

CABINET – 20 SEPTEMBER 2022

ITEM 4 – QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS

Questions	Cabinet Member
<p>1. COUNCILLOR BRAD BAINES</p> <p>To ask the Cabinet Member whether she will commit to meeting with myself, City Councillors, the Headteacher and Governing Board to New Hinksey CofE Primary School to discuss the potential for rebuilding the school on its current site or finding a new site for the school? The historic buildings of the school are becoming more and more expensive to maintain and are increasingly struggling to provide an accessible environment for all pupils. Dialogue about the school's future is not only important, but essential.</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LIZ BRIGHOUSE, DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, EDUCATION AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES</p> <p>Thank you for your email about the buildings issues faced by New Hinksey CofE Primary School. We have recently corresponded directly with the Governing Body on this issue. Many of OCC's schools are located in buildings that are not modern and present challenges for senior leadership teams and governing bodies as they deliver the modern curriculum that our children need and deserve.</p> <p>In planning school places the Council absolutely sees a need for the school places provided by New Hinksey CofE Primary School but regrettably no real funding opportunities for the rebuild you seek.</p> <p>Capital investment in school buildings will usually come from one of three sources.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Basic need funding to provide more school places.2. Funding from new housing developments if appropriate.3. Condition funds to improve buildings at imminent risk of closure if essential works are not carried out. <p>Basic need</p>

Questions	Cabinet Member
	<p>This is funding received from government based on a calculation of how many additional school places are needed in an area. Whilst there is a need for the current places there is no need to increase the supply of places in this area, and therefore the council receives no basic need funding for this area.</p> <p>Developer Funding Unfortunately we are not in a position to seek developer funding for primary school places in Oxford at the moment, due to the falling primary school pupil numbers. Even where there is housing growth, this is only balancing out falling births, leaving us with no growth forecast in most parts of Oxford. We are legally only able to secure developer funding for school places where we can show there would be a shortage caused by the new houses, and that is not the case. There are exceptions in the very large scale housing developments planned just outside the city boundaries. The condition of the current school does not provide a basis for requiring developers to pay for new school places.</p> <p>Condition Funding Whilst there has been an increase in condition funding allocated to the council in the last two years it is only sufficient to meet the most extreme need of items which are required because not to complete them would leave a serious H&S issue capable of closing the school.</p> <p>Condition surveys of the maintained school estate will be undertaken later this year to allow objective prioritisation of schemes. Were that to show that New Hinksey CofE Primary School was one of the schools in worst condition in the</p>

Questions	Cabinet Member
	<p>county it might be eligible for improvement works but a rebuild is most unlikely.</p> <p>I am sorry not to be able to offer more help at this stage.</p>
<p>2. COUNCILLOR CHARLIE HICKS</p> <p>I commend the headline target in LTCP5 of “By 2030 our targets are to: Replace or remove 1 out of every 4 current car trips in Oxfordshire” and congratulate Cabinet Members and officers for this. As the next step, in order to assess whether this target will be met by the subsequent policies and projects being put in place (such as Decide & Provide Parking Standards, COTP etc.), it would appear to be important to know what the target number of car trips is in absolute terms (rather than as a proportion). Please could you provide what the 2030 targets are for number of car trips in Oxfordshire by 2030 in absolute terms (broken down by city/districts if possible)?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR DUNCAN ENRIGHT. CABINET MEMBER FOR TRAVEL & DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</p> <p>Response to follow.</p>
<p>3. COUNCILLOR CHARLIE HICKS</p> <p>I commend the Cabinet’s much-stated ambition to put climate at the heart of everything the Council does. Given the role of Capital transport infrastructure projects on carbon output, what role (if any) are officers in the Climate team playing in the Capital programme review to ensure advice in the Pathways to a Zero Carbon Oxfordshire (PaZCO) report is being followed? i.e. Is there anyone from Sarah Gilbert’s team seconded to Belinda Dimmock-Smith’s team to support in the Capital programme review to</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR PETE SUDBURY, CABINET MEMBER FOR CLIMATE CHANGE DELIVERY & ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>The capital programme review is being overseen by the strategic capital programme board, chaired by Lorna Baxter, Director of Finance. Bill Cotton, Corporate Director for Environment and Place. The Chair of the Climate Action Programme Board sits on this board to provide links between both workstreams and ensure that the council’s priority to put climate at the heart of everything is met. Work is currently being scoped to further understand the role of embodied carbon within the capital programme and how we can use this</p>

Questions	Cabinet Member
<p>ensure climate and PaZCO is being put front-and-centre in prioritisation of the capital programmes and projects?</p>	<p>information within the strategic capital programme review, with this project being driven by members from both teams. Of equal importance is ensuring that any new highways promote the LTCP prioritisation, both directly, and through indirect actions such as closures of current transit routes to through traffic other than public or active transport, thus holding down total highways capacity available to private cars.</p> <p>In addition, we should note that the current highways program is driven by the Growth Deal, under which the previous administration committed to unprecedented levels of house-building, especially in Cherwell and South Oxfordshire. In the case of South Oxfordshire, the previous administration worked with DCLG to force through a Local Plan opposed by local voters and Councils. The emissions from building these homes are at least a factor of ten greater than those from any major highways and a rational climate approach would suggest (a) opposing currently agreed developments in car-dependent locations (possibly rendering all or part of schemes (especially HIF-1) unnecessary), and (b) pressuring house-builders to adopt radically lower carbon building methods. Following the recent egregious decision of the planning inspectors to reject the zero-carbon specification for the Salt Cross development, we are negotiating with the developer to maintain as much of the original vision as possible.</p>