> <p>Page 21: Item 8 LTCP Monitoring Report 2024-2025</p> <p>Page 22: Item 9 Climate Action Framework 2026-2030</p> <p><u>Finance, Property and Transformation (Cllr Levy)</u> Page 22, Item 10 Capital Programme Update and Monitoring Report</p> <p>Page 22, Item 11 Budget and Business Planning 2026/27 to 2030/31</p> <p>Page 23, Item 12 Revenue Update and Monitoring Report (November 2025)</p>	<p>Walker (1)</p> <p>Phillips (2)</p> <p>Edosomwan (3) Hanna (3)</p> <p>Edosomwan (4) Hanna (4) Jones(4)</p> <p>Fry (5) Pressel (5) Baines (5) Hanna (5) Worgan (5)</p> <p>Baines (6) Kerr (6)</p> <p>Fry (7) Kerr (7) Jones (7)</p> <p>Fry (8) Pressel (8) Baines (8) Middleton (8) Kerr (8)</p> <p>Pressel (9) Gordon (9) Barlow (9)</p> <p>Coles (10) Baines (10) Pressel (10) Kerr (10) Jones (10)</p> <p>Baines (11) Epps (11)</p> <p>Baines (12)</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Page 23, Item 13 Capital Programme Approvals - January 2026</p> <p>Page 23, Item 14 Social Value - New in-house approach</p> <p><u>Scrutiny Reports</u> Page 24 Education and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee presented the following reports: - a) The Virtual School b) Attainment c) Fostering</p> <p>Performance and Corporate Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee report on d) Devolution for Oxfordshire e) Budget and Business Planning f) Fix my street g) Business Management and Monitoring Report (Public Health Focus) h) Parking Permits i) Social Value Policy</p> <p>People Overview and Scrutiny Committee report on Oxfordshire Unpaid Carers Strategy.</p> <p>Place Overview and Scrutiny Committee reports on: - j) Infrastructure Funding Statement 2024/25 and s.106 Programme Update k) Movement and Place Plans l) Local Government Reorganisation - One Oxfordshire Proposal</p>	<p>Middleton (13) Kerr (13)</p> <p>Baines (14) McLauchlan (14)</p> <p>Baines (15h)</p>
<p>11</p> <p>12:25</p> <p>5 mins</p>	<p>NOTE: The Chair will propose taking item 11 ahead of Item 10</p> <p>Officer Code of Conduct (Pages 65 to 88)</p> <p>Movers 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</p> <p>Council is RECOMMENDED to amend the Constitution at Part 9.6 Officers' Code of Conduct.</p>	<p>M Smith SEC Shiri</p>

<p>12:30 40 mins</p>	<p>LUNCH</p>	
<p>10 13:10 35 mins</p>	<p>Director of Public Health Annual Report (Pages 25 to 64)</p> <p>Movers 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</p> <p>Council is RECOMMENDED to</p> <p>a) consider the 2025/26 Director of Public Health Annual Report and specifically note the progress made to address health inequalities in Oxfordshire following the publication of the Director of Public Health Annual Report in 2019/2020, which marked a pivotal moment in Oxfordshire.</p> <p>b) support the interactive format of the Director of Public Health Annual Report 2025/26 and note the insights that can be used for informing future service delivery plans.</p>	<p>M Gregory SEC Leffman</p> <p>S Brighthouse S Markham S Pressel S Middleton S Edosomwan S Baines S Hanna S Thomas</p>
<p>12 13:45 30 mins</p>	<p>Motion by Councillor Tom Greenaway</p> <p>Movers 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</p> <p>Pride in the appearance of the public realm is important to our residents. Clean and well-maintained pavements make people feel good about their neighbourhood, reduce accidents, and prevent more costly problems later. Neglect leads to uneven footways, hazards for those with mobility difficulties, and higher long-term repair bills.</p> <p>Routine weed clearance on county pavements was part of highways maintenance until 2007/08, when budget cuts removed the programme. Some parishes now commission their own weed spraying and may be using glyphosate, increasingly opposed by residents because of its risks to health, pets, rivers, and biodiversity. Other parishes are now beginning to trial alternative approaches.</p> <p>Council resolves to:</p>	<p>M Greenaway SEC Epps</p> <p>S Pressel S Middleton S Walker S Worgan S Baines S Barlow S Ashby S Filipova-Rivers S Gaul S Plumb</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Note the historic withdrawal of routine weed clearance and the resulting concerns about accessibility, safety, and neighbourhood appearance. 2. Recognise the Council's statutory duty to keep pavements free of hazards, and that neglect increases both risks and costs. 3. Request Cabinet to seek an officer report with options for re-establishing pavement weed clearance and scheduled maintenance, including alternatives to glyphosate, and how the Council can support towns and parishes to reduce reliance on chemical spraying. 4. Request that the Cabinet Member for Finance, Property and Transformation give due consideration to the findings of this report as part of the next round of budget setting. <p><i>Note: The motion, if passed, would constitute the exercise of an executive function in which case it will be referred to the Cabinet together with any advice the Council may wish to give, in accordance with Rule 13.5.1 (i) of the Council Procedure Rules in the Constitution.</i></p>	
<p>13</p> <p>14:15</p> <p>30 mins</p>	<p>Motion by Councillor Glynis Phillips</p> <p>Movers 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</p> <p>Oxfordshire is an expensive place to live and work. Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) staff need and deserve the Oxford Living Wage (OLW).</p> <p>Paying the OLW helps tackle in-work poverty, improves staff wellbeing and retention, and supports local economic resilience. Extending to all suppliers, service-providers and contractors, via inclusion in all contracts, will multiply the impact.</p> <p>From April 2026, the Oxford Living Wage, a voluntary rate set at 95% of the London Living</p>	<p>M Phillips SEC Barlow</p> <p>S Epps S Mallon S Brighthouse S Garnett S Fawcett S Crichton S Gordon S Cherry S Levy S Leffman S Bearder S Rawlins</p>

	<p>Wage, will be £14.06 an hour. It recognises the high cost of living in Oxford, costs that OCC workers must meet.</p> <p>This Council aims for a healthier, fairer and greener county, one that delivers real social value: Paying all staff a living wage is fundamental.</p> <p>In 2025-6 OCC's lowest paid staff earnt £980 less than if an Oxford Living Wage was in place.</p> <p>OCC could also implement an Oxfordshire Living Wage, reflecting the real cost of living in Oxfordshire.</p> <p>This Council therefore commits to an Oxfordshire Living Wage and asks Cabinet to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include sufficient capacity in the 2027/2028 budget to meet the cost of implementing the Oxford Living Wage for all staff • Ensure all new contracts negotiated after such decision has been made require contractors, suppliers and service providers to pay the Oxford Living Wage and existing providers as contracts get renewed • Seek to work with Oxford City Council and Oxfordshire District Councils to explore expanding the Oxford Living Wage to be an Oxfordshire Living Wage • Publicly promote OCC's commitment to the Oxfordshire Living Wage <p><i>Note: The motion, if passed, would constitute the exercise of an executive function in which case it will be referred to the Cabinet together with any advice the Council may wish to give, in accordance with Rule 13.5.1 (i) of the Council Procedure Rules in the Constitution.</i></p>	
<p>14</p> <p>14:45</p> <p>30 mins</p>	<p>Motion by Councillor Lee Evans</p> <p>Movers 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</p> <p>For eleven consecutive years, under varying political leaderships, Oxfordshire County Council</p>	<p>M Evans SEC Walker</p> <p>S Saul S Roberts S McLauchlan S Henwood S Crichton</p>

	<p>was named the top performing county council waste disposal authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The 2025 Satisfaction Ratings of Services survey showed 72% of residents were satisfied with the way Household Waste Recycling Centres operated, with only 16% dissatisfied. - The hard-work of employees who operate our centres, alongside the conscientiousness of Oxfordshire residents, made the operation of centres a success story in our county. <p>In spite of this positive record, this Council administration has implemented a series of changes, including a mandatory booking system and the need to bring proof of address with you when using a centre.</p> <p>This Council acknowledges that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The new rules for using waste and recycling centres place additional bureaucratic burdens on residents, making it harder for them to use local centres. - The implementation of these rules, we believe, has reduced the number of visits to the centres, with more waste likely to be redirected into District & City Council waste collections or, in some cases, fly-tipped. - These rules are, therefore, a threat to the high rates of recycling previously seen in our County and risk undermining public satisfaction with waste and recycling services. <p>Therefore, this Council resolves to request the Cabinet to reconsider the issue of rules for using the household waste and recycling centres; revoke these new and unnecessary burdens on local residents; and return to the popular and successful model previously operated.</p> <p><i>Note: The motion, if passed, would constitute the exercise of an executive function in which case it will be referred to the Cabinet together with any advice the Council may wish to give, in accordance with Rule 13.5.1 (i) of the Council Procedure Rules in the Constitution.</i></p>	<p>S Fletcher S Middleton S Snowdon S Cherry S Rawlins S Ashby S Fry S Hanna S Robertshaw S Levy S Mallon S Malik S Field-Johnson</p>
15	Motion by Councillor James Barlow	M Barlow SEC Garnett

<p>15:15</p>	<p>Movers 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</p> <p>Council notes both that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The <i>Oxfordshire Climate Risk and Vulnerability Assessment (2024)</i> identifies flooding and extreme heat as significant, growing climate risks; driven by warmer, wetter winters, more intense rainfall events, and prolonged summer heat waves. 2. The impacts of climate and ecosystem collapse are now acknowledged to be even greater than thought in 2024, posing an existential threat to human habitation, that will dwarf any economic collapses seen to date if serious adaptation does not become ‘business-as-usual’ in the same way that fiduciary duties are. <p>The assessment illustrates the need for catchment-wide, preventative approaches that build resilience across landscapes and communities to decrease flooding impacts – i.e. to make space for water upstream of residents’ living room. For heat, urban design is key to resilience, preventing heat islands, and residents’ deaths.</p> <p>Council notes adaptation measures’ success depends on being multi-year, multi-stakeholder collaboration, community and catchment-based. Partners’ (e.g. Environment Agency) work on 6-year funding cycles, allowing capacity and capability to build appropriately – starkly different to the 1-year Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) funding bid environment.</p> <p>Council requests that Cabinet implements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustained (ring-fenced for at least 6 years to match partners) and significantly increased investment to further build OCC’s capacity and capability to convene and work in catchment-based, multi-stakeholder action groups to embed climate adaptation activity as an essential part of business-as-usual • Two councillor-led action group pilots, convening, alongside officers and partners, 	<p>S Pressel S Gregory S Levy S Higgins S Gordon S Leffman S Snowdon</p>
--------------	---	--

	<p>to build capability in resilience through action, via</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A catchment for flooding,• An urban neighbourhood for urban heat islands <p><i>Note: The motion, if passed, would constitute the exercise of an executive function in which case it will be referred to the Cabinet together with any advice the Council may wish to give, in accordance with Rule 13.5.1 (i) of the Council Procedure Rules in the Constitution.</i></p>	
--	---	--

Date	Event	Location	Attendance
11 February	Visit to Ability Independence Motivation – Riding for the Disabled Association (AIM RDA)	Shrivenham	Chair
12 February	School Competition – St Birinus School	Didcot	Chair
14 February	One World Family Festival – Ashmolean Museum	Oxford	Chair
19 February	Oxfordshire Scout and Guide Show	Abingdon	Chair
20 February	Mayor’s Charity Coffee Morning & Bake Sale – Witney Town Council	Witney	Chair
20 February	Mayor’s Fundraising Dinner – Bicester Town Council	Bicester	Chair
22 February	Lunar New Year Celebrations	Oxford	Chair
24 February	Chancellor’s Honorary Degree Ceremony – University of Oxford	Oxford	Chair
26 February	Ramadan Community Iftar – Mansfield College	Oxford	Chair
27 February	Chair’s Informal Supper – South Oxfordshire District Council	Wallingford	Chair
5 March	Ramadan Community Iftar – Blenheim Palace	Woodstock	Chair
6 March	Annual Civic Reception and Citizen of the Year Awards	Witney	Chair
7 March	Chair’s Charity Lunch – Cherwell District Council	Kidlington	Chair
11 March	Fire & Community Safety Awards Evening	Woodstock	Chair
12 March	Ramadan Community Iftar – Oxford Academy	Oxford	Chair
15 March	Oxford Bach Choir Performance	Oxford	Chair
17 March	Oxford Work Café Celebration (Santander)	Oxford	Chair
19 March	Award Ceremony – Mark Harris (Oxfordshire County Council)	County Hall	Chair
20 March	Charity Quiz – West Oxfordshire District Council	Witney	Chair
23 March	Lord Mayor’s Charity Quiz – Oxford City Council	Oxford	Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

Questions from Members of the Public

Questions are listed in the order in which they were received.

<p>1. SANDI ADAMS</p> <p>Can you confirm whether Oxfordshire County Council has given any consideration to the development of an urban cable car system in Oxford, either as a standalone proposal or as part of wider transport planning?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR PLACE, ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE ACTION</p> <p>We are actively exploring innovative transport solutions, for example the study we are commissioning for mass rapid transport on the A40 corridor.</p> <p>Urban cable cars have been suggested periodically for Oxford over the years.</p> <p>A combination of very high cost, visual impact and the nature of Oxford's travel patterns make it challenging to see how there can be a business case for urban cable cars at this time.</p> <p>Oxfordshire already has a comprehensive road network which provides extensive transport connectivity. However, due to growth in vehicular traffic the county's road network is congested and hostile for active travel in many places. We are therefore working to manage traffic on the existing road network so that buses can run freely and pedestrians and cyclists can travel safely, whilst working with the rail industry and central government to improve the county's railway system.</p>
<p>2. PETER WEST</p> <p>Did OCC share the data protection impact assessment for both / either the traffic filters or congestion charge schemes with the Information Commissioners' Office (for approval / review)</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>No. The UK GDPR only requires an organisation to consult the Regulator on a Data Protection Impact assessment (DPIA) if the DPIA identifies a high risk and it is not possible to reduce or mitigate the risk in any way. As the DPIA for the traffic filters and/or congestion charge schemes does not identify a high risk to individuals there was no requirement for Oxfordshire</p>

<p>ahead of the congestion charges going live and, if not, why not?</p>	<p>County Council to consult with the Information Commissioners' Office (ICO) for approval or review ahead of the congestion charges going live. The DPIA for the schemes identified appropriate safeguards and mitigating measures such that no high residual risk remained. Responsibility for completing, assessing and signing off the DPIA rests with the data controller, not the ICO.</p>
<p>3. PETER WHITE</p> <p>Give the high number of congestion charge warning letters issued, what plans does OCC have to install new warning signage on the major approach roads to congestion charge sites, especially those approach roads with few, if any, warning signs?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>67,579 warning letters were issued during the first 6 weeks of the scheme. Oxfordshire County Council has no plans to install additional congestion charge warning signage. The current signage strategy is considered sufficient and provides motorists with multiple opportunities to avoid the charging points. A range of signs, including advance warning signs, are already in place to clearly warn of the congestion charge points.</p>
<p>4. YOLA DRAGE BRUNELLI</p> <p>How does Oxfordshire County Council intend to mitigate against the adverse economic impacts of the congestion charge which on St. Clements (where I have two businesses) have suffered a fall of 40 % year on year turnover since the congestion charge went in. Until October 2025 we were doing well. Do you even recognise this impact still less have a plan to do anything about it ?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The congestion charge is still a new scheme. We do not yet have data on the scheme's impact on footfall and consumer spending across the city – officers are working to secure this.</p> <p>The broader economic impacts of the scheme will take some time to understand, as these extend well beyond businesses with a “shop front”. The scheme is temporary and is due to be replaced by the traffic filter trial when Botley Road reopens.</p> <p>The St Clements car park can be reached without passing a congestion charging point, from Iffley Road and Cowley Road.</p>

<p>5. BERNADETTE EVANS</p> <p>The council promised to record data on footfall and spend to monitor the impact of the Congestion Charge on Oxford's hundreds of small high street businesses. This was in response to business owners expressing concern that it would harm trade. Data for footfall in November was duly published on the council's website. The figures included many likely inaccuracies such as footfall in Botley Road retail park being up 47% and Summertown being down 35% and raises questions about whether it is reliable. The data was subsequently removed from the website due to the method of collecting it (Huq) being shown to be inaccurate. Since then no monitoring of either footfall or spend has taken place leaving the business owners high and dry.</p> <p>In the run up to Christmas, Cllr Gant said the Congestion Charge was 'good for business' due to footfall having increased (year on year) by 22% in the city centre. This became the council's narrative. The 22% increase figure came from the now withdrawn Huq data. Knowing this, will Cllr Gant now retract this statement?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The county council undertook to publish monthly monitoring data in relation to the temporary congestion charge. A key part of this data set is monitoring footfall and spend. For this, we engaged a new external supplier, which it was hoped could provide the required information. Footfall data for November was extracted directly from the supplier's platform and published in December. Through comparisons with other data sources which became available in January, a number of anomalies were identified which could not be explained. The data was published in good faith and as soon as this became apparent the data was removed. The supplier has identified the issue and is working on correcting it. As soon as the data is available and validated, it will be published. A full public statement has been published on Oxfordshire County Council's website.</p>
<p>6. LINDA ELMS</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p>

<p>In light of the high number of congestion charge warning letters and fines being issued, does Councillor Gant still believe that the congestion charge signage is adequate? There are, for example no warning signs along Cowley Road and Iffley Road in the run up to the St Clement's filter.</p>	<p>Oxfordshire County Council has no plans to install additional congestion charge warning signage. The current signage strategy is considered sufficient and provides motorists with multiple opportunities to avoid the charging points. A range of signs, including advanced signage, is already in place to clearly warn of the congestion charge points and indicate where it applies.</p>
<p>7. NICHOLAS HARDIMAN</p> <p>Please can Councillor Gant specify how Oxfordshire County Council is now monitoring the impact of the congestion charge on businesses? Will footfall and Mastercard spend analysis be reissued, or will other metrics be used instead. If so, what system will be employed and, in both cases, how soon will information be available?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The county council undertook to publish monthly monitoring data in relation to the temporary congestion charge. A key part of this data set is monitoring footfall and spend. For this, we engaged a new external supplier, which it was hoped could provide the required information. Footfall data for November was extracted directly from the supplier's platform and published in December. Through comparisons with other data sources which became available in January, a number of anomalies were identified which could not be explained. The data was published in good faith and as soon as this became apparent the data was removed. The supplier has identified the issue and is working on correcting it. As soon as the data is available and validated, it will be published. A full public statement has been published on Oxfordshire County Council's website.</p>
<p>8. RICHARD PARNHAM</p> <p>Can OCC explain why there is a significant discrepancy between the numbers of cars captured via conventional traffic monitoring on congestion charge roads, during the time of congestion charge operation, and the number of cars captured by</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>It has since become apparent that the dataset we were receiving was incomplete, with a significant volume of repeated-journey counts missing from the information originally supplied. Videalert are now providing the</p>

<p>congestion charge monitors on the same roads, on the same days at the same time?</p>	<p>corrected dataset, and we are awaiting this so that a full and accurate analysis can be carried out</p>
<p>9. GEOFFREY SUTTON</p> <p>In the Oxfordshire BSIP Progress Report July 2025, in the table labelled “Progress Towards Headline Targets” on page 8, bus journey time was assessed to be 14.2 mph in 2019/20, (the base), 14.3 mph in 2024 with a target of increasing the 2019/20 base journey time of 14.2 mph by 10% (to 15.6 mph) by December 2025, meeting the target being a requirement of the Zebra funding as I understand it. Please can Councillor Gant state the bus journey time measured for 2025 and whether the target increase of 10% was achieved or missed by the end of December 2025?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The bus speed figures reported through the BSIP progress report are derived from monitoring data using all operators, routes, days and hours, and therefore reflect an overall network-wide average rather than performance at the times when bus reliability and capacity pressures are greatest. In practice, the performance improvements are being seen specifically during weekday daytime operation (typically 07:00–19:00). We are therefore considering making changes to the BSIP reporting to reflect this.</p> <p>When performance is assessed on this basis, analysis comparing November 2025 with November 2019 shows a speed improvement of approximately 2.1% indicating that bus journey times during core weekday operating hours have improved.</p> <p>It is important to note however, that the Enhanced Partnership commitment linked to government funding focuses on bus productivity, rather than headline average speed. Productivity improvements are delivered through a combination of speed improvements and reduced dwell time. While there is evidence of speed improvement, further operator data would be required to fully quantify changes in dwell time and overall productivity. The extended closure of Botley Road by Network Rail and resultant delay to the Traffic Filters scheme (which was unforeseen at the time the targets were set) has resulted in the target not being met. We are continuing to invest in bus priority measures and work closely with our operators to further improve bus journey times for passengers in line with our commitments in the Enhanced Partnership.</p>

10. DAVID STARES

I would like to know, How many warning letters / congestion charge fines have been issued by reference to each of the congestion charge sites since the charge went live?
i.e. x number of warning letters / x number of fines at the Hollow Way filter.

COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT**Warnings**

Month	Hythe Bridge Street	St Cross Road	St Clements	Thames Street	Marston Ferry Road	Hollow Way
October	1976	889	1802	828	555	53
November	9880	5060	13565	18635	2102	2685
December	1708	930	2142	4211	209	349

PCNs

Month	Hythe Bridge Street	St Cross Road	St Clements	Thames Street	Marston Ferry Road	Hollow Way
December	7435	2996	2504	12280	847	1516
January	3934	3213	2235	12848	1267	1590
February	7140	2406	2300	10433	1848	1520

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

<p>1. COUNCILLOR TOM GREENAWAY</p> <p>For several years, missing bollards and broken bollards on the NCN5 route in Abingdon have meant vehicles consistently parking on the pavement of busy pedestrian route. This issue puts our residents and historic buildings at serious risk of harm as the space is incredibly narrow and not built for vehicles, with multiple residents telling me they must swerve to avoid vehicles and one resident telling me that a vehicle has already hit the Grade 1 Listed Abbey Gate.</p> <p>This has been reported on FixMyStreet by residents for years now, but no action has been taken to fix this. Similarly, I have raised this issue with the highways department multiple times since being elected, but we are no closer to a resolution here. A post I shared online noting this needed to be resolved received 9,300 views and well over 100 messages of support, please can you tell me when these broken and missing bollards will finally be replaced with permanent ones to stop this antisocial parking?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Cllr Greenaway has been informed that the bollards will be replaced 'like for like' with removeable bollards not permanent ones as he requested.</p> <p>We applied to M Group for a quote for a batch of sign works including this job on 19 December 2025, we placed the order for the replacement bollards on 15 January 2026. The latest M Group update shows that the bollards have been ordered from the suppliers and that M Group are awaiting delivery of one bollard, we have a proposed provisional installation date for both bollards of 16 March 2026.</p>
--	--

2. COUNCILLOR MARK CHERRY

Would the Cabinet Member for Transport Management, Cllr Gant, assure me as the local member for Banbury Ruscote that M Group have the maintenance and personnel capacity to be able to fix potholes in roads like Prescott Avenue, Fiennes Road, Edmonds Road, which have seen substantial increases in potholes during the winter months. The Fairway Road is due micro-asphalt resurfacing work in late 2026, but there are numerous pothole defects outstanding before work even starts. In some cases, I have witnessed pothole repairs that only after a few weeks need to be reported and fixed.

Given the funding that the Labour government has given Oxfordshire County Council, would the Cabinet Member agree that, given value of money needed for council taxpayers, there is a need for drastic improvements?

COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT

We recognise the frustration and inconvenience that potholes and carriageway defects can cause and fully understand the expectation for timely and effective repairs, particularly on roads such as Prescott Avenue, Fiennes Road, Edmonds Road and Fairway Road.

Like many highway authorities across the country, Oxfordshire County Council is currently managing an exceptionally high and unprecedented volume of defects across the network. Prolonged periods of wet and cold weather during January and February have left road surfaces and underlying layers saturated, significantly accelerating deterioration. As a result, defects can form rapidly and, in some cases, previously repaired areas can fail sooner than would normally be expected.

This situation is not unique to Oxfordshire. Nationally, councils are facing similar challenges following one of the wettest winters in recent years, compounded by pressures on the availability of specialist crews, materials and suitable weather windows across the UK.

In response, we have taken steps to increase our operational capacity. This includes deploying additional repair crews, bringing in further contractor resources, extending working hours and carrying out repairs at weekends where appropriate. Our approach prioritises safety-critical defects first, while also addressing additional potholes encountered on site to maximise the effectiveness of each visit.

Regarding Fairway Road, we can confirm that micro-asphalt resurfacing is currently programmed for mid to late 2026. In the interim, defects that meet our safety

	<p>intervention criteria will continue to be repaired as part of routine and reactive maintenance, and we will monitor the condition of the road closely to manage risks until the planned resurfacing can be delivered. Further locations in Banbury locality are already included in our upcoming surface dressing, resurfacing and structural patching programmes for the spring and summer, when longer lasting repairs can be carried out effectively. Details of locations currently scheduled on our schemes map for delivery within the next one to three years can be viewed via the following link: https://oxfordshire.highway-iams.uk/Live/PBLC_ANON/PIP/?cg=scheme</p> <p>The additional funding provided by government has enabled us to strengthen our response, and we remain focused on delivering best value for council taxpayers by targeting resources where they are most needed and ensuring repairs are carried out safely and efficiently.</p> <p>Your continued engagement and the valuable contribution you make through your role as a Super User is appreciated.</p>
<p>3. COUNCILLOR MARK CHERRY</p> <p>Would the Cabinet Member urgently investigate the flooding situation at the following roads: Park Road, next to the Mosque, and Boxhead Road West. The County Council's highway contractors have cleared all the storm drains in the locality; however substantial flooding is still taking place and is causing concern to local residents?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Officers have confirmed this issue is on the drainage investigation list. Due to the current programme, it is anticipated investigations will take place in April / May.</p>
<p>4. COUNCILLOR SAJ MALIK</p> <p>Has the number of people actually using buses on routes *other than Park-and-ride services*</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Data from the main bus operators* indicates good growth in patronage across P&R services and other local bus services, with the latter accounting for the large proportion</p>

<p>increased since the congestion charge implementation?</p>	<p>of patronage growth in 2026. Overall year-on-year patronage growth is approximately 8% since the introduction of the congestion charge. A third of this growth is on P&R services with the remaining two-thirds on non-P&R services, with some impressive growth on corridors serving the city from other areas e.g. Didcot. This is very encouraging given it is still early days of the congestion charge. Whilst other factors are at play, such as increased frequencies implemented as part of the bus service improvements plan, other increases have been made possible as a direct result of the congestion charge e.g. new and improved services as well as free P&R bus. This is all part of a wider strategy to make walking, cycling and bus the natural first choice.</p> <p>*Note: data is provided by the bus operators. Not all operators responded to the request for information</p>
<p>5. COUNCILLOR LAURA GORDON</p> <p>To ask the Cabinet Member for Finance: What plans are being made to manage the cuts in funding from central government?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR DAN LEVY, CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, PROPERTY AND TRANSFORMATION</p> <p>The impact of the Fair Funding Review 2.0 was considered as part of the budget agreed by Council on 10 February 2026. Additional on-going savings of £5.4m were built into the final agreed budget for 2026/27 to balance to the available funding. Further savings of at least £15.5m are expected to be required in 2027/28.</p> <p>The Financial Strategy for 2026/27 sets out the council's approach and explains that the Delivering the Future Together programme is accelerating the delivery of financial and non - financial benefits and supporting the council's financial sustainability. Where the council is providing services above the statutory minimum or at a level above statistical neighbours, action to reduce spend or increase income will have to be taken to help meet the legal requirement to balance the budget overall. This will need to be considered through the Budget and Business Planning process for 2027/28. The process of preparing the budget for 2027/28 has already commenced, because of the scale of the challenge created by the settlement.</p>

	<p>The Business Management & Monitoring Report to Cabinet in January 2026 explained that £5.5m additional interest on balances is expected to be held in a new Budget Reserve at 31 March 2026 and will be available to support future budget processes on a one – off basis.</p>
<p>6. COUNCILLOR GARETH EPPS</p> <p>At the last full Council, mention was made that the High Needs Deficit for SEND provision would be subject to a 90% rebate. However, it now appears that this rebate will only come with strings attached. Could I ask the Cabinet Member what those strings are, and how they might affect the choices we make?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR SEAN GAUL, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE</p> <p>Many thanks to Cllr Epps for raising what is possibly the most important subject matter of the moment. There has been much discussion on the 90% SEND deficit write off with some residents writing to me asking what we plan to do when we receive our injection of cash and have new breathing space.</p> <p>There are a few points to underscore, the Secretary of State for Education confirmed in a meeting with Lead Members for Children’s Services and Directors of Children’s Services that whilst there is a commitment to the 90% write off, any support coming from the Department for Education will be completely conditional on how much or how little they approve of the SEND reform plan that each local authority must now write and submit by May 17th. Each Council has been allocated a financial adviser to work with them to develop this plan, however this is a tight deadline and comes before the end of the SEND reform consultation which closes on the 18th May.</p> <p>We estimate that our cumulative deficit will be £163 million by March 31st, therefore our write off value is set to be worth £147 million. There is a lot of pressure to get this SEND reform plan right, as we are told it will either secure the full write off, or not. Its important to note this is not an injection of cash which can be spent, this is a write- off of cumulative years of in- year overspends since the last reforms which have been set against Councils budget.</p> <p>Separate to this, the SoS went onto say that our deficits for the next two years are likely to be subject to similar government support, but again, this is not to be assumed,</p>

	<p>and any forthcoming support will not be unlimited. It is also the case that whilst the Government are consulting on SEND reforms the legislation hasn't changed and isn't expected to until 2029-2030. An acceptable SEND reform plan is expected to be effective in driving down future deficits before government support is required. If we are successful in securing a government write off, this will not mean that we will have spare funds or new breathing space, we will be left to carry the remaining 10% worth £16 million with no certainty about who is liable for future deficits which will inevitably run up in the new financial year and the next.</p>
<p>7. COUNCILLOR TIM BEARDER</p> <p>Withdrawn</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p>
<p>8. COUNCILLOR SEAN GAUL</p> <p>Can I firstly record my most sincere thanks for the meaningful and completely professional way in which the Cabinet Member for Transport Management has engaged with me on all my Bicester East discussions, queries, and concerns to date. In following up on one of those discussions that we have had since I arrived to this council, can I press for some detail in response to questions that are being energetically and emphatically put to me by concerned residents and local campaigners who are impatient for safe passage across our busy Launton Road for residents of nearby Glory Farm who rely on being able to access their Lidl, Iceland Food Warehouse and The Range. I and many others have seen countless instances where mums with buggies are struggling to cross</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Thank you for raising the desire for a new pedestrian crossing at Launton Road Bicester. Officers have confirmed to me the request for scheme is recognised and is logged on our unfunded schemes programme as it has not been prioritised for the Road Safety and Accessibility funding in 26/27. A review of s106 funding unfortunately hasn't identified a suitable fund. Officers will continue to review the schemes priority for future funding and other funding opportunities as it is appreciated that this crossing that is well supported by the local community.</p> <p>Regretfully funding from your Councillor Priority fund is likely to fall some way short of the funding required and so may be better utilised elsewhere.</p>

<p>with busy traffic ceaselessly flowing from either side and the elderly who catch a break from one side of passing traffic who kindly slow to allow for passage only to have to give up when the traffic on the other side does not reciprocate. Residents are understandably confused on this issue given our local newspaper reported February last year that this matter was resolved (Bicester: Commitment for new pedestrian crossing secured Bicester Advertiser). My question is, is it resolved and if so, when will we see a new safe pedestrian crossing? If it is not resolved, what are the realistic timeframes from inception to completion and can use of my priority funding aid acceleration of this crucial work?</p>	
<p>9. COUNCILLOR SEAN GAUL</p> <p>Bicester North is a busy train station which relies on the constant use of the rail bridge above the Buckingham Road. With trains above the bridge constantly, vehicle movements underneath is an almost constant too. In addition to the trains above and vehicles below, pedestrians, cyclists, wheelers, prams, and pushchairs are frequent users of the pavements on either side of the passing vehicular traffic below the bridge, which in dry conditions is typically without event. However, when the rain falls and the gullies fill, the highway element of directly beneath the railway bridge on Buckingham Road floods too</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR PLACE, ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE ACTION</p> <p>Thank you for raising these concerns, which officers are already aware of.</p> <p>The gullies in this area were last cleansed in August 2025 as part of the annual gully cleansing regime. At the time of cleansing, all gullies were found to be in working order with no reported defects.</p> <p>We are aware that there may be issues at the outfall, which is located on Network Rail land, and will be pursuing this with Network Rail to understand what works may be required. Any necessary maintenance to the ditch itself is understood to be the responsibility of the landowner.</p>

<p>easily and too quickly. Considerate drivers will want to do their very best not to create tidal splashes as they pass through consequently drenching the active travel community, but it is tough as there is nowhere to go other than directly ahead. As the party who advocates most for the active travel community, can I ask for support from the Cabinet Member for Place, Environment and Climate Action to help drive through a plan to resolve what could well be a matter of lesser importance considering the size and scale and breadth and depth of work carried out by this county council, unless you are the pedestrian or cyclist or mum with kids or wheelchair user that has started their day getting drenched from head to toe?</p>	<p>Pending any necessary third-party ditch clearance, further drainage investigations have been included in the forward rolling programme, which will include a CCTV survey of the associated pipework. We anticipate that these works will be undertaken within three months of instruction, however, our expectation is that the works will be scheduled for early April, subject to the requisite permit approvals.</p>
<p>10. COUNCILLOR DAVID HENWOOD</p> <p>New road layouts and amendments often involve officers from the Vision Zero team, who encourage pre-application engagement with stakeholders such as CoHSAT, Cyclox, Oxford Liveable Streets, and pedestrian groups. While early engagement is clearly valuable, can the Council explain why equivalent engagement is not routinely extended to motorist groups, disabled people's organisations, residents, and representatives of school children (with appropriate adult supervision)? How does the Council ensure that all affected road users are equally considered at the pre-application stage?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The Council encourages applicants to consider the needs of all road users at an early stage, but it is important to be clear about what pre-application engagement is — and is not.</p> <p>Pre-application discussions are confidential, in line with national planning practice. This allows applicants to explore options openly with officers and receive frank advice before proposals are finalised. The Council does not carry out external consultation at this stage, and pre-application material is not public.</p> <p>Crucially, the Council does not engage selectively with particular user groups during pre-application discussions. We do not consult cyclists' organisations in preference to motorists, or any other group over another. Instead, officers apply adopted policies —</p>

	<p>including the user hierarchy and the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan — to ensure that the needs of all road users are considered consistently. Because of this confidentiality, the Council cannot consult with motorists' organisations, disability groups, residents, or representatives of school children at pre-application stage — just as it cannot consult with any other external group. Responsibility for any early stakeholder engagement rests with applicants. All groups have full and equal opportunity to comment once a formal planning application is submitted and proposals are public, ensuring transparency and fairness before decisions are taken.</p>
<p>11. COUNCILLOR DAVID HENWOOD</p> <p>Can the Council confirm the total number and value of compensation claims received in the last 12 months relating to pothole damage, how many of those claims were upheld, and what assessment has been made of the underlying causes? What steps are being taken to reduce both the number of claims and the associated cost to the taxpayer?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>For the period 1st January to 31st December 2025 the Council received 1926 claims for pothole related damage to vehicles, with a value of £691,688.</p> <p>For claims received in the period 1st January to 31st December 2025, 872 of the claims received within that timeframe were accepted and £229,715 paid out in compensation</p> <p>In the period 1st January to 21st February 2026 the Council has received 2118 claims for pothole related damage, with a value of £629.721. We are working through the investigation of these, so currently cannot confirm how many will be accepted or the cost to the Council.</p> <p>For the period 22nd February 2026 to the 18th March 2026 approx. 870 claims were received. We are unable at this time to provide further information on the value of these claims as the claim value information has not as yet been unloaded within the system.</p>

In response, we have mobilised an unprecedented level of operational resource, with 27 pothole repair crews currently deployed across the county. The use of four Dragon Patchers to deliver targeted remedial works, alongside increased use of specialist plant such as Bobcat to address larger areas of carriageway deterioration. Both county council and contractor teams are operating extended hours, including weekends, to accelerate repairs and respond as quickly as possible. All defects are prioritised based on safety risk, and, where appropriate, temporary repairs may be undertaken to maintain network safety while permanent solutions are programmed. We recently issued a press release outlining these measures, which you may find of interest: [Oxfordshire increasing number of crews repairing potholes following cold snap](#) and are publishing weekly stats on our LinkedIn and other channels - <https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/transport-and-travel/your-place>

To minimise repeat failures and reduce associated claims, the council undertakes post-completion quality inspections on a proportion of completed repairs. Any works identified as substandard are rectified promptly at no additional cost to the authority. Where recurring quality issues are identified, these are addressed through formal contractual performance management, which may include financial adjustments and impacts on contractor Key Performance Indicators. In addition, the council has established a dedicated Defects Process Improvement Team (PIT) to strengthen end-to-end defect management. This programme focuses on improving inspection accuracy, works instruction quality, and data integrity, with the specific aim of reducing abortive visits, achieving improved “right first time” outcomes and lowering the number of successful Section 58 claims, thereby delivering better value for money for taxpayers.

The council’s Insurance and Highways teams work closely together to ensure claims are assessed consistently and robustly, supported by inspection records, repair histories and compliance with policy. Where the council can evidence that it has taken reasonable steps to maintain the highway, this helps to successfully defend claims and protect public funds.

<p>12. COUNCILLOR DAVID HENWOOD</p> <p>Would the Council consider allowing 24-hour access through the temporary congestion charge locations for fully zero-emission vehicles, in order to strengthen the incentive effect and support residents and businesses who have already invested in compliant vehicles?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The primary purpose of the temporary congestion charge is to reduce congestion while Botley Road is closed to traffic, ahead of the county council's implementation of the trial traffic filters. Its focus is on improving bus journey times where this is most needed, as well as enhancing conditions for pedestrians and cyclists. Although air quality is expected to improve in many parts of the city, this is not the scheme's main objective.</p> <p>Electric vehicles occupy the same amount of road space as vehicles with internal combustion engines; as a result, they contribute just as much to congestion and road danger.</p> <p>The congestion charge, and its eventual successor - the trial traffic filters, applies only to cars. All other vehicle types can pass through the congestion charge points without incurring a charge. Furthermore, a range of permits are available for cars, including those for 'business cars used as goods vehicles' and 'personal cars used as goods vehicles'.</p>
<p>13. COUNCILLOR JAMES ROBERTSHAW</p> <p>With the current strategy of Living Well and the unpaid carers strategy, does the service know how many unpaid carers there are in the county, what their needs would be and if the budget funding is available to help those people?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR TIM BEARDER, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULTS</p> <p>According to Census 2021, there are 52,674 unpaid carers in Oxfordshire.</p> <p>Under the Care Act 2014, the Council and NHS have a statutory duty to ensure that needs of unpaid carers are assessed, and support is available for carers.</p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council has a long-standing partnership with Carers Oxfordshire. The current contract expires on 31 March 2026 and following the approval by a Delegated Decision, we commissioned a renewed unpaid carer support service through a procurement exercise. The new contract will be in place from 1 April 2026.</p>

The budget for the new service is £1,071,631 per year plus £625,250 for carer payments, both shared equally between OCC and ICB.

Our carer support service is the primary way we meet Oxfordshire's carers' needs based on Carers Surveys, regular feedback we receive, and wider research. We had carried out a comprehensive review of carers needs and priorities in preparation for the Carers Strategy, which was then co-produced with carers. The Strategy's vision and priorities reflect what carers told us matter to them.

The support service provides a comprehensive menu of support options for carers including:

- Information, advice and support- online, over the phone and face-to-face
- Carrying out carers' assessments
- Peer support, training, befriending services and carers groups
- Care Matters - a quarterly newsletter for carers
- Administering Carer ID
- Providing short break opportunities for carers.

Please see [Services Handbook](#) for details

The service helps to reduce carer stress and carer breakdown. The service has seen consistent growth in the number of people being supported which demonstrates the high and increasing level of demand by the service. Our Carers Strategy complements and strengthens the support and provides a platform for health, social care and voluntary sector partners join their support offers to have a meaningful and joined up support for our carers.

Following a carer assessment, carers can be awarded up to £300 in any 12-month period. We are working with our data team on developing further ways of identifying carers known to the Council who most at risk of carers breakdown are, to help support them better.

<p>14.COUNCILLOR JAMES ROBERTSHAW</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member also advise on the plans to develop the family support network in the county?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR TIM BEARDER, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULTS</p> <p>Oxfordshire has a wide range of family support networks, providing information, advice, emotional support, advocacy, and practical help for families, unpaid carers in Oxfordshire.</p> <p>1. Oxfordshire Family Support Network (OxFSN) Home - OxFSN</p> <p>Oxfordshire Family Support Network is set up and run by families for families of people with learning disabilities across Oxfordshire and surrounding areas. They provide independent, reliable information, advice, and support to families of individuals with learning disabilities across all ages.</p> <p>Adult Social Care Commissioning Service at Oxfordshire County Council has a contract OxFSN which covers strategic partnership, providing training and information. As part of this, OxFSN played a key role in co-developing Oxfordshire’s Learning Disability Strategy for 2025-2035, including hosting the World Café Event in Didcot on 26 November 2024, which was one of the main events to hear views and experiences of families, professionals, and people with learning disabilities. OxFSN also produced guides for families including the Moving-Into-Adulthood Handbook.</p> <p>2. My Life My Choice Home - My Life My Choice</p> <p>We also have a funding agreement with My Life My Choice, a charity run by and for people with learning disabilities in Oxfordshire, which covers self-advocacy groups and Quality Checkers. Self-advocacy groups are spaces where they can have a voice, be</p>

listened to, and supported by their peers. It is also a place for them to make friends, be social and share what's important to them, the barriers they are facing and how they would like to improve their lives.

[Cabinet approval of the LD strategy](#)

2. Oxfordshire Parent Carers Forum (OxPCF) is an impartial, independent body led by a dedicated team of volunteers. The team are all parent carers of children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND). They are hosted by Oxfordshire Family Support Network.

OxPCF collaborates with the Council's Adults and Children's services to support SEND and carers related initiatives. OxPCF is a member of Carers Strategy Oversight Group, which connects carers and professionals together to ensure that support is relevant, meaningful, meet carers' needs, and ensures their voices are heard.

3. Oxfordshire County Council Family Information Service (FIS)

- A onestopshop providing information on childcare, activities, local services and family support <https://fisd.oxfordshire.gov.uk>

4. Carers Oxfordshire (Supports Family Carers of All Ages)

- Provides advice, information, support groups, financial guidance, and carer payments.
- Offers both universal (information & advice) and targeted (assessments, breaks, emotional support) help for families caring for relatives.
- www.carersoxfordshire.org.uk

5. Wider Support available for families

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dementia Oxfordshire – support for people with dementia and their families. • Age UK Oxfordshire – services for older people and their families • Oxfordshire Mind and Rethink Mental Illness – mental health support for families. • Better Housing Better Health – practical support on home safety and wellbeing. • Various community groups supporting people and their families to remain independent in their communities. <p>This is a non-exhaustive list of support networks for families in Oxfordshire that we work closely with, which illustrates how we work with them to provide vital support for families, whether this is enabling easier access to information, emotional support, practical help, advocacy or specialist advice. Our work covers various arrangements including contracts, funding agreements and strategic partnership supporting our ongoing work and strategic planning. We are proud of our partnerships with networks supporting people and their families and have no plans to develop our own family support network at present.</p>
<p>15.COUNCILLOR NICHOLAS FIELD-JOHNSON</p> <p>Many potholes are repaired and then within a few days the repairs fall apart such as in Leafield a pothole was mended and then within days it was back to its original poor state and also drivers have complained about a pothole that has opened up just weeks after it was repaired on Bampton Road near Witney. When will we hold the maintenance company to account for its shoddy workmanship?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Officers and I fully understand how frustrating it is for residents and road users when a defect reappears shortly after work has been completed. A good number of repairs remain in good condition, however, a percentage can fail prematurely, especially during prolonged periods of wet weather. We are also carrying out a slightly higher number of temporary sweep & fill repairs at the moment which may not last as long as the sawn cut repairs. This may be done if a more complex permanent repair is needed to be planned.</p>

	<p>To minimise repeat failures and reduce associated claims, the Council undertakes post completion quality inspections on a proportion of completed repairs.</p> <p>Any works identified as substandard are rectified promptly at no additional cost to the authority, though the frustration and disruption to the public this causes is recognised.</p> <p>Where recurring quality issues are identified, these are addressed through formal contractual performance management mechanisms (this can include financial and other penalties).</p> <p>Officers are also using the recent challenges to jointly improve on defect management; including inspection coverage, works instruction quality and data, achieving improved “right first time” outcomes, maximising value of FMS SuperUsers.</p>
<p>16.COUNCILLOR NICHOLAS FIELD-JOHNSON</p> <p>OCC has tried and tested better road repair material. Why is that not being used for pothole repairs rather than the old asphalt which never lasts?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council employs a range of repair materials and techniques, rather than relying solely on traditional asphalt, selecting the most appropriate solution based on site conditions and operational requirements at the time of repair.</p> <p>Our highway depots utilise Hot Rolled Asphalt (HRA), which is delivered daily and stored in heated hotboxes, enabling permanent repairs to be carried out where weather and site conditions are suitable. In addition, we deploy several high-performance cold-lay materials, many of which are widely used by highway authorities nationally.</p>

	<p>These include products such as Viafix (https://www.viatec-uk.com/), which is moisture-activated and can be installed in wet conditions, and Tough Patch, supplied by UltraCrete (https://www.ultraproducts.co.uk/road-repair/ultracrete-tough-patch/). While these materials can offer strong performance in specific circumstances, they are significantly more expensive and therefore cannot be used as a universal solution across the network.</p> <p>We also undertake repairs using mastic asphalt and operate Dragon Patcher spray-injection technology, both of which are effective for particular defect types and locations. Furthermore, the Council is currently evaluating thermal repair techniques, utilising infra-red heating to rework existing materials. This method is under active consideration and may be introduced subject to final technical and operational approval.</p> <p>There is no single repair material that is suitable in all circumstances. The method selected is informed by factors such as the underlying condition of the carriageway, prevailing weather, traffic loading, and the urgency of making a defect safe. In some cases, an initial temporary repair is necessary to manage immediate risk, with a more durable intervention programmed when conditions permit.</p> <p>Repair performance is continuously monitored, and the Council regularly reviews materials and techniques to ensure repairs are safe, effective, and represent best value for public funding.</p>
<p>17.COUNCILLOR NICHOLAS FIELD-JOHNSON</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p>

<p>Can Cllr Gant confirm how many pothole repairs are currently outstanding in West Oxfordshire and how many were fixed in January and February?</p>	<p>The number of pothole defects outstanding in West Oxfordshire as at 19 March 2026 is 1144.</p> <p>The number of pothole defects fixed in January was 591.</p> <p>The number of pothole defects fixed in February was 641.</p>
<p>18. COUNCILLOR SUSANNA PRESSEL</p> <p>A couple of months ago this council put out some highly misleading -- in fact completely false -- figures for footfall in Oxford city centre. Please can you explain how this happened, and give us the correct figures?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The county council undertook to publish monthly monitoring data in relation to the temporary congestion charge. A key part of this data set is monitoring footfall and spend. For this, we engaged a new external supplier, which it was hoped could provide the required information. Footfall data for November was extracted directly from the supplier's platform and published in December. Through comparisons with other data sources which became available in January, a number of anomalies were identified which could not be explained. The data was published in good faith and as soon as this became apparent the data was removed, so as <u>NOT</u> to be misleading. The supplier has identified the issue and is working on correcting it. As soon as the data is available and validated, it will be published.</p> <p>A full public statement has been published on Oxfordshire County Council's website.</p>
<p>19. COUNCILLOR SUSANNA PRESSEL</p> <p>How does our backlog of unspent money from S106 and CIL compare with other local authorities?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR PLACE, ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE ACTION</p> <p>We are proud of our record of securing S106 contributions from developers to pay for the infrastructure that communities need. The process of collecting and spending S106 is complex and often for large projects such as schools, relies on collecting funds from multiple developments over many years. Necessarily therefore we will carry a balance</p>

	<p>of funding, especially following periods of intense development. However, we are well aware that there are areas where we must accelerate delivery and ensure that future funding is collected in a way that leads to the most effective delivery of infrastructure. Independent surveys published in the trade-press have reported Oxfordshire as holding a high level of S106 funding in reserves when compared with other authorities both in absolute terms and, to a lesser extent, when considering the funds held by the size of the authority. These surveys are based on FOI returns from authorities, with the most recent survey based on a 70% return rate from councils. There is still significant improvement to make but we are showing very positive progress. To address these issues, we have put in place a comprehensive improvement programme most recently reported to the place Scrutiny Committee in November 2025. There are no official national figures published for the level of S106 contributions held.</p> <p>As the upper tier authority, Oxfordshire County does not collect CIL as this is a district function. Where the local scheme permits (currently for South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils) we request CIL funding for specific projects against an agreed budget. This is drawn down into the Capital Programme with delivery reported back to the districts quarterly.</p>
<p>20. COUNCILLOR SUSANNA PRESSEL</p> <p>There is a new life sciences building in my division in Botley Road going up fast. It's called Fabrica. The developers applied to be allowed to have seventy-four car parking spaces, although it is almost opposite the massive Seacourt park and ride car park, a few minutes' walk from Oxford Station and on multiple excellent bus routes, with safe cycle routes leading to its door. I urged our officers to ask for a reduction in the number of car</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR PLACE, ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE ACTION</p> <p>At the time of the application for the Fabrica development (2022) the relevant Local Plan policy stated that:</p> <p><i>'the parking requirements for all non-residential development, whether expansions of floorspace on existing sites, the redevelopment of existing or cleared sites, or new non-residential development on new sites, will be determined in the light of the submitted Transport Assessment or Travel Plan, which must take into account the objectives of this Plan to promote and achieve a shift towards sustainable modes of travel. The</i></p>

<p>spaces. They did not do so. In view of this, how can we claim to have an active travel policy? And how can we claim that we want to reduce congestion and pollution?</p>	<p><i>presumption will be that vehicle parking will be kept to the minimum necessary to ensure the successful functioning of the development.</i></p> <p><i>In the case of the redevelopment of an existing or previously cleared site, there should be no net increase in parking on the site from the previous level and the Council will seek a reduction where there is good accessibility to a range of facilities.'</i></p> <p>The proposals included 63 staff parking spaces - a provision for 10% of staff - 8 spaces for visitors and 3 disability accessible spaces. This was a reduction of 84 spaces compared to the previous number on the site.</p> <p>Despite this, highways officers had initially objected to the proposals on the basis that the numbers had not been justified and the need had not been evidenced given the accessible location of the site. Following the submission of further evidence by the applicant, it was accepted by the City Council Planning Authority and highways officers that in this case the provision was the minimum necessary to ensure the successful functioning of the site and that the proposals were in line with the policy outlined above.</p> <p>It should be noted that three subsequent applications for life sciences buildings on Botley Road have since been approved with no staff parking, in line with LTCP targets.</p>
<p>21. COUNCILLOR LESLEY MCLEAN</p> <p>What steps are being taken to ensure that roads forming key bus corridors in Kidlington are prioritised for maintenance and resurfacing? and what the timeline is for making the full route across Kidlington fit for purpose, effective and secure, particularly in areas where road conditions have deteriorated under sustained bus and heavy vehicle use?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Thank you for raising ongoing concerns regarding the condition of bus routes within your division.</p> <p>I appreciate the frustration caused by recurring defects, and would like to reassure you that a number of key routes in the area have been treated in recent years as part of our wider maintenance programme. These include Grovelands (much of which was</p>

	<p>resurfaced last year), sections of Lyne Road, the Langford Road / Banbury Road junction, and Cassington Road. These schemes were delivered to address structural issues and improve overall resilience of the carriageway.</p> <p>In addition to completed works, further treatments are planned. Sections of Lyne Road are programmed to receive targeted repairs using the Bobcat patching method, which is effective at addressing localised defects and extending the life of the road. Looking ahead, the A44 is also included in the forward programme for surface dressing next year, which will provide a more comprehensive treatment along this important route.</p> <p>While a full resurfacing of all bus routes is not currently programmed, their condition continues to be monitored through inspections and FixMyStreet reports, with defects prioritised for repair based on safety and condition criteria. This approach allows us to target available funding where it will have the greatest benefit.</p>
<p>22. COUNCILLOR EMILY KERR</p> <p>When Cabinet took a decision that taxis should be temporarily permitted to go through the LTN ANPR points, it agreed to review this policy once the traffic filters were in place. Can you give us an update on timeline for this review?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The council committed to review the LTN ANPR points once the traffic filter trial is in operation. The trial has been delayed due to the ongoing closure of Botley Road by Network Rail. It is expected that the Botley Road will reopen in August 2026, at which point the traffic filter trial is due to commence. If monitoring data (a minimum of 6 months would likely be required) suggests that some or all of the LTN ANPR points can be adapted, the council would need to consult on any proposed changes.</p>
<p>23. COUNCILLOR EMILY KERR</p> <p>Can you give an update on the process and timeline for reconfiguring the dropped kerb design specification? (e.g. mandating new builds and planning recommendations for residential</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR PLACE, ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE ACTION</p> <p>A street design guide to better reflect current good practice and council priorities is currently being developed and will include a new design standard for dropped kerbs. Following suitable levels of engagement and consultation with relevant parties, it is hoped that the document will be presented to Cabinet in the summer. Officers are considering whether or not it is appropriate to introduce the planned new design</p>

<p>dropped kerb conversions in order to avoid altering the footway gradient).</p>	<p>standard for drop kerbs ahead of the adoption of the whole document and will look to do so if possible.</p>
<p>24. COUNCILLOR EMILY KERR</p> <p>Could you outline the process for enforcing the regulation that taxis carrying their own children on the school run should not be driving through school street ANPR cameras? And can you share data on how many fines have been issued to those who are doing this?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>I can confirm that Taxis are only exempt from school streets when picking up and dropping off a fare paying journey. At present we have not identified any drivers breaching this requirement, but if we do as well as issuing a fine, we would remove their exemption from that school street entirely. If there are concerns about potential instances of this happening, then please provide specific details to our parking team who will investigate and take appropriate action.</p>
<p>25. COUNCILLOR JAMES FRY</p> <p>I suppose that granular data exist by day and hour about the hourly number of vehicles on each road for which measurements exist. If so, please will you provide statistics on the numbers of vehicles in each hourly segment along each road during (a) public holidays, (b) school terms, and (c) school holidays, distinguishing between state school and private school holidays. Please compare the recent monthly data with the data from the previous year.</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>I have asked officers to liaise with you directly to provide this data, where available</p>
<p>26. COUNCILLOR JAMES FRY</p> <p>Congestion charging is now raising much more money than was assumed in the initial forecasts. Will the Cabinet now agree to provide targeted subsidies for bus fares for city residents who are excluded from the free bus services to/from Park</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The congestion charge and the free P&R offer are intended to reduce traffic and improve bus journey times in the city, and there is evidence that they are doing just that. This is delivering benefits to pedestrians, cyclists and bus users, including those who cannot afford to run a car.</p>

& Rides. For example, at present total daily bus fares for a family with children are a major deterrent for the family to switch to buses from a car. Is it not possible, using data on deprivation, such as the HMRC data used for the City Council's effective Council Tax Reduction Scheme, to offer free bus travel inside the city to those families who currently can least afford to switch away from car use?

In all parts of Oxford including the most deprived areas, at least 50% of commuters travel to work by non-car modes. Those commuting by non-car modes stand to benefit the most from the congestion charge.

Lower income households are much less likely to have access to a car, with 45% of households in the lowest income areas of Oxford having no access to a car compared to 23% in the highest income areas.

According to census and vehicle licensing data, the most deprived households are more likely to own vans or other commercial vehicles, which are exempt from the congestion charge. This will tend to benefit those in more deprived areas.

The spending priorities for the congestion charge are being evaluated in view of income forecasts, which are being continually updated.

Residents will note that Cllr Fry is, once again, advocating for the benefits of a policy which he and his party have opposed. Under his proposals there would be no targeted subsidies of the kind he calls for, nor would there be free travel on Park and Rides, no improvements to bus routes and timetables as introduced on November 9 and February 22, no air quality improvements, no safety gains and reduction in casualties, and no electric buses.

Perhaps Cllr Fry will also confirm which of the various different Labour policies on transport he supports since his leader in the City Council confirmed unambiguously yesterday that the Labour groups on this council and that one do not talk to each other and do not have the same policy, even when, as in the case of Cllr Fry, they are the same people.

<p>27. COUNCILLOR JAMES FRY</p> <p>PM2.5 particles are an increasingly important form of dangerous emissions. What is the Council doing to improve the comprehensive monitoring of these emissions in a similar manner to the monitoring of NOx emissions? Beyond supporting the switch from diesel to electric buses, what is the County Council proposing to do to reduce PM2.5 emissions from households and transport?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR PLACE, ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE ACTION</p> <p>The County Council has adopted an Air Quality Strategy and associated Route Map containing more detailed actions. Some progress towards these actions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An indoor air quality monitoring project which encourages residents to borrow air quality monitors from their local libraries free of charge (https://letstalk.oxfordshire.gov.uk/indoor-air-quality). This helps to raise awareness of behaviours that can lead to poor indoor air quality including wood burning which is a dominant source of PM_{2.5} emissions in Oxfordshire. We have proactively worked with the City Council to support to loan the monitors to members of the boating community. The scheme is being expanded to 4 other libraries in areas that are known to have an increased vulnerability to health risks posed by poor air quality addressing health inequalities. Westgate is one of these libraries. • We supported messaging on Clean Air Night regarding solid wood burning. • Public Health commissions the better housing better health service, which supports residents to heat their homes efficiently and supports the replacement of wood burning with more environmentally friendly forms of heating. • Trading Standards have carried out a review of the selling of wood for burning to ensure it is compliant. • There are several transport demand management schemes which aim to lower vehicle usage in the city (zero emission zone, workplace parking levy and the temporary congestion charge – followed by the trial traffic filters) which together with the other transport measures will tackle PM_{2.5} exhaust emissions from road transport, in addition to the electric buses which Oxford City's recent air quality modelling source apportionment exercise showed buses now

	<p>contribute to 0.41 % of total PM_{2.5} emissions compared to 19.29 % in the previous source apportionment exercise in 2020.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have modelled PM_{2.5} emissions across the entire county and have looked into health inequalities linked to air pollution and will complete a health needs assessment for air quality to enable a targeted evidence-based approach. <p>Monitoring</p> <p>Monitoring of air quality is carried out by District and City Councils who we work with and support with their annual reporting, as well as wider partnership work, such as managing and supporting the Oxonair (oxonair.uk) website.</p> <p>We have developed an internal air quality monitoring policy, to review and manage the sensors that we use, through the School Streets and green Infrastructure project, which includes PM_{2.5} monitoring.</p>
<p>28. COUNCILLOR GLYNIS PHILLIPS</p> <p>Can the Cabinet member let me know when speed cameras will be installed at the Barton Park junction? I first asked this question in July 2024 and despite numerous dates being quoted the residents are still waiting. I would welcome a definite date as residents have been waiting too long for this vital safety measure to slow down traffic at this pedestrian crossing</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Thank you for your question. I am very grateful to the councillor for her continued engagement, and that of her fellow city councillors, with the very real safety concerns of residents of Barton Park about crossing the A40. As she knows I have worked hard to engage with this issue myself. Unfortunately, the root of the problem is that the city council originally included a footbridge over the A40 as part of the plans for Barton Park, but then allowed it to be dropped, resulting in a large edge-of-city residential development cut off from Oxford and from schools and other facilities by a major four-lane A road. It is very, very much harder to fix a problem like this once it is in place than to get it right in the first place. We will, however, continue to work hard to deliver the improvements which are within our competency. I'm sorry that it has taken considerably longer than anticipated to progress this scheme. Thames Valley Police (TVP) are procuring this equipment with a financial contribution from the county council and they originally suggested that the installation would progress in spring. As this is a TVP led installation, we are bound by their timeframe. When officers have a more</p>

	<p>definitive date, they will of course inform yourself and other interested stakeholders. I and officers will continue to push TVP for this to happen as soon as possible.</p>
<p>29. COUNCILLOR EMMA GARNETT</p> <p>We're in a climate and ecological emergency and must protect our green spaces. The UK is one of the most nature depleted countries in the world and wildlife numbers here have declined by almost 20% since 1970.</p> <p>University of Oxford and its colleges have hundreds of lawns made up of heavily mown, monocultured grass - as anyone can see from a walk around Oxford or Google maps satellite, with very few wildflower meadows or wilder patches to be found.</p> <p>Kings College, Cambridge has shown that ambitious wildflower meadows on manicured quads can be a huge success for wildlife, people and public relations.</p> <p>Could the County Council use its relationship with the University to encourage fewer lawns and more meadows, and what are we doing for wildflowers on our highways verges?</p> <p>Refs: https://stateofnature.org.uk/ ; https://www.cam.ac.uk/stories/kings-wildflower-meadow-a-break-from-the-lawn ; https://www.oxfordstudent.com/2024/06/12/the-</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR PLACE, ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE ACTION</p> <p>The council's Landscape and Nature Recovery Team have a working relationship with the Leverhulme Centre for Nature Recovery and Oxford University Sustainability Team, as well as through the Healthy Ecosystem Restoration Oxfordshire group. The colleges (each a separate entity) are significant landowners within the county, with potential to make a significant contribution to the Oxfordshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy vision for a well-connected, biodiversity rich network for nature through their land management. This has been the primary focus for recent positive discussions we have had with some of the college bursars to discuss what the Local Nature Recovery Strategy means for them, and will be following up on these as we continue to build relationships.</p> <p>Meanwhile, in its capacity as the Highway Authority, Oxfordshire County Council actively manages roadside verges to balance road safety, accessibility, and biodiversity, including the protection and encouragement of wildflowers. This approach is set out in the Council's Highway Verge Maintenance policy and the Verge and Vegetation Management report.</p> <p>The Council has formally designated Roadside Verge Nature Reserves, areas of highway verge that are managed specifically to support wildflowers, pollinators, and other wildlife. These sites are cut less frequently and at appropriate times of year to allow plants to flower and set seed. There are currently 52 designated RVNR sites across the county.</p> <p>Where it is safe and appropriate, verge management prioritises biodiversity by:</p>

<p>oxford-lawn-balancing-tradition-and-sustainability/</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing the frequency of grass cutting outside safety-critical areas • Timing cuts to avoid the main flowering season • Removing arisings to prevent soil enrichment, which helps wildflowers thrive <p>This approach aligns with national best practice and guidance from Plantlife and local biodiversity partners.</p> <p>While biodiversity is important, the Council must still meet its statutory duties. Verges at junctions, bends, crossings, and along footways and cycleways are cut more regularly to maintain visibility and safe access for all road users. These areas are not suitable for wildflower growth due to safety requirements. Not all verges are managed directly by the county council. In many urban areas, District, Town, or Parish Councils manage verge cutting under formal agency agreements. Some communities also manage verges locally for wildlife, with county council support where appropriate. This means wildflower approaches can vary by location.</p>
<p>30. COUNCILLOR EMMA GARNETT</p> <p>To tackle climate change we need to tackle unsustainable transport and ensure walking and wheeling is safe for everyone to do. Illegally parked cars hinder this progress. Oxfordshire County Council currently insists that parking wardens observe cars illegally parked on Double Yellow Lines for a grace period of 10 minutes before being able to ticket them. Given updated national guidelines in October 2022 - which states that grace periods do not apply to Double Yellow Lines - many councils no longer do this. Please can you explain what Oxfordshire is</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>It's important to note that on enforcement of yellow lines a "period of grace" is not given however, we are required to have a period of observation as things like loading and unloading are legally allowed.</p> <p>The council's operational policy is to give 5 minutes observation for private motor vehicles and 10 minutes for commercial vehicles. This observation period is laid out in the Council's Parking Policy and ensures that PCNs are not issued to customers who are legitimately loading/unloading or board/alighting.</p> <p>Officers are currently reviewing the Parking Policy with a view for consultation to commence later in the new financial year. We have discretion on the observation periods, and I can confirm these will be reviewed during this process.</p>

<p>doing to review this and the timeline for new parking procurement contracts where we might be able to reconsider this approach?</p> <p>See “Grace periods”: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/civil-enforcement-of-parking-contraventions/guidance-for-local-authorities-on-enforcing-parking-restrictions</p>	<p>With regards to the procurement, it is expected that the contracts will be awarded in the final quarter of 2026.</p>
<p>31. COUNCILLOR EMMA GARNETT</p> <p>The trend for buying larger cars and SUVs has resulted in more fuel and energy use, more greenhouse gas emissions and more climate change, as well as increasing risk of serious injuries for pedestrians in the event of a crash. Oxfordshire County Council has size and weight limits for vehicles of 2 metres high, 2 metres wide, 5 metres long and 2.25 tonnes in weight. Are these limits checked by OCC and does OCC withdraw parking permits if they find that these limits have been breached?</p> <p>https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/transport-and-travel/parking/parking-permits/resident-parking-permits/new-residents-parking-permit https://www.theguardian.com/environment/ng-interactive/2019/oct/25/suvs-second-biggest-cause-of-emissions-rise-figures-reveal</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Yes, permits are withdrawn if it becomes apparent that a vehicle exceeds these limits.</p>

<p>32. COUNCILLOR LEE EVANS</p> <p>As we approach the one-year anniversary of this Council administration, I am worried about the lack of progress made to improve phone signal in rural areas. Many of my residents, in villages like Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor, Charney Bassett and Hinton Waldrist, suffer from poor phone signal. Yet the schemes announced so far by the Council - like the 'Mobile Digital Twin' - seem to focus more on restating the problem, not solving it. What concrete steps has the Cabinet member taken to improve phone signal in rural parts of Oxfordshire?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR BEN HIGGINS, CABINET MEMBER FOR FUTURE ECONOMY AND INNOVATION</p> <p>Mobile phone coverage is principally a matter for both the networks themselves and OFCOM as regulator, rather than the county council. The digital twin project (Digital Places) is not funded to secure interventions by the public sector for resolving mobile coverage issues. It does however provide detailed evidence of exactly where and to what extent mobile coverage is poor in locations selected for assessment. This in and of itself helps us guide residents to understand which network is the 'least bad' in these areas. It is also helping the team engage with operators, communities, and in some cases planning teams, to help navigate what could be done, which we are starting to see examples of. This is never going to provide quick fixes as much as we would want it to. Oxfordshire though is very much a leader in this area, able to lead engagement to a greater extent than many of our peers.</p>
<p>33. COUNCILLOR LEE EVANS</p> <p>It is deeply frustrating for me, and my residents, to find that after we've fought to get potholes repaired, sometimes the road is breaking up again within days and worse than ever within just a few weeks. Can the Cabinet Member provide an update on the Council's work to check the quality of pothole repairs, including how many potholes were repaired, checked, found to be defective, and how many claims were made against contractors' guarantees of quality in the past year?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Officers and I fully understand how frustrating it is for residents and road users when a defect reappears shortly after work has been completed. A good number of repairs remain in good condition; however, a percentage can fail prematurely, especially during prolonged periods of wet weather. We are also carrying out a slightly higher number of temporary sweep & fill repairs at the moment which may not last as long as the sawn cut repairs. This may be done if a more complex permanent repair is needed to be planned.</p> <p>To minimise repeat failures and reduce associated claims, the Council undertakes post completion quality inspections on a proportion of completed repairs.</p> <p>Any works identified as substandard are rectified promptly at no additional cost to the authority, though the frustration and disruption to the public this causes is recognised. Where recurring quality issues are identified, these are addressed through formal contractual performance management mechanisms (this can include financial and other penalties).</p>

	<p>Officers are also using the recent challenges to jointly improve on defect management; including inspection coverage, works instruction quality and data, achieving improved “right first time” outcomes, maximising value of FMS SuperUsers.</p> <p>Liability is identified either through our random quality inspection or when a defect fails within the guarantee period and it is agreed this is due to workmanship or noncompliance with policy.</p> <p>For the proactive quality inspections, a percentage of defects are randomly chosen for quality inspections. Any defects found to have quality issues or non-completion to instruction. are raised as 'non-chargeable defects' (NCDs). MGroup do have the have the opportunity to challenge the concerns raised and provide evidence why they shouldn't be non-chargeable. This is then agreed (or not) with Oxfordshire County Council officers.</p> <p>In terms of numbers identified as part of the defects quality inspection checks, 452 potential NCDs have been reported this financial year resulting in 219 agreed. Not all defects cost the same, but assuming the current average cost per defect is approximately £125, the cost to MGroup for the return visits to date is approximately £27k.</p>
<p>34. COUNCILLOR LEE EVANS</p> <p>Anecdotally, usage of the Stanford Quarry tip (Household Waste Recycling Centre) is significantly down since the Council imposed its unnecessary requirements on residents when using the tip earlier this year. If this is the case, it would be deeply concerning - and may be consistent with more fly-tipping and/or less recycling. Can the Cabinet Member provide usage figures for the Stanford Quarry tip, and other HWRCs, for the 13 months up to month-end</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR PLACE, ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE ACTION</p> <p>The OCC Waste Management team have been liaising with district council colleagues through the Oxfordshire Resources and Waste Partnership operational and enforcement groups. To date, no increases in fly tipping have been brought to the attention of the team, nor any new trends emerging since changes were introduced within the HWRCs.</p> <p>As part of the changes, a reduction in visitor numbers was anticipated through improved measures to prevent illegal trader abuse of the service, as well as fewer non-Oxfordshire residents using the services, both of which come at a cost to the service. Intelligence from other authorities suggests booking systems lead to customers planning their visits better, delivering more on each trip to the HWRC, but making</p>

<p>February 2026, so we can see the impact of the Council's new tips policy on visits?</p>	<p>fewer overall visits. It is also worth noting there have been spells bad weather since the service changes were introduced which often impacts service usage.</p> <p>HWRC traffic data supplied in Appendix 1 below. Please note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic data has to be treated as indicative, as this will include other traffic movements beyond pure HWRC visitor vehicle movements (e.g. operational traffic) - Traffic count data for Stanford and Dix Pit HWRCs is not included as these systems had periods of faultiness across several months in this period. We believe that visitor trends should not be too dissimilar to the other HWRCs. - This is a very narrow data set drawn from what is typically a quiet time of year, and longer term trends and other data sets need to be analysed to fully understand the impacts on the service.
<p>35. COUNCILLOR IAN SNOWDON</p> <p>During March I visited multiple locations around Didcot and nearby villages where tree, hedgerow and vegetation clearance has been taking place as part of the HIF1 road works, following concerns raised by residents.</p> <p>Despite the widely recognised start of bird nesting season on 1 March, under guidance associated with the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, significant areas of trees and hedgerows were still being removed. Residents are understandably concerned about the potential</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR PLACE, ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE ACTION</p> <p>The guidance in relation to the 1st March date is in respect of management of trees and hedges. The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 that is applicable is focused on the protection of wild birds (schedule 1) and this is complied with.</p> <p>For both HIF1 and NPR3 the contractors have professional ecologists who undertook a pre-work survey before any work started.</p> <p>For HIF1 ecologists come to site every 48 hours to do a wide range of inspections for all ecology, including nesting birds.</p>

impact this may have on nesting birds, wildlife and local biodiversity. On the occasions I visited these sites I did not observe any ecological supervision present.

Given that the HIF1 scheme was approved in December 2024 and the council has therefore had considerable time to plan these works, residents are questioning why this vegetation clearance was not completed before the start of nesting season. Residents have also now begun receiving letters regarding vegetation clearance associated with the Didcot Northern Perimeter Road Phase 3 (NPR3), scheduled to begin during the week commencing 16 March, raising further concerns that additional habitat may be removed during nesting season and may affect wildlife potentially displaced by the HIF1 works.

Can the Cabinet Member confirm what ecological supervision, mitigation measures and compliance checks are currently in place for vegetation clearance associated with both the HIF1 and NPR3 schemes during bird nesting season, and explain why this work was not completed prior to the start of the nesting period?

No trees or hedges have been or will be removed that show any signs of birds nesting. If any active nests are found, work will stop and mitigations, such as buffer zones, put in place.

With the above controls in place to protect the birds, it allows us to continue to make progress with the scheme.

For NPR3 I have been informed that two ecologists were on site on Monday 16 March to carry out pre-work checks and have adjusted the method of working in line with their findings to ensure that nesting birds are not disturbed. We are ensuring that the ecologists continuously supervise the works on site.

Vegetation clearance works at NPR3 mainly involve the trimming back of highway hedges where they are overhanging the verges and cutting/ strimming of verges.

<p>36. COUNCILLOR IAN SNOWDON</p> <p>The proposed NPR3 road has increasingly been referred to in the press as a “road to nowhere.” Planning permission granted in 2012 has now lapsed, and the council recently told the BBC that it was “looking at ways to accelerate construction of the whole road.” However, in November the council stated in several pieces of correspondence that construction would begin in 2026.</p> <p>Given that the planning permission has now lapsed, and residents have seen years of delay on this project, can the Cabinet Member confirm whether construction will still begin in 2026 as previously stated? If not, will she acknowledge that this is yet another example of this Liberal Democrat administration over-promising on infrastructure delivery and failing to deliver the roads and connectivity that residents and businesses across the county rely on?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR PLACE, ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE ACTION</p> <p>The programme has been revised with planning application expected to be submitted in winter 2026/27.</p> <p>Construction will start once permission has been granted and relevant conditions discharged.</p> <p>Officers are speaking with developers to coordinate timely delivery of both sections of the road.</p>
<p>37. COUNCILLOR IAN SNOWDON</p> <p>There has been considerable discussion in recent weeks, both in the media and on social media, about the amount being spent on pothole repairs across Oxfordshire.</p> <p>In particular, the MP for Didcot and Wantage, Olly Glover, has publicly claimed that £40 million is being spent on pothole repairs alone.</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>I can confirm that the budget allocation for highway safety defects (which is mainly potholes but not entirely) for 2025/26 is £4.54m, though the forecast for spend is £5.2m, with £4.4m being spent repairing potholes that are considered a safety concern. This reactive maintenance is revenue funded. In addition to this, potholes that are not considered an immediate safety concern are be repaired as part of planned works through our patching work or by the dragon patcher for example. The</p>

<p>However, my understanding is that the £40 million figure relates to a much broader range of highway maintenance activities, including drainage works, road resurfacing, footway repairs, and other essential maintenance, rather than pothole repairs specifically.</p> <p>To avoid confusion by our MP's and ensure residents are provided with accurate information, can the Cabinet Member confirm exactly how much funding has been allocated specifically for pothole repairs in the 2025/26 financial year?</p>	<p>£48.8m of capital highway maintenance is made up of various programmes but of this, around £32m is allocated to carriageways for the prevention or fixing of potholes.</p>
<p>38. COUNCILLOR GARRETH EPPS</p> <p>The village of Wigginton in my division has no bus stop. The 488 bus stops nearby, but in 2024 after efforts to formalise a bus stop, Thames Valley Police effectively prohibited the bus stopping nearby. This means residents have to walk almost 2 miles along the busy Hook Norton-Milcombe road, with no footway or lighting, if they want to catch the bus, which several do. Thames Valley Police also refuse to comment on what measures might overcome their objection to Wigginton residents catching the bus without this dangerous walk.</p> <p>The County Council is supposed to be in a "road safety partnership" with Thames Valley Police. Will the Lead Member meet with me and invite the police to broker a solution, or does he</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Officers have investigated the provision of bus stops near to Wigginton to access service 488, including a site meeting held in 2024 which was attended by representatives from our Highways team, Thames Valley Police, the bus operator and the parish council. A number of potential locations were investigated however, no safe location was found.</p> <p>Officers work with representatives from Thames Valley Police and the relevant bus operator when investigating locations for bus stops, to select locations that all parties are satisfied are acceptably safe. In this instance, all the parties were in agreement that there is no safe location near to Wigginton and this was reluctantly accepted by the parish council.</p> <p>Officers consider there have been no material changes that would warrant re-investigating this at the present time.</p>

<p>share my view that TVP's commitment to road safety appears to exist in name only?</p>	
<p>39. COUNCILLOR ANDREW CRICHTON</p> <p>On Dukes Meadow Drive in my division, on the west side of Hanwell Brook, there is a section of road that floods heavily. It has flooded repeatedly and consistently since I was first elected as a District Councillor in 2022 and over this past winter has flooded more than I have ever seen it flood before. Causing misery for pedestrians and drivers alike. It appears to be due to several drains in the road that, though seemingly unblocked, are not draining water. I know this has been raised repeatedly by residents. Can you confirm if this issue is being investigated by the Highways team, and do you have any update I can pass to residents on this matter? Are we any closer to understand why this happens?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Thank you for your Question regarding the Drainage on Dukes Meadow Drive.</p> <p>As part of the investment into scheduled gully cleansing this financial year, 25/26, officers have confirmed that all the gullies on Dukes Meadow Drive, particularly in the area in question, were inspected and cleansed during May 2025. In light of the concerns raised by Cllr Crichton, officers have been requested to undertake further investigation into the potential reasons why the gullies and drains are not draining as quickly as they possibly should be.</p> <p>Officers do have a fairly long list of similar sites for investigations however, officers have confirmed that this location will be added to the list.</p>
<p>40. COUNCILLOR JAMES BARLOW</p> <p>Please can the Cabinet Member reassure the parents, carers and staff of St Nicholas' Primary School Wallingford that from opening on 1st September 2026 there will be both a suitably-surfaced durable and direct walking and wheeling route to the school's new site that is appropriate for infants and buggies etc along</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Officers from the Countryside Access team and the Place Planning team have been working closely with Cllr Barlow, the representatives from the Diocese, the school, the representatives from the housing developers, and residents of Wantage Road to ensure that there are improvements to the footpath ahead of the school opening. Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) officers have been trying to understand the proposed works as provided by the developer so an informed decision can be made</p>

PRoW 390/16/30 from Fir Tree Avenue to the new Highcroft estate, and a safe crossing provided across Fir Tree Avenue adjacent to PRoW 390/16/30. Ideally, the Head Teacher notes, the path and crossing would both actually be ready from end June 2026 to allow for the children and carers to use it for the transition days in July.

before going ahead with any option to ensure that whatever is progressed does not generate new problems further down the line. The team are aligned with Cllr Barlow on this as it will be a suitable route to the school and will help to improve the Walk to School initiatives, thus having positive impacts on the air quality and health and wellbeing of the school community.

Furthermore, officers from the Behaviour Change and Travel Plans team have been working with the schools in Wallingford to help increase awareness and levels of active travel, through the development and delivery of the school travel plans which highlights ways to improve and enable sustainable and active journeys to and from school. The team are funding the creation of an active travel map for the new St Nicholas school which will be handed out to new parents joining the school and will appear on the school website, aiding decisions on how to travel to the school. It will highlight key walking and cycling routes to the school and indicative locations of where parents should park if they have driven to school so they may "park and stride".

It is worth noting that works have recently been completed by the Countryside Access team on the footpath 390/28/10 that is to the south of the school. This still provides suitable access from Fir Tree Avenue (appreciating that this would be a longer walk to the school than footpath 390/16/30), as well as the forthcoming improvements at Queens Avenue by the developer following completion of the build out of the site.

Every effort is being made to ensure that the path is open ahead of the transition days in July 2026. The team will continue to meet regularly as a group with Cllr Barlow those mentioned above to update on progress made.

Regarding the crossing mentioned across Fir Tree Avenue adjacent to the PROW. This is a side-road entry treatment over Fir Tree Avenue, which will provide a safe crossing. Some community infrastructure funding has recently been received towards its delivery. The team are looking at the programme for this and will continue keep you informed of progress of this as part of the ongoing meetings.

<p>41. COUNCILLOR JAMES BARLOW</p> <p>When will OCC fulfil its acknowledged responsibility and provide an appropriate surface and drainage to a key Wallingford active travel route, Croft Villas, so that it can return to being usable when it rains?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>As Cllr Barlow has stated, Oxfordshire County Council Highways maintains Croft Villas as a metaled Public Right of Way. Over the past decade, Croft Villas has received regular maintenance. Recently, it was identified that the drainage system required cleaning and jetting, specifically targeting the main carrier pipe due to reported slow draining. This work was completed on 19 February.</p>
<p>42. COUNCILLOR JAMES BARLOW</p> <p>When will the 136 bus service from Wallingford to Cholsey station have frequent peak time journeys, that connect with train times, reinstated?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Service 136 has recently been improved from its previous hourly frequency to a half-hourly frequency throughout the day, providing many more journey opportunities between Wallingford and Cholsey in line with our policy to improve public transport services; however, we are aware of the gap in the morning peak period.</p> <p>The Council has been quoted a cost of £29,500 per annum to provide two additional journeys in the morning peak, which is not considered to represent value for money. This would represent a 31% increase in the overall cost of service 136, which is not sustainable.</p> <p>Whilst a journey by bus from Wallingford to Reading is longer than a journey by bus to Cholsey, the much shorter journey time by train to London reduces the time difference. For example, in the event a 136 journey was available, a commuter catching the 07:22 train from Cholsey could reasonably expect to leave Wallingford at about 07:00 and arrive at London Paddington at 08:23; by catching the current X40 from Wallingford at 07:10, a commuter could expect to arrive at London Paddington by 08:35 – almost identical journey times, and at similar cost.</p>

	<p>As the County Council and Thames Travel have invested heavily in service X40 with brand new buses and an improved timetable, commuters also have a much greater choice of journey times with buses running from early until late seven days per week.</p>
<p>43. COUNCILLOR ROBIN JONES</p> <p>Can the Cabinet member confirm that the public consultation on the draft revised Minerals and Waste Local Plan proceeded in Jan-Feb 2026 as outlined in the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) Review Timetable and therefore that work towards the Minerals and Waste Development Scheme (MWDS) is on schedule for Adoption in March 2027?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR PLACE, ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE ACTION</p> <p>In July 2025, Cabinet agreed to cease producing a new Minerals and Waste Local Plan under the current plan-making system and prepare to produce the plan under the new plan-making system, proposed by the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023, once it was brought into effect. Therefore, there is no current timetable for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan production, nor are we seeking to adopt by March 2027 and consequently no consultation was undertaken in January/February 2026.</p> <p>The Levelling Up and Regeneration Act commencement regulations relevant to Local Plans were made on 2 March 2026 and the substantive plan making sections comes into effect on 25 March 2026. We are now examining these Regulations, the new plan making guidance and the implications for the new Minerals and Waste Plan. A new timetable for the production of the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Plan will be published in due course.</p> <p>If Councillor Jones would like to discuss the Minerals and Waste Plan, the Minerals and Waste Policy and Strategy Team would be more than happy to meet.</p>
<p>44. COUNCILLOR ROBIN JONES</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member please advise on the status of the 'B480 scheme' or the proposal for the creation of a LTN from the Grenoble Road roundabout towards Oxford? Has this scheme been sequestered for now in light of the</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>There are no proposals for an LTN for the B480.</p> <p>As part of an emerging development proposal at the Northfield site https://my.engaged.space/northfield/#home, the developer has proposed a diversion of the Oxford Road between the B480 and Garsington for vehicle traffic, with the current road maintained for cycle and pedestrian use.</p>

<p>proposed Northfields and South Oxford Science Village developments?</p>	<p>The county council has undertaken high-level design work for the B480 to help inform potential highway proposals in this area.</p> <p>Should a developer bring forward proposals, it is anticipated that residents, stakeholders and the wider would have an opportunity to input into design proposals as part of a consultation process.</p>
<p>45. COUNCILLOR ROBIN JONES</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member please update as to the status of the Science Vale Movement and Place Plan?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR PLACE, ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE ACTION</p> <p>The Science Vale Movement and Place Plan (MAP Plan) was adopted by cabinet on 27 January 2026 and has been published on the Oxfordshire County Council website alongside an overview chapter. The MAP Plans form Part 2 of the council's Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP) and sit alongside a number of other supporting strategies (such as the Freight and Logistics Strategy and the Active Travel Strategy). The MAP Plans are policy guidance documents and will be used to support future workstreams, scheme development, funding bids, responses to planning applications and developer contributions. They will remain live documents, with regular updates to ensure that they reflect the latest policy guidance, future Local Plans and strategies, and the development of schemes.</p> <p>The teams will continue to work towards the objectives and proposals contained within the delivery plan of the Science Vale MAP Plan.</p>
<p>46. COUNCILLOR LIAM WALKER</p> <p>Can you please confirm how much M-Group have had to cover the cost for pothole repairs that have failed?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Liability is identified either through our random quality inspection or when a defect fails within the guarantee period and it is agreed this is due to workmanship or noncompliance with policy.</p>

	<p>For the proactive quality inspections, a percentage of defects are randomly chosen for quality inspections. Any defects found to have quality issues or non-completion to instruction. are raised as 'non-chargeable defects' (NCDs). MGroup do have the have the opportunity to challenge the concerns raised and provide evidence why they shouldn't be non-chargeable. This is then agreed (or not) with Oxfordshire County Council officers.</p> <p>In terms of numbers identified as part of the defects quality inspection checks, 452 potential NCDs have been reported this financial year resulting in 219 agreed. Not all defects cost the same, but assuming the current average cost per defect is approximately £125, the cost to MGroup for the return visits to date is approximately £27k.</p>
<p>47. COUNCILLOR LIAM WALKER</p> <p>Given the Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing and Safety has been stripped of her main role overseeing the Fire and Rescue service, is this Cabinet post now redundant and removing it could therefore save taxpayers money?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LIZ LEFFMAN, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>The Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing and Safety has assumed responsibility for the Registration and Coroner's services and is responsible for other vital services such as emergency planning and trading standards, which I hope Cllr Walker will agree are of paramount importance in maintaining the wellbeing and safety of our residents, especially those who are most vulnerable.</p>
<p>48. COUNCILLOR LIAM WALKER</p> <p>Please breakdown for each household waste recycling site the recorded number of visits since 1st September 2025 until the latest data collected in March.</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR PLACE, ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE ACTION</p> <p>Data supplied in Appendix 2 below for traffic data. Please note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic data has to be treated as indicative, as this will include other traffic movements beyond pure HWRC visitor vehicle movements (e.g. operational traffic)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic count data for Stanford and Dix Pit HWRCs is not included as these systems had periods of faultiness across several months in this period. We believe that visitor trends should not be too dissimilar to the other HWRCs. - Visitor numbers vary through the year, with far fewer customers visiting HWRCs in the winter compared with spring, summer and autumn. HWRCs are typically far busier in September and October, and a comparison to February will normally show a significant difference in visitor numbers without factoring in service change. We have included data from Jan 2025 so comparisons can be made for the same period last year. - The period since the service changes is a very narrow time period, drawn from what is typically a quiet time of year, and longer term trends and other data sets need to be analysed to fully understand the impacts on the service.
<p>49. COUNCILLOR GAVIN MCLAUCHLAN</p> <p>Given the parlous state of the roads through the historic village of Warborough please can cabinet confirm a date when the road (A329) through Warborough will be resurfaced, it is dangerous. I have had the following from the Highways Engagement team: "the A329 Warborough has been flagged in our database for a resurfacing scheme and is currently awaiting review by the relevant team. While I am unable to provide a specific timescale for these works now, please rest assured that the scheme is on the team's radar, and any necessary works will be planned accordingly." This road is in considerably worse shape than the Abingdon Road in Dorchester was before it was resurfaced</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Two schemes have been identified in this area, subject to funding approval in future financial years. One is for edge strengthening of a section of the A329 to the north of Warborough from just north of Lower Grange to Town Hill, and the other is for surface dressing from Town Hill through to the junction with the Henley Road.</p> <p>If approved, details will be added on the map at the following link which shows information on all our schemes: https://oxfordshire.highway-iams.uk/Live/PBLC_ANON/PIP/?cg=scheme</p> <p>Officers will continue to inspect and carry out any safety defect repairs necessary in the meantime though.</p>

<p>last year. I am embarrassed monthly when I attend the Parish Council meeting in their Greet Hall, and have to pick my way through the potholes to get there.</p>	
<p>50. COUNCILLOR GAVIN MCLAUCHLAN</p> <p>Can the cabinet member please confirm the overall plans for Benson Lane in Crowmarsh please? This section of road has recently been subject to a consultation on speed limits, and has a multitude of other projects associated with it, such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. A path continuation from the new estate (French Gardens) to Benson Lane b. A crossing from the above path across Benson Lane to get to the pavement opposite c. The clearance of a pre-existing overgrown path as a suitable alternative route to the above d. The future of the old SODC site which was burnt down a few years ago (probably a district issue more than OCC) e. Rejigging the bus routes through Crowmarsh to run both ways down Benson Lane to incorporate new traffic lights on the A4074 and a bus only entrance into Benson Lane f. An extended path and cycle way from Benson Lane leading to Benson Marina g. The potential siting of a new Fire Station in Benson Lane 	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Response to follow.</p>

<p>h. Potential "Bloor 2" housing estate on land opposite Howbery Park on Benson Lane</p> <p>The whole project needs to be looked at in a holistic fashion not piecemeal as currently seems to be the case.</p>	
<p>51. COUNCILLOR GAVIN MCLAUHLAN</p> <p>Having asked the residents and the Parish Council of Benson to input into a consultation on the "Mobility Hub" last September we have heard nothing. What is the current plan for this looking like? There are other village plans which are predicated on what happens to the Mobility Hub, all of which are currently on hold until such time as they hear back on what actually will be committed to...and when.</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The public consultation for the Benson mobility hub concluded in October last year. Since then, we've been carefully reviewing all the responses that were submitted and, at the same time, conducting a road safety audit for the design. We are now in the final stages of completing a preliminary design, which should be ready very soon. Additionally, we're actively looking at various funding streams to help ensure we can move ahead to construction with greater certainty and less risk.</p> <p>The report summarising the public consultation responses will be published shortly. Alongside this, we are making plans to arrange briefings for members and the local parish in the coming weeks, so everyone will be kept informed about next steps and commitments.</p>
<p>52. COUNCILLOR JAMES PLUMB</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member provide the number of pothole repairs completed across the Marcham & Cumnor Division between 12th December 2025 and 12th March 2026, together with the proportion of those completed within the council's standard 28-day repair timeframe?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The number of pothole repairs completed across the Marcham & Cumnor Division between 12 December 2025 and 12 March 2026 was 165. Of these, 104 were completed within the 28-day repair timeframe.</p>

<p>53. COUNCILLOR JAMES PLUMB</p> <p>Two months have now passed since local organisations, including Cumnor Parish Council, submitted their feedback on the draft freight study covering the B4017, B4044 and B4449. Residents and parish representatives are understandably keen to understand the next steps. Could the Cabinet Member provide an update on the current status of the study, including when we can expect a timeline for the recommended actions, further engagement with affected Parish Councils, and clarity on how their feedback is being incorporated into the final version?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR PLACE, ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE ACTION</p> <p>I wish to thank you and the parishes for your comments during the engagement period in January. This scheme is interdependent with the work on the Windrush Valley Freight Study, which has taken longer to progress and agree next steps than anticipated.</p> <p>The stakeholder engagement for the Windrush Valley project has led to suggestions that also cover the area south of the A40 and includes the B4017, B4044 and B4449 area. Officers are seeking to respond to likely consequences of the suggestions made on the Windrush Valley Study and conclude that study before then turning attention back to the B4017, B4044 and B4449.</p> <p>Officers will be mindful of whether the suggestions made for the Windrush Valley meet the objectives of the B4017, B4044 and B4449 Parishes. Whilst it was hoped to be able to run both projects side by side, as was taking place at the end of last year, increased workloads in other areas such as the emerging West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2043, has meant this hasn't been possible.</p> <p>It is expected that the Windrush Valley report will be completed by Spring, and to progress work on the B4017, B4044 and B4449 before the Summer.</p>
<p>54. COUNCILLOR JAMES PLUMB</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member outline what steps are being taken to improve communication between officers and elected members regarding highways and maintenance works in our</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR NEIL FAWCETT, CABINET MEMBER FOR RESOURCES AND DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>I completely agree that we need to improve the communications with councillors over highways schemes taking place in their divisions. We ought to be in a position to let our local residents know when work is going to be taking place, and even more</p>

<p>divisions? In particular, will the Council consider implementing automated notification systems so that councillors receive timely alerts when works are scheduled, commenced, delayed, or completed? Improved and consistent communication would greatly enhance our ability to keep residents informed and manage expectations locally.</p>	<p>important now that road improvement schemes, gully clearing etc. are happening much more often across the county.</p> <p>Our Highways Maintenance teams have been working closely with our corporate communications team and the M Group contractor teams to enhance the way we provide updates and information.</p> <p>One of the key improvements has been the addition of a series of dedicated information pages in the Councillors' section of Hive, OCC's internal information repository. These new pages are designed to supplement the existing updates sent to members, which include regular emails and calls from our teams.</p> <p>We fully recognise that there's always room to improve how we communicate, and we're committed to ongoing collaboration across all teams involved in order to achieve that. The aim is to ensure councillors have the information they need to keep residents informed and manage expectations locally.</p>
<p>55. COUNCILLOR THOMAS ASHBY</p> <p>I, along with many residents, have noted the rapid rise in the number of vape shops, off-licenses, and barbers selling nicotine and other similar products on our High Streets. While many operate legitimately, there is growing concern regarding those exploiting young people.</p> <p>I recently witnessed an off license in Witney failing to conduct age verification checks. It was evident that products were being sold to</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JENNY HANNABY, CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY WELLBEING AND SAFETY</p> <p>Trading Standards has dedicated resources focused specifically on tackling the issues of illegal vapes, tobacco, and underage sales. Every year, we undertake extensive operations to combat these illegal activities and protect our residents, despite the many competing demands on our service. While the primary focus of your question was underage sales, it's important to highlight the close link with illegal products such as single-use vapes and cheap illegal tobacco, which are particularly attractive to underage buyers and therefore a significant part of our enforcement work.</p> <p>Attached you will find the statistics requested for the financial years 2024/2025 and 2025/2026, illustrating the significant volume of work Trading Standards has delivered</p>

<p>individuals who appeared well under the age of 16 without any request for ID.</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member please confirm the steps the Council is taking to safeguard our youth? Specifically, I request details on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The frequency and nature of Trading Standards inspections. • The number of shops that have failed test purchases, including their general locations. • The total number of complaints and active investigations involving these establishments. 	<p>and our ongoing commitment to combating illegal tobacco, vapes, and underage sales. We continue to balance this vital activity alongside our wider responsibilities, always aiming to maximise our impact with the limited resources available.</p> <p>It's also worth noting the upcoming Tobacco and Vapes Bill currently progressing through Parliament. If enacted, potentially by January 2026, this new legislation will create a smoke-free generation, make it increasingly difficult for underage individuals to access vapes, and introduce fixed penalties for underage sales. These changes will allow for swifter action and reduce the need for lengthy court processes, enabling Trading Standards to respond more quickly to incidents.</p> <p>In response to the specific incident reported in Witney, it would be extremely helpful to have further information about the shop where the underage sale was witnessed. Details like this are vital for us to direct our resources effectively, target our enforcement work where it's most needed, and justify the use of directed surveillance or underage test purchasing exercises when appropriate.</p> <p>We encourage constituents and councillors to report concerns directly to Trading Standards via the Citizens Advice consumer helpline, operated by our partner Citizens Advice. Reports made to the helpline are routed to the relevant Trading Standards service and also help us gather national intelligence and provide advice to consumers. The Citizens Advice consumer helpline is available on 0808 223 1133 (Relay UK textphone: 18001 then 0808 223 1133), Monday to Friday, 9am to 5pm (excluding bank holidays).</p> <p>Thank you again for raising these important concerns. Please let me know if you need any further information or clarification.</p>
<p>56. COUNCILLOR THOMAS ASHBY</p> <p>For seven years, Oxfordshire County Council has deliberated on the installation of two</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p>

<p>crossings on Deer Park Road. Despite repeated assurances that these projects were moving forward, the last 12 months can be defined through "dither and delay" regarding 'liability' concerns. This prolonged inaction is unacceptable.</p> <p>To rectify this situation and restore public trust, I ask that the Cabinet Member:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instruct the Director of Highways to contact me personally to arrange an onsite visit at these locations. • As a gesture of goodwill, fast-track the Colwell Brook / Olley Crescent S106 Delivery Works into the Phase 1 Programme. <p>Moving these works from Phase 2 to Phase 1 would demonstrate that the Council prioritises the safety and wellbeing of West Witney residents, who currently feel severely let down.</p>	<p>It can be confirmed that the project related to path improvements between Downs Road and Book End, Witney (Route 34 in the Witney LCWIP) has recently been passed to the Delivery Team, as part of the S106 Accelerated Delivery programme .</p> <p>In order to develop the proposals, and to ensure they fit with local requirements, the team will now arrange a site meeting with Cllr Ashby to walk and talk the route and inform the progression of design and development of a works programme, including any formal consultations that may be required. As of January 2026, not all developer funds secured for the project have been received by the county council. Any programme of works will be subject to all developer funding being held by the county council.</p> <p>As a Cabinet member I would not of course seek to "instruct" the Director of Highways or any other officer to do anything. I am grateful to them for the actions described in the answer.</p>
<p>57. COUNCILLOR THOMAS ASHBY</p> <p>West Oxfordshire District Council is proceeding with plans to develop 18,000 homes across the district, with 5,000 specifically designated for the Witney area.</p> <p>While the new Movement and Place Plans are a positive step, they lack, or likely will lack fully</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR PLACE, ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE ACTION</p> <p>The Movement and Place Plans (referred to as "MAP Plans") are part of the council's Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP), which was adopted in July 2022. The MAP Plans form Part 2 of the LTCP and sit alongside other council policies and strategies. The MAP Plans are policy guidance documents and will be used to support future workstreams, scheme development, funding bids, responses to planning applications and developer contributions. They will remain live documents, with regular</p>

<p>funded, practical solutions for the inevitable surge in traffic. For instance, despite 1400 homes being planned for Burford Road, there are no provisions to upgrade Dry Lane, a key arterial route to the Wychwoods.</p> <p>Furthermore, Witney is still reliant on a single River Windrush crossing; it is essential that the Council mandates developer contributions toward the West End Link Road.</p> <p>How does the Council intend to mitigate these infrastructure pressures across all 5000 proposed homes?</p>	<p>updates to ensure that they reflect the latest policy guidance, future Local Plans and strategies, and the development of schemes.</p> <p>The draft West Oxfordshire Lowlands Movement and Place Plan has been advancing and is currently undergoing engagement in advance of public consultation during May. The Lowlands Plan replaces the Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4) Connecting Oxfordshire Strategies for Witney and Carterton, extending them to cover new areas, support sustainable growth and to develop a framework that reflects the shift to a people first approach. The MAP Plans outline how the vision, targets, and outcomes of the LTCP will be delivered in locations across the county. They will be used to guide future workstreams, scheme development, funding bids, responses to planning applications, securing developer contributions and will support and enable sustainable growth. The West Oxfordshire Lowlands Movement and Place Plan is pivotal to accommodating the transport and movement needs arising from planned development.</p> <p>In addition to the MAP which will be a live document that is updated at regular intervals, the county is working with West Oxfordshire District Council on transport modelling work to support the emerging Local Plan. This work will identify the impacts of the proposed growth and seek to identify high level mitigation measures. This is the process for identifying the mitigation measures for the 5000 homes in the Witney area. This work is due to be completed in April and report in May, with a view to it being published along side the Local Plan 2043 Regulation 19 in June. In addition, officers will continue to assess each planning application received on its own merits and seek to secure infrastructure and service contributions and improvements that meet the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Planning Obligations tests as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p>
<p>58. COUNCILLOR IAN MIDDLETON</p> <p>The recently agreed S106 agreement for the OUFC stadium in my division includes what</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The signed Section 106 agreement for the OUFC stadium secures (i) the design and implementation of matchday CPZ(s) around the site – initially within 2 km with scope to</p>

<p>appears to be conflicting expectations with regard to parking controls around the development and how their operation will be financed.</p> <p>Apart from sums for the setting up of a CPZ, which seems inadequate for the size of the zone proposed, there is a sum of £184,120 for “additional enforcement officers” to cover a period of between 1 and 3 years. However elsewhere in the agreement it says that existing OCC enforcement officers can patrol proposed CPZs without additional cost to the County Council.</p> <p>If OCC anticipates that there will be no additional investment in enforcement and the initial funding period is only for a maximum of 3 years, what happens after that? How can OCC officers enforce a 3km radius CPZ without additional resources when they currently struggle to enforce the existing parking restrictions in Kidlington? Isn't it highly likely that Council Tax payers will end up footing the bill on top of local residents having to pay £20 a year to park outside their own homes?</p>	<p>extend a further 1 km if monitoring shows it's needed; and (ii) £184,120 (indexed) for additional enforcement officers to provide initial, matchday-focused enforcement capacity while the CPZ beds in. These items are listed in the County Council's transport obligations that underpin the S106 legal agreement and were part of the package considered by Planning Committee.</p> <p>After that initial period, ongoing CPZ enforcement is expected to be funded from the CPZ itself (permit income and penalty charge receipts) within OCC's civil enforcement arrangements, rather than by general Council Tax; this in line with the national civil parking enforcement framework.</p> <p>In short, the S106 provides pump-priming to establish effective controls and enforcement from day one; day-to-day operation thereafter (after the pump-priming period) is intended to be cost-neutral to the taxpayer and managed within OCC's civil enforcement service. The legal agreement also builds in flexibility to extend the CPZ by a further 1 km if monitoring shows it's required, so coverage can be matched to on-the-ground conditions as they emerge.</p>
<p>59. COUNCILLOR IAN MIDDLETON</p> <p>The wooded area adjacent to the site intended for the new OUFC football stadium in my division is currently under consideration by Natural</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR DAN LEVY, CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE, PROPERTY AND TRANSFORMATION</p> <p>The Section 106 agreement for the OUFC stadium secures a Woodland Management Plan for the adjacent woodland, which remains in OCC ownership. Responsibility for</p>

<p>England for designation as Ancient Woodland. There have also recently been reports of rare protected species in the area such as brown hairstreak butterflies.</p> <p>This area remains in the ownership of OCC but the S106 agreement hands responsibility for the woodland management plan to the District Council and the developer. The period over which the plan operates is ill-defined, ranging from the duration of the development to 25 years from its completion. There's also provision for the plan to be amended and updated with no apparent reference to OCC as the landowner.</p> <p>Given that this land belongs to OCC and we gave undertakings during the proposals to lease the adjacent site to OUFC about natural habitat protection, biodiversity and Local Nature Recovery Strategies, is it appropriate that OCC, as the landowner, appears to have abdicated all responsibility for the long term maintenance and protection of this site to another authority and to the developers themselves?</p>	<p>preparing, implementing, and monitoring the plan sits with the developer, under the approval and enforcement of Cherwell District Council.</p> <p>The plan must operate for a minimum of 25 years from completion, with formal monitoring reports required at 1, 3, 5, 10, 15, 20, and 25 years. Any amendments to the plan must be agreed in writing with Cherwell DC.</p> <p>OCC retains landowner rights and the Woodland Management Plan is about ensuring works done on the site leased to OUFC does not damage the Woodland. It is not about granting OUFC rights to carry out work in the Woodland (it grants no such rights) nor about OCC giving up its custodianship of the Woodland (OCC is not giving that up).</p>
<p>60. COUNCILLOR IAN MIDDLETON</p> <p>Part of the S106 agreement for the OUFC stadium in my division includes a S278 requirement for a minimum 3.5m wide path along the North West side of Frieze Way (A4165) along with a crossing over the A44 at the Loop Farm</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR PLACE, ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE ACTION</p> <p>The S106 agreement secures the principle of a minimum 3.5m wide shared footway/cycleway along the northwest side of Frieze Way (A4165) and a crossing at Loop Farm roundabout, to be delivered via a Section 278 (S278) agreement with Oxfordshire County Council (OCC). No detailed design or construction drawings are included at this stage.</p>

<p>roundabout. This is proposed as the primary pedestrian route to allow fans to walk from Peartree P&R to the stadium site.</p> <p>This is loosely referenced in the S106 agreement with no details about how it will be achieved. There also appears to be no reference to it on the plans. Most importantly, there are no details about how much of the established mature hedgerow along the edge of the Frieze Farm site will be removed (if any) to facilitate it.</p> <p>Can the cabinet member provide more detailed information on exactly how this path will be constructed and how much further local ecological and habitat damage it will cause on top of that we are already likely to see as part of the construction of the stadium itself.</p>	<p>Plans & Committee Report: Planning documents and committee report describe the route as a key pedestrian link from Peartree Park & Ride to the stadium, but do not show a finalised alignment or construction detail. The S278 process will determine the exact design.</p> <p>Hedgerow Removal & Ecology: There is no quantified detail yet on hedgerow removal; S106 documents acknowledge that some vegetation management may be required. Ecology officers have stated that any loss must be minimised and mitigated (such as new planting or habitat creation agreed with OCC ecology team), and further ecological assessment will be required at the S278 stage.</p> <p>Current Status: The detailed S278 mitigation package, including the final design and ecological assessment, has not yet been submitted to OCC. All impacts, including any hedgerow removal, will be reviewed and mitigated as part of technical approval.</p>
<p>61. COUNCILLOR CHRIS BRANT</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member reassure families in my division and across the Banbury area whose children were offered secondary school places in Bicester rather than at schools in the Banbury area, that the Council is working to address this issue and ensure that, wherever possible, children can attend secondary schools closer to their communities? And can he confirm whether all affected families have now been contacted?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR SEAN GAUL, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE</p> <p>The Council has successfully secured 30 additional places at North Oxfordshire Academy, and since Monday 2nd, 17 more places have become available at Banbury schools following parental refusals. While these developments increase overall capacity in the Banbury area, it is important to clarify that access to these places is governed by the admissions procedures and not directly linked to specific groups of children. Our engagement with Banbury schools remains ongoing as we explore further opportunities to expand capacity. We are also reaching out to colleagues across the border to identify any additional options that may benefit local families.</p> <p>To ensure all affected families are kept fully informed and supported, we have sent letters to every parent outlining the next steps. To help families who have been offered</p>

	<p>places in Bicester, we have set up a dedicated phone line for any questions or concerns. For families who have not yet responded—either to the letter or by calling the phone line—officers have proactively made direct contact to ensure everyone receives guidance and support.</p> <p>We remain committed to keeping families updated throughout this process and to ensuring children have the best possible chance to attend schools close to their communities.</p>
<p>62. COUNCILLOR KIERON MALLON</p> <p>New figures have revealed the Council is top of the table for held Section 106 money again. Of the £269 million secured from housing developers, £154 million is for education. What is this councils plan to unlock this funding and ensure investment in our local schools.</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR PLACE, ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE ACTION</p> <p>Given the scale of housing delivery in the county, the Council holds significant reserves of s106 for extending school capacity. The nature of s106 funding means that funding for major projects such as new school builds is assembled from many sites over multiple years. Equally, new schools are only built and opened once the number of local children has reached a level to make the new school viable without reducing viability of other nearby schools. Having said that, through our s106 Improvement Programme and through reviewing our overall capital delivery, we have recognised that in some cases delivery needs to be faster with clear project specifications and delivery resource. Having looked at highway, public realm, and transport infrastructure delivery over the past year and identified opportunities and funding to unlock delivery issues, the new Assistant Director of Schools and Settings Sufficiency with the Directors of Property, and of Economy and Place, are working to review the status of school projects and plan to set out a revised delivery plan in the next financial year.</p>
<p>63. COUNCILLOR BEKAH FLETCHER</p> <p>The recent Milton Interchange works were, overall, extremely well run, delivered collaboratively and under significant time</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>I can confirm that the Head of Service is formally looking into this with Mgroup to understand how this occurred and taking measures to improve processes and how we</p>

<p>pressure. However, once the junction reopened, one set of road markings was dangerously incorrect. The initial timeframe given for correcting this was three days, and it was only after councillor intervention that this was reduced to 48 hours. Will the Cabinet Member confirm whether a formal investigation will take place into how this error occurred, why it took direct engagement from councillors to prioritise remediation, and how the Council will demonstrate that lessons have been learned for future major works?</p>	<p>work to minimise the likelihood of this happening again. Processes and systems are in place to try and ensure these types of errors are avoided through drawing checks, site inspections and supervision – obviously something went wrong here. I can confirm that with immediate effect additional supervision checks during works taking place and on completion are now in place with the contractor.</p> <p>Obtaining road space approval to undertake the necessary remedial work was needed from National Highways and our own Network team required negotiation to agree a shorter timeframe than the original permission given to achieve the earliest possible start date.</p>
<p>64. COUNCILLOR BEKAH FLETCHER</p> <p>In 2025, two significant road closures affected the Harwell, Western Valley and Blewbury division: the Grove Road closure in July–August, and the Didcot Road/Miles East closure in October–November. At the time, it was acknowledged that there were failings in the execution of both schemes, and investigations were promised into each instance, with a commitment that the relevant County Councillor would be involved. To date, no consultation with the Councillor has taken place. Have these investigations been delayed, and if so, what is now the expected timeframe for their completion and councillor involvement?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The service has carried out a review of processes to understand what caused the issues at these works and adapted process to prevent recurrence. Officers will be in touch in April to discuss amendments made and how best local members can feed into significant works such as the closures described.</p>

<p>65.COUNCILLOR BRAD BAINES</p> <p>The Government has increased revenue fundings for the Bus Services Fund given to Local Authorities by 9% over the next three years. Can the Cabinet Member specify how the Administration will use this funding to improve bus connectivity for communities within the top three deciles of transport related social exclusion - such as Donnington, Littlemore and Greater Leys in Oxford City which have seen the 46 and 3A bus services withdrawn?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The Administration has demonstrated its commitment to the improvement of bus services across Oxfordshire through a comprehensive programme of new services, improved frequencies, and expansion of operating hours, and restoring connectivity to rural areas where services had formerly been lost.</p> <p>The increase in Bus Services Fund revenue money from Government, whilst welcomed, remains insufficient to fund all requests received, particularly when bus services exist in these areas. The communities referred to have all seen recent improvements to their services, with higher frequencies on Iffley Road and Abingdon Road, a significant increase in services to Littlemore, and provision of four buses per hour on Grenoble Road for Greater Leys. However, the improvement on Grenoble Road was not successful and the frequency has now returned to that which was in place before February 2025.</p> <p>The funding increase will be absorbed by above-inflationary cost increases and the requirements of the hugely successful MyBus Oxfordshire ticket scheme, which benefits young people (5-18) in Oxford and countywide. Discounted travel for young people has been regularly requested by local Members in the city, and this Administration is delivering on that request through unprecedented investment in fares initiatives.</p>
<p>66. COUNCILLOR BRAD BAINES</p> <p>What steps is the Cabinet Member taking to ensure effective adherence to speed limits within Oxford following the forthcoming review, including through the use of speed cameras, vehicle activated signs (VAS) and infrastructure interventions; and what conversations has he had with Thames Valley Police regarding</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The planned review of 20mph speed limits will include Oxford, together with the approximately 275 new limits elsewhere in the county under the 20mph transformation programme. It is an integral part of the Safe Speeds strand of the Vision Zero Whole System approach to road safety. The review will look at current speeds on the network and priorities for action for further speed management measures (subject to funding</p>

<p>enforcement, including potential use of average speed cameras on key routes?</p>	<p>and consultation), including close liaison with Thames Valley Police and their own prioritisation processes for speed enforcement.</p>
<p>67. COUNCILLOR BRAD BAINES</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member confirm that the County Council will take all necessary steps to reinforce or replace Donnington Bridge following findings by its structural engineering team, including delivering funding and timetabling works within the shortest possible timeframe? Will the Cabinet Member also review his previous decision in 2025 to not fund a full-timetable bus service across the bridge given the ongoing disruption to local residents?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>We are committed to ensuring Donnington Bridge remains safe and resilient for the future and recognise the disruption the current restrictions cause for residents.</p> <p>A precautionary 7.5 tonne weight restriction has been introduced whilst further detailed inspections and monitoring are being undertaken to better understand the condition of the structure, with an aim to determining the most appropriate long-term interventions.</p> <p>We will programme any necessary works as soon as we are able to do so in line with the engineering evidence.</p> <p>The County Council has no current plans to expand the provision of the minibus services over Donnington Bridge, as the existing service is provided at reasonable cost using vehicles and drivers available in the off-peak period between other commitments. The cost of providing additional services covering school and peak times would unfortunately be prohibitive.</p> <p>Alternative services are available within a ten-minute walk on both sides of Donnington Bridge, and those wishing to travel between points across the bridge are able to change buses easily in the city centre – for example at Queen’s Lane where interchange between services is straightforward.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

MQ34. COUNCILLOR LEE EVANS

Anecdotally, usage of the Stanford Quarry tip (Household Waste Recycling Centre) is significantly down since the Council imposed its unnecessary requirements on residents when using the tip earlier this year. If this is the case, it would be deeply concerning - and may be consistent with more fly-tipping and/or less recycling. Can the Cabinet Member provide usage figures for the Stanford Quarry tip, and other HWRCs, for the 13 months up to month-end February 2026, so we can see the impact of the Council's new tips policy on visits?

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
2025	53088	49587	76595	79046	73687	70394	71461	83315	65829	62310	55792	55283
2026	44447	32128										
Percentage change	-16%	-35%										

Please note:

Traffic data has to be treated as indicative, as this will include other traffic movements beyond pure HWRC visitor vehicle movements (e.g. operational traffic)

Traffic count data for Stanford and Dix Pit HWRCs is not included as these systems had periods of faultiness across several months in this period. We believe that visitor trends should not be too dissimilar to the other HWRCs.

This is a very narrow data set drawn from what is typically a quiet time of year, and longer term trends and other data sets need to be analysed to fully understand the impacts on the service.

This page is intentionally left blank

MQ48. COUNCILLOR LIAM WALKER

Please breakdown for each household waste recycling site the recorded number of visits since 1st September 2025 until the latest data collected in March.

	Jan-25	Feb-25	Mar-25	Apr-25	May-25	Jun-25	Jul-25	Aug-25	Sep-25	Oct-25	Nov-25	Dec-25	Jan-26	Feb-26
Alkerton	7616	6808	10701	11026	10277	9821	9845	11684	8545	8239	7431	7642	5507	3547
Ardley	8696	7865	12333	12027	11672	10678	10776	12481	10084	9345	8698	8984	7488	5307
Drayton	12210	11144	18647	20101	15996	15910	15873	18236	14671	14045	12559	12263	9760	6872
Oakley Wood	11012	10706	15577	16126	15110	14922	15063	17712	14581	14184	12833	12337	9882	6989
Redbridge	13554	13064	19337	19766	20632	19063	19904	23202	17948	16497	14271	14057	11810	9413

Please note:

Traffic data has to be treated as indicative, as this will include other traffic movements beyond pure HWRC visitor vehicle movements (e.g. operational traffic)

Traffic count data for Stanford and Dix Pit HWRCs is not included as these systems had periods of faultiness across several months in this period. We believe that visitor trends should not be too dissimilar to the other HWRCs.

Visitor numbers vary through the year, with far fewer customers visiting HWRCs in the winter compared with spring, summer and autumn. HWRCs are typically far busier in September and October, and a comparison to February will normally show a significant difference in visitor numbers without factoring in service change. We have included data from Jan 2025 so comparisons can be made for the same period last year.

The period since the service changes is a very narrow time period, drawn from what is typically a quiet time of year, and longer term trends and other data sets need to be analysed to fully understand the true impact on the service.

This page is intentionally left blank