

# CABINET

**MINUTES** of the meeting held on Tuesday, 13 March 2012 commencing at 2.00 pm and finishing at 4:40 pm.

**Present:**

**Voting Members:** Councillor David Robertson – in the Chair  
Councillor Arash Fatemian  
Councillor Louise Chapman  
Councillor Jim Couchman  
Councillor Lorraine Lindsay-Gale  
Councillor Kieron Mallon  
Councillor Mrs J. Heathcoat  
Councillor Melinda Tilley  
Councillor Rodney Rose

**Other Members in Attendance:** Councillor Mathew (Agenda Item 6)  
Councillor Greene (Agenda Item 6)  
Councillor Purse (Agenda Item 6)  
Councillor Pressel (Agenda Item 8)  
Councillor Armitage (Agenda Item 8 and 13)  
Councillor David Turner (Agenda Item 8)  
Councillor Hannaby (Agenda Items 9, 11 and 15)  
Councillor Jean Fooks (Agenda Item 14)

**Officers:**

Whole of meeting Joanna Simons (Chief Executive)  
Deborah Miller (Law & Governance)

Part of Meeting Item	Name
6	M. Tugwell (Deputy Director (Growth & Infrastructure))
7	P. Clark (Head of Law & Governance and B. Threadgold (Strategy & Communications))
8	M. Tugwell (Deputy Director (Growth & Infrastructure))
9	Dr Jonathan McWilliam (Director of Public Health)
10	B. Chillman (Children, Education & Families)
11	R. Noonan (Social & Community Services)
12	S. Collins (Pensions, Insurance & Money Management)
14	A. Bailey (Performance & Review)
15	J. Pearce (Strategic Commissioning)

*The Committee considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting, together with a schedule of addenda tabled at the meeting, and decided as set out below. Except insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda, reports and schedule, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.*

### **33/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

(Agenda Item. 1)

Apologies were received from Councillor Keith Mitchell.

### **34/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

(Agenda Item. 2)

Councillor Lindsay-Gale reported that she had been subject to a number of critical statements by a number of objectors, both in the Press and a formal complaint which had now been fully investigated.

The contention was that she was in some way biased and should not be taking part and voting on the Mineral and Waste Plan due to a claimed membership of the campaign group, Parishes Against Gravel Extraction (PAGE). She stated that she wished to make it explicitly clear that she had never been a member of PAGE, although did know some of the members through her role as Councillor and County Heritage Champion.

Since being appointed as Cabinet Member, she had taken extra care not to be associated with any one particular group and had sought to consider the issues with an open mind and would give due and proper thought when reaching future decisions, in the interest of the whole of the County and not for any particular parish. She therefore believed that there was no legal reason as to why she should not take a full part in the debate at Item 6.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Lindsay-Gale for her statement and referred to a note detailing the electoral division of each Cabinet Member which had been circulated at the Meeting.

### **35/12 MINUTES**

(Agenda Item. 3)

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 14 February 2012 were approved and signed.

The Erratum to the minutes of 20 December 2011, as set out in the Addenda was noted.

### **36/12 QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS**

(Agenda Item. 4)

Councillor John Tanner had given notice of the following question to the Cabinet Member for Transport:

“What research, traffic surveying and computer modelling has been done on the likely impact that the proposed changes to Frideswide Square in Oxford will have on general traffic flow, bus and taxi movements, and cycle and pedestrian safety?”

Councillor Rose replied:

“Most of this has been covered in Member briefings, and previous Cabinet Meetings [Delegated on 31 March, 2011, for example]. As the detail is too great to rehearse here, and is not relevant to Agenda Item 8 today, as both schemes under consideration perform equally, I will be happy to facilitate a briefing for Councillor Tanner outside today’s Meeting, should he be interested.”

A Supplementary Question was then asked:

“Councillor Tanner thanked the Cabinet Member for his answer and welcomed Councillor Rose’s offer to facilitate a briefing.”

### **37/12 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS**

(Agenda Item. 5)

The following requests to address the meeting had been agreed:

Item 6 - Councillor Charles Mathew, speaking as Local Member  
Mr Chris Hargraves, Senior Planning Officer, West Oxfordshire District Council

Mr Adrian Hatt, Member of CAGE

Mr John Taylor, Member of PAGE

Councillor Patrick Greene, speaking as Local Member

Councillor Lynda Atkins, speaking as Local Member

Councillor Anne Purse, Shadow Cabinet Member for Growth & Infrastructure

Professor John Dowling

Mr Mark Gray, Chairman of Cholsey Parish Council

Item 8 - Councillor Susanna Pressel, speaking as Local Member

Mr Graham Jones, ROX

Councillor Alan Armitage, speaking as Local Member

Ms Gwennyth Pedler, Oxfordshire Unlimited

Item 9 – Councillor Jenny Hannaby, Shadow Cabinet Member for Adult Services

Item 11 - Councillor Jenny Hannaby, Shadow Cabinet Member for Adult Services

Item 13 – Councillor Alan Armitage, Shadow Cabinet Member for Finance & Property

Item 14 – Councillor Jean Fooks, Shadow Cabinet Member for Deputy Leader

Item 15 - Councillor Jenny Hannaby , Shadow Cabinet Member for Adult Services.

**38/12 OXFORDSHIRE MINERALS AND WASTE PLAN: MINERALS AND WASTE CORE STRATEGY PROPOSED SUBMISSION DOCUMENT**

(Agenda Item. 6)

The Cabinet had before them a report (CA6) which set out the vision, objections, spatial strategy, core policies and implementation framework for the supply on minerals and management of waste in Oxfordshire to 2030.

Councillor Mathew stated that, in his opinion, none of the substantial issues and conflicts had been addressed when preparing the final draft and that the fundamental matters which had been stressed ad nauseam were conspicuous by their absence. The matter of gravel miles; the north/south of the Thames dichotomy of the source versus the need, the effect of cumulative excavation, the lack of clarity of mathematics in the document on the calculation of primary and secondary gravel excavation and need, the lack of coordination with neighbouring counties had again been completely ignored. For these reasons, he feared the core strategy remained unsound and in grave danger of being rejected.

Mr Chris Hargreaves, Policy Manager, West Oxfordshire District Council, spoke to express the concerns of that Council to the proposed minerals strategy. He referred to the previously expressed concerns about West Oxfordshire continuing to be the main supplier of sand and gravel within the County but focussed on the likelihood of the minerals strategy being found to be sound by a Planning Inspector expressing concerns that the proposed strategy was neither justified nor effective. In particular he suggested that for the strategy to be justified it must be the 'most appropriate when considered against the reasonable alternatives' and that there were genuine reasonable alternatives that should be explored in more detail before the plan is finalised. In terms of effectiveness of the strategy he stated that the Inspector would be looking at the extent to which the strategy is sufficiently flexible and what contingencies cater for a change in circumstances. He expressed the view that very few contingency measures had been put in place with all the County Council's eggs in one basket and a lack of flexibility which could be provided by considering the alternatives. Finally he questioned the internal coherence of the strategy referring to the stated objective to 'minimise the distance minerals need to be transported by road' as against the proposed locational strategy which continued to separate the areas of working from the main locations of growth.

Mr Adrian Hatt, a solicitor from Hedges in Wallingford, spoke on behalf of the Communities against Gravel Extraction (CAGE) against the proposal to site a new gravel pit between Wallingford and Cholsey. He stated that it was not too late to make sensible changes to what they believed was a flawed strategy. He referred to two emails sent to Cabinet Members and the attachments: the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) map and the matrix produced by Susie Coyne, well-respected minerals consultant aspects of which would be addressed by other speakers. He stated that when looking to site a new gravel pit it was common sense and sound planning to locate it in an area least likely to impact on local people. He argued that there were

several possible alternative sites in South Oxfordshire and queried how Cholsey and been selected. In addition he queried the quality and quantity of gravel at Cholsey and combined with the need to import crushed rock stated that this could blight an unspoilt area for 50 years. He referred to the second email that suggested that the wording in the strategy be extended to refer to areas in South Oxfordshire rather than to Cholsey alone allowing time for a fair comparative assessment to be undertaken. He noted that there was 8 years before the site was needed. He concluded that if it went ahead as it stood then CAGE would continue to protest strongly and would challenge the strategy at public enquiry.

Councillor Patrick Greene, speaking as the local Councillor for Cholsey including Winterbrook spoke in support of the work carried out by CAGE in respect of their third party and even handed investigations by an expert. He noted that Cholsey was singled out at a late stage in deciding on matters of Policy M3. He referred to a number of matters that would be fundamental to the proposed strategy such as – AONB final decisions for both Chilterns and North Wessex Downs, planning matters and views from RAF Benson on bird strike. These matters could all stop extraction at Cholsey with an inspector finding our strategy unjustified and unsound

He expressed concern that if policy M3 went ahead there would be blight on the area of Wallingford and Cholsey. For the next 8 years with property prices falling. He referred to the impact on Wallingford and Cholsey of the proposals and in particular the heavy transport on adjacent roads. He stated that it is many peoples opinion that under these circumstances businesses will not be attracted to the area, and tourists will stay away. He drew attention to other areas for potential gravel extraction in South Oxfordshire which were far more rural and with many less residents close to any one particular site. It can be envisaged that economies in such areas would not effected as badly as would the economy of Wallingford and Cholsey and the knock on effect to Oxfordshire's economy as a whole. He supported the change to the strategy proposed by the previous speaker. He referred to the huge number of objections (some 700 or so) to the siting of gravel extraction in Cholsey and suggested that the Council could increase its credibility in the population's eyes if it gave a little more thought and time to this issue particularly as there is plenty of time to do so before Sutton Courtenay gravel extraction runs out in approximately 8 years time. He urged the Cabinet to use their discretion and take on board the suggested amendment wording to policy M3.

Councillor Lynda Atkins, speaking as a local Councillor for Wallingford indicated that her views were supported by Wallingford Town Council. She focussed on the risks around the identification of Cholsey as a site for mineral extraction and in particular referred to 2 outstanding issues that cast doubt on the deliverability of the Framework. Firstly the views of the AONB's stated on 9 March that expressed concern about the impact on them and secondly the issue of bird strikes on aircraft operating from RAF Benson. The site lay directly below the flight path from one of the runways and so could not be adequately addressed in specific planning applications as suggested. Either issue could result in the site not being delivered and with

the two potentially fatal flaws the framework being considered could not be said to be deliverable.

Mr Mark Gray, spoke as Chair of Cholsey Parish Council and indicated he was also a member of CAGE. He supported the views previously expressed by Mr Hatt and focussed on other sites that could have been short-listed. He questioned the approach used in determining a new site which was not based on finding the areas where sand and gravel are located and then weeding out the most constrained sites. He referred to the arguments from officers that detailed analysis was not needed at this stage and would be for site allocations in the future. However local residents had always known that the proposed area around Cholsey comprised three adjacent sites and not some broader area. He referred to the concerns of CAGE and the Parish Council that had led to the engagement of a minerals specialist to assess the alternative sites in South Oxfordshire. He highlighted that the three Cholsey sites were bottom of the ten sites considered. Those at the top were: land near Drayton St Leonard; Land at Culham; Nuneham Courtenay and Stadhampton. He referred to the matrix circulated to Cabinet Members and suggested that the Cabinet should be asking whether any of those sites that came out on top in the independent report the Parish Council and CAGE had commissioned were constrained by being AONB or nature reserves, were in flood zones, near rivers, bounded by listed buildings or subject to MOD objections and the answer was no. Additionally they generally had no archaeological interest, important amenities or rights of way through them. He accepted that all the sites including Cholsey had good road access but in comparison Cholsey was constrained by the other factors mentioned.

Mr John Taylor, Chairman of PAGE (Parishes Against Gravel Extraction) spoke in support of policy M1 with a target of at least 0.9 million tonnes of secondary and recycled aggregate a year. However, rather than encourage the production and supply of secondary and recycled aggregates, PAGE asked that Oxfordshire County Council should proactively work with appropriate stakeholders to develop an action plan to achieve and surpass this target. He further urged the County Council to adopt a more progressive policy towards the use of secondary and recycled aggregate in order to preserve the Oxfordshire landscape from future land-won minerals working. The establishment of further permanent and temporary sites should be a focus for future planning policy.

PAGE cautiously supported policy M2 with a planned sand and gravel extraction rate of a maximum of 1.26 million tonnes a year.

In relation to policy M3, PAGE supported the policy for the locations of land-won aggregates, particularly as the County had now reviewed the expected locations of economic development growth over the next 15 years with a 50:50 balance between north and south Oxfordshire. PAGE further supported the selection of Cholsey as the south Oxfordshire site to replace Sutton Courtenay as it was nearest to the centres of demand and has limited flood risk.

Councillor Anne Purse, whilst acknowledging that a lot of work and discussion had gone into preparing the strategy, expressed concern that too much weight had been placed on West Oxfordshire to provide gravel which was not in proportion to the level of development in that part of the County. The west of the County had already seen the destruction of meadows that should still be there. She further recognised that safeguarding had been put in place in certain areas, but felt that this meant even more intense extraction in other areas.

In relation to waste, she sought assurance that archaeological and Paleontological finds would be protected should they be found on waste sites

Professor John Dowling expressed reservations about the validity of the core strategy on the basis that the Council was in a period of change and should not be making fundamental decisions which could be opposed by the new Cabinet in May.

Councillor Lorraine Lindsay-Gale, Cabinet Member for Growth & Infrastructure in moving the recommendations asked for approval to submit the revised policies in the Minerals & Waste Core Strategy to full Council on 3 April. She noted that this would mark the end of a very long process which had included two previous consultations. She informed cabinet that in September 2011 the Strategy had gone out for a third Consultation. Responses have been assessed by the Minerals & Waste Working Group and considered by the Growth & Infrastructure Scrutiny Committee on 27<sup>h</sup> February 2012. Overall this work had not led to any new substantive issues being put forward that call into question the principles on which the draft strategies were prepared. She referred to the huge amount of time officers had spent working on this consultation and she was confident that they had carefully addressed all the concerns and issues raised by local residents, producers and contractors.

She outlined why there was a vital and pressing need to provide clarity and certainty within the county's minerals and waste planning process for all concerned, and hoped that if colleagues agreed the changes today, the Core Strategy could take another decisive step towards official adoption by central government.

Councillor Lindsay-Gale highlighted two issues:

Firstly the robustness of 1.26 mtpa apportionment figure has been criticized for being too low by the producers and too high by those seeking to protect the environment. She had begun calling for a locally derived extraction figure for the county in 2009 so that we could prove to central government that the 2.1 mtpa annual figure passed down to us by SEERA was far too high. The figure of 1.26 already agreed by Cabinet was arrived at on the basis of an average between two figures, one derived from the past 10 year's production and the other from planned population growth. Our officers have re-examined their methodology and are confident that this approach is robust. Indeed there has been no alternative put forward or any challenge made to

the 1.26 from central government. I trust this indicates that they too recognize it as being robust.

In the current uncertain economic climate this figure may look high, but we must hope and indeed plan for an upturn in demand, and provide a landbank of potential reserves over the period of the plan.

Secondly she commented on the inclusion of Cholsey as the preferred option for a site in the south of the county to replace Sutton Courtenay when it runs out in about 8 years time. She stated that the residents had campaigned strongly and Cabinet had listened to their concerns today. However after careful re-examination of their case our officers were confident that Cholsey was the best option in terms of location, lack of constraints, closeness to market and access to good transport links.

In addition to the two issues she refuted the argument that all the proposed development was in the south, and all of the extraction is in the west referring to current growth figures. The strategy provided a positive overall direction of travel. The proposals provided a cap to current levels of production in the west.

With regard to mineral miles Councillor Lindsay-Gale asked for patience – as the County Council were addressing the issue but had to work through existing permissions which meant progress would inevitably be slow. The inclusion of Cholsey demonstrated the ambition to minimize mineral miles as much as we can going forward.

Councillor Lindsay-Gale also referred to the waste proposals that made provision for facilities that would be required for the management of all wastes in Oxfordshire up to 2030. This included not only municipal waste, but also waste that is produced by the private sector, including commercial, industrial, construction, demolition and excavation waste. She outlined the key challenge for this council to provide and enable facilities that will increase recycling and the recovery of materials as an alternative to sending them to landfill. She referred to the successful growth in recycling so far and referred to the aim to build on this success by raising our target to 70% by 2025 which will in turn result in our investment requirements becoming less. We will also work to ensure that our facilities meet Oxfordshire's needs, not others. The Ardley EfW facility was now under construction and would treat at least 95 per cent of Oxfordshire's non-recyclable household waste, diverting it away from landfill, at the same time generating electricity. She commented on work with the National Decommissioning Agency and the local members in the Harwell and Culham areas to ensure that the Council's policies on dealing with legacy radioactive waste reflect requirements at a national level. The waste proposals had been out to consultation and she referred to some changes being proposed in reaction to the responses received as set out in Annexes 1 and 2.

**RESOLVED:** to: (by 8 votes to 1)



- (a) agree the amended minerals, waste and core policies in Annex 1 and the amended minerals and waste vision and objectives in Annex 2 as the basis of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy – Proposed Submission Document for approval by the full County Council.
- (b) delegate authority to finalise the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy – Proposed Submission Document, including amendments to the supporting text, to the Cabinet Member for Growth & Infrastructure.

**39/12 EQUALITIES POLICY AND OBJECTIVES - EQUALITY POLICY 2012-2017**

(Agenda Item. 7)

The Cabinet had before them a report which set out how the County Council was approaching its responsibilities for ensuring that all residents in Oxfordshire have fair access to services and equal life chances and sought approval of an Equality Policy for 2012-2017.

**RESOLVED:** to approve the Council's judgement on effectiveness and key equality objectives as set out in the Equality Policy 2012/2017 and to RECOMMEND Council to receive the report.

**40/12 FRIDESWIDE SQUARE, OXFORD - TRANSPORT AND PUBLIC REALM SCHEME**

(Agenda Item. 8)

The Cabinet considered a report which summarised the outcome of design work and stakeholder consultation on two options for the improvement of Frideswide Square, Oxford.

Councillor Susanna Pressel, speaking as local member for West Central Oxford, expressed concern about the methodology used for consultation as local residents had not been consulted. Although she supported the 'boulevard' option she had concerns over some of the safety issues, especially on the part of people with disabilities, unconfident cyclists and elderly pedestrians in relation to that option and warned against carrying out the scheme 'on the cheap'. She referred to the need for: CCTV cameras to keep traffic speeds down to a maximum of about 15 mph at all times; improvements to be carried out under the Railway Bridge for pedestrians and cyclists; improved landscapes; consideration to be given to how to stop cyclist on pavements; loading and unloading and access for emergency vehicles.

She further questioned whether improving the flow would attract more traffic and whether the removal of bus lanes would mean that bus journeys would take longer.

Mr Graham Jones, speaking for ROX welcomed the proposed improvements to Frideswide Square which he hoped would commence within the next two

to three years. He expressed the hope that the final design would include reduced speeds in the square to improve conditions for cyclists and pedestrians; an improved access from the Botley Road; a clearway layby to attract new businesses to the area, 'gentle' edges to the bus lanes to enable proper access for buses and the provision of a reserve lane for emergency vehicles.

Councillor Armitage, speaking as local member for West Central Oxford spoke in support of the 'Boulevard' option, whilst raising concern regarding the safety of cyclists, namely the danger of vehicles turning left at roundabouts. He reminded members of the fatal accident to a cyclist close to the railway bridge a few years ago and to other serious injury in the area. He urged the Cabinet to ensure that a design which addressed cyclists' safety concerns was one of the highest priorities during the next stage of the design work, as without it, he believed that the scheme could undermine what the Council was trying to achieve at an important gateway into Oxford.

Ms Gwynneth Pedlar, spoke on behalf of Oxfordshire Unlimited, an organisation supported by the County Council to monitor and advise the Council on issues affecting disabled people. Of the two options presented, Oxfordshire Unlimited was satisfied that the 'Boulevard' design was the one most favoured due to clearer sight lines and dedicated crossings making it clearer. She believed that the safety could however be improved with controlled crossings in several areas. She sought assurance that the removal of traffic lights would not increase the number of pedestrian accidents and that in the event that accidents did increase lights would be restored quicker than the six month period mentioned. She raised further concerns over the lack of provision for cyclists; a loading bay on the south side being directly in line with a pedestrian crossing; delays from the Botley Road, the length of bus bays; no provision of safe crossings in the Rewley Road/Hythe Bridge Street area; the crossing at the Station approach being too close to the corner; entrance/exits for Kwik Fit and Staples and loading and unloading for commercial premises along Park End Street.

Oxfordshire unlimited believed that the disabled section of society living and working in Oxfordshire and not been fully understood and considered and believed that any approval of a carriageway layout without the intrinsic safety consideration of all vulnerable users was unacceptable and that making a decision today premature until more detail was provided.

In moving the recommendations Councillor Rodney Rose, Cabinet Member for Transport reminded those present that the report before members today was to get down to one design to then go forward for proper planning and design. He gave assurances that he would take account of all those passing through the junction and that he would talk to all those affected once the detailed design was available.

Mr Steve Howell gave an assurance that officers would look at the Botley Road and the issue of cyclists passing under the Bridge.

**RESOLVED:** to approve the “Boulevard” option for Frideswide Square for detailed design and implementation, including the advertisement of any necessary traffic orders.

**41/12 HEALTH & WELLBEING AND SOCIAL CARE: NEW ROLES FOR LOCAL AUTHORITIES**

(Agenda Item. 9)

The Cabinet considered a report which outlined the changes to health and wellbeing and social care and discussed the future direction for health and healthcare in Oxfordshire.

Jonathan McWilliam, Director of Public Health, delivered a presentation on the opportunities for local government under the proposed reforms to the health system. The presentation covered the new structure of the Health & Wellbeing Board, the implications for the County Council, the Scrutiny function and district councils and the particular opportunities open to Oxfordshire County Council.

Councillor Jenny Hannaby spoke in support of Health & Wellbeing being returned to the County. She urged the Director for Public Health to work closely with districts councils to ensure the well-being of those in rural areas. She expressed hope that Scrutiny and Health Watch would provide a means of monitoring how well the new board was performing and that Oxfordshire could be a flagship for the rest of the Country.

**RESOLVED:** to approve the direction of travel as set out in the report CA9 and to ask the Director of Public Health to report back on future developments in due course.

**42/12 EXTENSION OF AGE RANGE AT WOODEATON MANOR SCHOOL - PROPOSAL FOR ALTERATION OF LOWER AGE LIMIT**

(Agenda Item. 10)

The Cabinet had before them a report CA10 which sought approval to extend the age range of pupils at Woodeaton Manor School to include pupils of Key Stage 2 primary school age so that it becomes an age range of 7 to 18.

**RESOLVED:** to support the Governing Body of Woodeaton Manor School by approving the publication of a statutory notice for the alteration of the lower age limit at Woodeaton Manor School.

**43/12 EMBEDDING PERSONALISATION**

(Agenda Item. 11)

The Cabinet had before them a report by the Cabinet Member for Adult Services which welcomed the introduction of Personalisation as a policy and reviewed some of the risks involved in more direct purchasing of social care by individuals. The report further outlined the measures being proposed to Adult Social Care Scrutiny Committee for assuring quality in externally

provided care. This included the role of Members in promoting and assuring quality in services which operated in their locality.

Councillor Jenny Hannaby, Shadow Cabinet Member for Adult Services spoke in support of paragraphs 15, 16 and 17 of the report CA11, namely that Members should have a central role in the further development and promotion of personalisation in Oxfordshire and in the Adult Services Scrutiny Committee considering proposals for Members to take a more formal role in assuring service quality across key provision in their local area. She stressed that there would need to be a firm division of officers and member processes.

**RESOLVED:** to

- (a) to note the current position; and
- (b) to RECOMMEND to Council to receive the report and debate its implications for Members.

#### **44/12 ACADEMIES AND PENSION COSTS**

(Agenda Item. 12)

The Cabinet had before them a report which, in response to a letter sent out to all Local Authority Leaders and Chief Executives in England, set out the statutory position regarding Academies and the local Government Pension Scheme.

**RESOLVED:** not to support the option of allowing academies to be pooled with the County Council for LGPS purposes, and to inform the Pension Fund Committee accordingly.

#### **45/12 2011/12 FINANCIAL MONITORING & BUSINESS STRATEGY DELIVERY REPORT - JANUARY 2012**

(Agenda Item. 13)

The Cabinet considered a report which set out the forecast position from each Directorate, including the delivery of the Directorate Business Strategies which were agreed as part of the Service & Resource Planning Process for 2011/12-2015/16. The Cabinet also had before them a supplementary report by the Assistant Chief Executive & Chief Finance Officer as set out in the Addenda, which outlined changes made to the credit rating matrix limits set out in the Annual Treasury Management Strategy & Annual Investment Strategy for 2011/12 and 2012/13.

The Cabinet congratulated Ms Baxter on her recent appointment as Deputy Chief Finance Officer.

Councillor Armitage referred to the additional balances in funds, particularly around school intervention projects and early intervention, expressing concern that cuts were maybe being carried out too aggressively. He

questioned whether the under spends presented an opportunity to reduce pressure on Managers.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Education & Families pointed out that the savings in early intervention were in middle management and not to the service.

The Cabinet Member for Schools Improvement referred to the million under spend in school intervention projects, stressing that the money was earmarked to raise educational attainment by looking at different ways of working to achieve it.

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Property in moving the recommendations detailed the Directorate positions as set out in the report. In relation to the comments made on the substantial under spends shown, he indicated the £2m of the under spend was due to be spent in next year and that the rest would go into efficiency reserves. He commented that Directorates had worked hard to achieve early savings for 2012/13.

**RESOLVED:** to

- (a) note the report and approve the virements as set out in Annex 2a;
- (b) agree the creation of the new reserves as set out in paragraph 45 to 48; and
- (c) approve the new capital schemes and budget changes set out in Annex 9c.
- (d) note the changes made to the credit rating matrix limits set out in the Annual Treasury Management Strategy & Annual Investment Strategy for 2011/12 and 2012/13 under delegated powers (per paragraph 2 and 9); and
- (e) RECOMMEND Council to note the changes made to the credit rating matrix limits set out in the Annual Treasury Management Strategy & Annual Investment Strategy for 2011/12 and 2012/13.

**46/12 CORPORATE PLAN PERFORMANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT REPORT FOR THE 3RD QUARTER 2011**

(Agenda Item. 14)

The Cabinet considered a report (CA15) which sought agreement to the proposed renewal of the current S75 NHS Act 2006 pooled budget agreement and lead commissioning with Oxfordshire Primary Care Trust from April 2012 – March 2013 for the two pooled arrangements for older people and people with physical disabilities and people with a learning disability.

Councillor Jean Fooks, Shadow Cabinet Member for the Deputy Leader referred to those areas of the report where, she considered, items were not on track, or there was no evidence yet available, in particular 'tackling transportation priorities', 'breaking the cycle of deprivation' and 'Environment and Climate Change'. Under 'Closer to Communities', she drew attention to

the lack of progress in the eight non-priority areas despite the target date of June 2011. She suggested that the report would benefit from specific recommendations where a target had not been achieved.

In relation to 'breaking the cycle of deprivation' targets, The Cabinet Member for Children, Education & Families referred Councillor Fooks to page 177 of the report and the NEETS targets which had been met and had seen a consistent improvement since September last year. She further referred to the success of reducing teenage pregnancies in Oxfordshire.

The Deputy Leader reminded Councillor Fooks that all the targets had associated action plans.

**RESOLVED:** to note the report.

#### **47/12 RENEWED SECTION 75 AGREEMENT WITH OXFORDSHIRE PCT**

(Agenda Item. 15)

The Cabinet considered a report which proposed the renewal of the current s75 NHS Act 2006 pooled budget agreement and lead commissioning with Oxfordshire Primary Care Trust from April 2012-March 2013 for the two pooled arrangements for:

- Older people and people with physical disabilities and
- People with a Learning Disability.

and in relation to Joint arrangements with Oxford Health (Provider) to delegate the responsibility to the Director Social and Community Services to enter into a further Mental health pooled Section 75 agreement with Oxford Health. The purpose of this Agreement was to facilitate the provision of integrated services by the partners in the manner and locations specified in this Agreement and to be limited to eligible people within the Council's borders.

Councillor Jenny Hannaby, Shadow Cabinet Member for Adult Services stated that the area for Older people and people with Physical disabilities and People with Learning Disabilities had not historically in some areas performed as well as she would have liked. She hoped the new agreement, which she noted had a cut off clause, would make a difference including a proper look at the services with more focus on areas needing improvement

She sought assurance that there would be sufficient residential care and respite places available and that supported living support services, which would be funded through personal budgets, received the correct funding and that monitoring took place to make sure the funding is sufficient for their needs.

.....  
She welcomed the fact that existing staff arrangements would continue with the new arrangements and that the Oxfordshire clinical group had approved the new arrangements for authority to rest with Director and 151 officers.

The Cabinet Member for Adult Services responded to the points made commenting that he was aware of the concerns that Councillor Hannaby raised and would continue to monitor the situation carefully.

**RESOLVED:** to:

- (a) endorse the proposals to agree joint agreements with Oxfordshire PCT set out above which have been approved by Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group;
- (b) grant delegated authority to the Director and s151 officer to agree the section 75 partnership agreement with Oxford Health.

**48/12 FORWARD PLAN AND FUTURE BUSINESS**

(Agenda Item. 16)

(Agenda Item 16)

The Cabinet considered a list of items (CA16) for the immediately forthcoming meetings of the Cabinet together with changes and additions set out in the schedule of addenda.

**RESOLVED:** to note the items currently identified for forthcoming meetings.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing