



**Cabinet
Tuesday, 25 April 2017**

ADDENDA

3. Minutes (Pages 1 - 14)

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 March 2017 are attached.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

CABINET

MINUTES of the meeting held on Tuesday, 14 March 2017 commencing at 2.00 pm and finishing at 4.22 pm

Present:

Voting Members: Councillor Ian Hudspeth – in the Chair
Councillor Mrs Judith Heathcoat
Councillor Nick Carter
Councillor Melinda Tilley
Councillor Steve Harrod
Councillor Lorraine Lindsay-Gale
Councillor David Nimmo Smith
Councillor Lawrie Stratford
Councillor Hilary Hibbert-Biles

Other Members in Attendance: Councillor Liz Brighthouse (Agenda Item 4)
Councillor Jean Fooks (Agenda Item 6)
Councillor Neville Harris (Agenda Item 6)
Councillor Susanna Pressel (Agenda Item 6)
Councillor John Tanner (Agenda Item 5)

Officers:

Whole of meeting	Peter Clark (Chief Executive); Sue Whitehead (Resources)
Part of meeting	
Item	Name
6	Maggie Scott, Assistant Chief Executive; Bev Hindle, Strategic Director for Communities; Jonathan McWilliam, Strategic Director for People; Lorna Baxter, Director of Finance; Robin Rogers (Resources)
7	Simon Furlong, Director for Community Safety and Chief Fire Officer; Julian Green (OFRS)

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.

23/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

(Agenda Item. 1)

Apologies were received from Councillor Rose.

24/17 MINUTES

(Agenda Item. 3)

The Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 21 February were approved and signed as a correct record.

25/17 QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS

(Agenda Item. 4)

Councillor Howson had given written notice of the following question to Councillor Lindsay-Gale at the last Cabinet meeting

“Since September, 2013 could you list the school building contracts for Oxfordshire’s schools (including academies and free schools where building work has been funded through Oxfordshire) that have not been completed on time and how long after the start of a term when the building was required was it before the project was completed?”

Councillor Lindsay-Gale replied:

“Since September 2013 and up to September 2016 there have been 39 building contracts delivering additional pupil places that were required to be met at the start of an academic year.

In respect of these building contracts 19 delivered the new teaching spaces by the start of the academic year stated and 20 did not. In 14 of these cases the necessary teaching space was delivered through short term utilisation of existing space in advance of completion of the new teaching spaces, in 4 instances temporary hired facilities were provided on site. In 2 instances, the increase in pupil numbers to be met by the school was postponed to the following year.

Individual building contracts combine the need to deliver teaching space with other ancillary works. Completion of teaching space is the primary need and as a consequence it tends to occur in advance of contract completion.

Between 2013 and 2016 the range of difference between the availability of new teaching spaces and the start of the academic year were

- 19 projects completed before the start of term
- 6 projects completed within 1 month of the start of term
- 4 projects completed between 1 and 3 months of the start of term
- 1 project completed between 3 and 6 months of the start of term
- 4 projects completed between 6 and 12 months of the start of term
- 5 projects completed more than 12 months after the start of term

Delay can occur during

1. design development - this can be due to changes in scope, establish an optimum solution, gaining statutory consents, value engineering the design within budget constraints as well as resource issues and inefficiencies

2. construction – this can be due to encountering unforeseen works, inaccurate programming, sub contractor's entering into administration, resource issues and inefficiencies.”

Supplementary: Responding to a further question Councillor Lindsay-Gale agreed that the position was not satisfactory and that the County Council was working hard with Carillion to improve the situation. She hoped that in six months the picture would be more positive.

Councillor Tanner had given written notice of the following question to Councillor Hudspeth

“The residents of my Oxford division are horrified at the prospect of their City Council being abolished and replaced by a single county-wide council. Will the cabinet reconsider its proposal for ‘One Oxfordshire’ and put the County Council’s efforts instead into co-operating with the districts to deliver improved services?”

Councillor Hudspeth replied:

“I’m sure Cllr Tanner will be delighted to hear that Cabinet has reconsidered the proposals in its ‘One Oxfordshire’ discussion document and by listening to feedback from the public and stakeholders, and by working with South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils, has produced a bid to government entitled ‘A New Council for a Better Oxfordshire’.

However, I am not surprised that the residents of Cllr Tanner’s division are horrified. The City Council, where he sits as a member of the City Executive Board, has lavishly funded an extensive campaign of misinformation disgracefully wasting taxpayers’ money on adverts and opinion polls designed to scare residents. Time and time again the City Council has described the proposals as a “takeover” of City Council services by a “remote unitary county council” when the fact is that the proposal is for an entirely new council that is neither “district” or “county”. The City also conveniently ignores the fact that 80% of local authority services within the City are already delivered by the County Council. What is being proposed is in fact a significant localisation of powers – albeit within a new model of governance.

Disgracefully, this misinformation has often been targeted at the most vulnerable, including suggesting with no evidence whatsoever that under a unitary council: “council housing could be sold off and provision for social housing would lose priority”. On the contrary, as Cllr Tanner well knows, not only does the legislation surrounding transfer of housing stock require a referendum amongst tenants which makes the question purely hypothetical in the absence of widespread support, the Better Oxfordshire bid specifically commits to keeping council housing in public ownership. The bid proposal also demonstrates how a single unitary authority will be in a much stronger

position to deliver new homes of all types, in stark contrast to the poor performance of the City Council's planning policies.

At the same time the City Council has refused to accept the open and on-going invitation to take a leadership role and to work together to refine and improve the proposals. The leader of the City Council continues to refuse an invitation to a weekly meeting of council leaders and thereby ensure that his concerns on behalf of residents are addressed – another point that might horrify the residents of Cllr Tanner's division.

What we are setting out today is a positive and optimistic approach for ensuring the long-term sustainability of local public services and improving outcomes for residents for years to come.

During an extensive public and stakeholder engagement period, we have been able to understand the views of local people, partners and business and to build that understanding into the final proposal. Through our partnership with South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils, we have been able to improve the proposal further.

A major aspect of feedback through the engagement process was that Oxford needs a governance model that allows a sovereign decision making capacity to be established that is separate from the unitary council and that covers the community, environmental and civic issues that are best managed at the community level. The proposal therefore now recommends that Oxford City have an independent city council; a new council established under the terms of chapter four of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. This new body would be designed to complement and enhance the strategic functions of the unitary council and to replace the overlap and conflict inherent to the current model.

This new vision: of a re-formed council for the City under a different legislative framework working in partnership with an entirely new unitary council working across the whole of the functional economic area, has the potential to bring about the partnership working and improvement that residents want and need.

We fully acknowledge that such a bold vision now needs fully articulating and the bid document proposes that a "city convention" is created to bring together residents, business, politicians, community groups, existing councils and parishes, public sector partners and Oxford institutions such as universities and hospitals. A broad range of stakeholders need to be at the heart of forming the new council so that it is built from the ground-up out of civic society rather than formed from political interests alone.

The PwC report commissioned by the City Council states that:

"Oxfordshire now has to make a choice. If it maintains the status quo, political and chief officer effort will increasingly be focused on the incessant challenge of managing and delivering core service provision across a diverse

geography against the backdrop of budget reductions and rising demand. In doing so, local government will not be fulfilling its wider duty - the duty to ensure Oxfordshire retains and leverages its competitive advantage for the benefit of the people and places it serves and the universities and businesses that are located in and have chosen to invest in Oxford and Oxfordshire.

Our conclusion is that, based on the work undertaken and the analysis carried out, now is the time for a decision to be made on a new settlement for the structure and form of government and governance in Oxfordshire. A new settlement that will create new structures for the administration and delivery of key public services across health and social care and children's and adults services and also have responsibility for both economic and housing growth."

We cannot escape these conclusions: the status quo is not a sustainable option.

Therefore, what Cllr Tanner must then answer to his residents is this: what is his viable alternative proposal to structural local government reform and why has it not been presented more than a year on from the original four-unitary announcement?

In its heart of hearts the City Council yearns for an independent city unitary for Oxford. However, their own analysis demonstrates irrefutably that this is simply financially unviable and moreover, unsafe for the most vulnerable residents.

Even if it were, what they have never answered is what would the boundaries of a city unitary be? How would they reach the minimum thresholds for unitaries, even at the 2006 levels? If the City thinks that its residents are not enthusiastic to be part of a unitary council for the whole of Oxfordshire, I think they will find that the residents of Abingdon are even less enthusiastic about being part of a city unitary. Of course, an expansion of the city boundaries would also see a significant political shift. For all these reasons, despite the City having obtained extensive analysis pointing to unitary in some form as being the best option for residents, they have so far failed to bring forward their own proposal.

In fact the alternative now clung onto, to avoid facing up to change is for a Combined Authority, with retention of all existing council structures, the retention of six leaders, six cabinets and six sets of councillors and all of the related back office costs – but with the addition of an extra layer of government on top.

A combined authority with a mayor is likely to have an annual cost of £2m just to run itself. This doesn't of course incorporate the opportunity costs of missing out on recurring £20m savings and the far greater future potential for service improvement and transformation going forward.

Setting aside the fact that our understanding from government is that there are to be no more substantial devolution deals, I simply cannot believe that we would be in a credible position with government if we have rejected unitary proposals and the savings and investment they could generate out of hand – and then come begging for more money anyway.

Indeed nowhere else in the country is pursuing such a model- the Cambridge deal is of course shorthand for a Cambridgeshire and Peterborough deal – Peterborough is a separate unitary authority and so a combined authority there makes sense in a way that it does not in Oxford.

While Cllr Tanner seems to be asking us to maintain the status quo – and as the City Council's own report tells us that would be to fail in our duty to residents - our positive Better Oxfordshire proposal is to take the active choice and to do the right thing for Oxfordshire.”

Supplementary: In response to concerns raised with Councillor Tanner by residents the Leader stressed that it would be a new Council providing better services, with better accountability and reduced waste.

Councillor Fooks had given written notice of the following question to Councillor Nimmo Smith:

“The County Council spends considerable time and effort in deciding appropriate speed limits across the county. For instance, on the A40 in my division the limit on Sunderland Avenue has been reduced from 40mph to 30 mph. Elsfield Way to the east of the Cutteslowe roundabout is now supposed to be 30mph increasing in steps to 40 and then 50mph. These limits are regularly and almost continually ignored. The signage could be improved but the fact is that drivers see no reason to observe the limits. There is no enforcement. The now frequent very large and heavy lorries cause noise and vibration, made worse by the deteriorating road surface on Sunderland Avenue. This nuisance is made much worse by the speed of the vehicles.

My constituents understandably feel angry that limits are not enforced – which is a police responsibility. County officers are looking to provide flashing VAS signs to remind drivers of the 30mph limit, which is much appreciated, but some formal enforcement is likely to be needed as well.

Would Cabinet agree to make a formal request to Thames Valley Police to carry out their duty to enforce speed limits, which have been set for a reason? Should the Police and Crime Commissioner be invited to meet with officers and councillors to discuss where such activity is most needed, with a reminder that it is a safety issue as well?

Would the cabinet member agree that without enforcement , the setting of speed limits does very little to achieve the desired impact on driver behaviour?

Supplementary: Councillor Nimmo Smith in response to Councillor Fooks questions about timing and a wish to be involved in meetings agreed that she be informed and involved as much as possible.

Councillor Nimmo Smith replied:

“I share your concerns and can confirm that officers have already alerted the Police to this fact, and would be happy to formalise this request on Cabinet’s behalf. I would also be happy to facilitate discussions with the Police and Crime Commissioner on prioritise for limited resources within the Police and how the two organisations may work better together.

Enforcement is helpful but not essential in every situation. The monitoring of a large number of speed limit changes in the county indicates worthwhile improvements in safety being achieved, even in cases where there is a level of speeding after the reduction of the speed limit, also, as we know, it only takes a few vehicles to decide to adhere to the speed limit to achieve a wider general reduction in speed.”

Councillor Smith had given written notice of the following question to Councillor Nimmo Smith:

“Headington Action is a voluntary organisation with charitable status (Charity No. 1099173) whose sole aim is to benefit the community of Headington. The Headington Market was set up by the group in September 2007 and it uses the stall fees to fund community activities. The group would like to promote the market by displaying notices in carefully selected sites but has been advised that this is against county policy although it has been noted that the policy is not adhered to throughout Oxfordshire.

I note that the County's Corporate Plan states "The council is trying to create an environment where communities can take action on issues important to them" and that it wishes to "Facilitate and encourage communities to help themselves." Would the cabinet consider a policy for local Charity organisations to be allowed to display banners/notices similar to that used by Cheltenham Council?

This is a link to the Cheltenham policy:
https://www.cheltenham.gov.uk/info/6/business/325/displaying_advertisements/4 “

Councillor Nimmo Smith replied:

“Advertising on the highway, whatever the subject matter, is the responsibility of the respective District Council exercising its powers under the Town & Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations. In the present case that would be Oxford City Council.

Oxfordshire County Council as the Highway Authority would be informed and asked for a view as to the suitability of a location should an application be received by a District. We treat each application referred to us on its merits; we don't have an overall policy for advertising on the highway. The Headington group seem to have misunderstood that situation.

Banners across the highway are the responsibility of the Highway Authority; unfortunately there are no suitable sites within Oxford City boundary, though we do occasionally authorise them in other parts of the county."

Supplementary: Responding to a question about whether it would be better to have a County wide policy Councillor Nimmo Smith agreed that it would and Councillor Smith welcomed the opportunity to work with him to that purpose.

26/17 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda Item. 5)

A petition was received from Councillor Susanna Pressel with two residents, Deborah Agulnik and Patricia Murphy regarding safety on the Botley Road;

A petition was received from Councillor John Tanner on behalf of Oxford City Council opposing Proposals for the Future Organisation of Local Government in Oxfordshire

The following requests to address Cabinet had been agreed by the Leader:

Ian Green - A member of the Executive Committee of the Oxford Civic Society

Dr Barbara Hammond MBE

Councillor Fooks, local councillor for Wolvercote & Summertown

Councillor Neville Harris, local councillor for Didcot Ladygrove

Councillor Pressel, local councillor for Jericho & Osney

Councillor Brighouse, Chairman of Performance Scrutiny Committee

27/17 DRAFT PROPOSAL FOR THE FUTURE ORGANISATION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN OXFORDSHIRE

(Agenda Item. 6)

In September 2016, Cabinet considered reports from Grant Thornton and PwC and a recommendation from the Performance Scrutiny Committee on options for reorganisation of local government within Oxfordshire. Cabinet directed officers to engage with stakeholders and the public to prepare proposals for a new unitary council to cover the whole county.

A discussion document was published in January 2017 to inform an extensive stakeholder and public engagement process. This process has now been completed.

Cabinet considered a report setting out the full proposal that has subsequently been developed and recommending that the proposals are submitted to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

Councillor Hudspeth, Leader of the Council made a statement setting out the context and events leading to the report before Cabinet and summarising in brief the reasons for the bid.

Ian Green, on behalf of the Civic Society commented that they had thoroughly reviewed the original proposals and submitted comments. Having considered the Better Oxfordshire proposals the Civic Society was still of the view that it was not ready for public consultation and was certainly not ready for submission to the Secretary of State. In particular Mr Green highlighted that they considered the governance aspects were too vague to enable assessment of the effectiveness of Oxford City governance. They believed that more could be learnt from Wiltshire. Mr Green also referred to the lack of consensus from all six councils in Oxfordshire and felt that this meant it would not be agreed by the Secretary of State. He hoped that Cabinet would agree to more efforts to achieve a consensus.

Dr Barbara Hammond, spoke against the proposals on three grounds. Firstly she believed that there was no mandate as there had been no formal consultation. People in her neighbourhood were confused. The removal of public consultation from the transition stage was deeply worrying. Secondly she stated that there was no evidence that the move to a single unitary would meet the four objectives set out in the documents. Finally Dr Hammond commented that it was the wrong time to introduce something as disruptive as this in a region that was facing uncertainty due to Brexit.

Councillor Jean Fooks, local councillor for Wolvercote & Summertown spoke in support of the proposal which she pointed out had the support of the three main parties on Oxfordshire County Council. She expressed disappointment that the City Council and other district councils had refused to sit round the table. Councillor Fooks referred to the leaflet produced by the City Council which she believed should be rebutted as it made false claims. She would welcome greater detail and felt that the revised bid before Cabinet today was an improvement. It was essential going forward to involve local people.

Councillor Harris commented that it was an inevitable part of the process of forming a new unitary council that there would need to be rationalisation of staff. From his experience of this type of process strong political decision making would be needed to ensure that it was humanely followed through. Councillor Harris identified that there would be many jobs lost, retirements, redundancy and a higher than normal level of natural wastage. The process would be complex due to the need for continuity of service provision, the requirement to harmonise different employment terms and conditions. It was essential that the process of rationalisation was shown to be fair and equitable. He added that he spoke as a supporter of a unitary council but one

that had been fully consulted on and where the final decision on going forward was taken by full Council.

Councillor Pressel, local councillor for Jericho & Osney, expressed her concerns that the proposals would be a disaster for Oxford. People were confused, there was insufficient detail and it was not acceptable if Oxford should become a glorified parish council. She added that a unitary council was not the only option but if it did go forward then she would wish to see the City retain its current powers, its current share of council tax and its current budget. Councillor Pressel added that she would wish to see a larger joint committee so that there could be a fairer representation of men and women.

Councillor Brighthouse, Chairman of Performance Scrutiny Committee stated that the comments of the Committee were before Cabinet and that many of the Cabinet Members had attended the Committee meeting. This was not the first time that the Committee had had an opportunity to consider the matter as they had also looked at the two consultant reports. The Committee at that time had considered that the way forward was for a completely new council. The real issue was being able to run services for the most vulnerable with everyone working together in the new council. Councillor Brighthouse recognised that this was a journey and that ultimately the Secretary of State would decide but that the new authority should be built from the ground upwards. Councillor Brighthouse expressed concern that cultural issues be recognised and the importance of engaging the BME communities. An important principle going forward would be the need to listen to and engage with people and to hear even the voiceless.

Peter Clark, Chief Executive paid tribute to the many officers who had been involved in the bid development. He briefly detailed the results of the two consultant reports and the work undertaken since the decision by Cabinet in September 2016. In particular he referred to the stakeholder engagement work. He expressed delight that South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils had joined with the County Council to produce the joint proposal. Their involvement had led to an improved bid with strengthened local democracy, more detailed thinking around Oxford City governance and council tax harmonisation and better protection for local plans. The two District Councils had already agreed the proposal for submission to the Secretary of State. Peter Clark outlined the process going forward and confirmed that were the Secretary of State minded to agree the proposal then the Secretary of State would have a period of formal engagement with representations being invited over a 6-8 week period. Peter Clark advised of a minor amendment to recommendation (h) to include consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive.

Peter Clark addressing the points raised by speakers:

1. Refuted the suggestion that the proposal was too vague and not ready. The bid was 149 pages long and clearly set out the principles to be applied. It recognised that the City Council was an important part of Oxfordshire and set out the principle of a new council with pre-

- cepting powers and the concept of a City Convention. It was not usual to attempt to set everything out at this stage.
2. Referred to the engagement report that set out a significant amount of support. He highlighted the door to door survey which he considered was a true reflection of opinion and therefore carried considerable weight.
 3. Commented that the report and bid document set out the objectives and demonstrated how they would be met.
 4. Stated that there would be more detail going forward but that a lot of that detail was for the new council or the implementation executive to determine.
 5. Agreed that any process of staff rationalisation needed to be fair transparent and robust. However the evidence from other authorities was that compulsory redundancies would not be that great. It was not correct that everyone's job was at risk. There would be management rationalisation but services would still need to be delivered.
 6. Commented that the City Council needed to engage in the process and that pre-cepting powers were contained in the bid.
 7. The size of the Executive Board would be determined by the Secretary of State.

From the floor Councillor Tanner made comments in relation to the Chief Executive's fitness to lead the County Council and upon challenge apologised for those remarks. His apology was accepted by the Chief Executive.

During debate Cabinet made the following points:

1. A number of Cabinet Members referred to parishes in their Division that were well aware of the proposals and were not confused by them. There had been strong support from rural parishes with one Cabinet Member highlighting that all 19 Parish Councils in her Division were supportive.
2. Two separate reports had come to similar conclusions about the best way forward with limited resources and agreed that a single unitary saved most money. Cabinet Members supported the unitary proposal as the best possible outcome for the people of Oxfordshire, avoiding duplication, giving economies of scale and allowing the joining up of services. It was a great opportunity to provide a one-stop shop for all residents in Oxfordshire.
3. Cabinet welcomed the increased opportunity for individual councillors to make a difference in their area.
4. Several Cabinet Members refuted the suggestion that they and other County Councillors were remote from the people of Oxfordshire. They attended parish meetings, knew their local communities and the vast majority of county councillors were the same.
5. One Cabinet Member in supporting the proposals indicated a preference for 5 area boards with pre-cepting powers for each of them.

6. Cabinet accepted the greater validity of the door to door research which had been carried out by an independent company when compared to the online survey which was self-selecting.
7. A Cabinet Member refuted claims that a unitary council would pose a threat to arts organisations in Oxford.
8. There was some discussion of the context to the current position including the role of the district councils with regard to the devolution discussions.
9. Cabinet highlighted the changes made to the original discussion document "One Oxfordshire" which demonstrated that the engagement had not been a paper exercise. They welcomed that if the Secretary of State was minded to agree then there would be a period of formal engagement.
10. Cabinet Members expressed disappointment over some of the press releases coming from the district councils.
11. Cabinet compared the lack of democratic accountability in a combined authority and mayor model as against that in a unitary council.
12. Cabinet highlighted that good work already underway in district councils around such matters as housing would be complemented when developed alongside strategic services such as infrastructure and education.

The Leader of the Council moved the recommendations with the suggested amendment to recommendation (h) and it was:

RESOLVED: unanimously to:

- (a) Note and commend the approach taken by the Leaders of Vale, South Oxfordshire, and the County Council in putting the interests of residents, business and communities first in bringing forward these proposals.
- (b) Consider the proposals, in particular taking note that 70% of those responding to the representative household survey supported the proposal for a new single unitary council for Oxfordshire
- (c) Respond to the recent letter from the Secretary of State and submit the proposals for a new unitary council for Oxfordshire, subject to any minor amendments required
- (d) Delegate the power to make such amendments to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader of the County Council and with South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils
- (e) Ask officers to seek local support from key stakeholders and the wider public to promote the proposals to Government, and respond to any subsequent consultation undertaken by the Secretary of State
- (f) Agree that the further development of the Area Executive Board model, through the establishment of a Joint Committee, open to all Districts and City Councils across Oxfordshire and the County Council, should be formed as early as possible. This Joint Committee should work with the existing County Council advisory group, local communities, Town and Parish Councils, and key delivery partners to develop detailed proposals that articulate the role, powers, format,

scale and responsibilities of the Area Executive Boards which will be submitted to the Implementation Executive for inclusion with the proposed constitution of the new council.

- (g) Ask officers to take steps to establish the City Convention to work with residents and local stakeholders to design the new model of governance in Oxford.
- (h) Authorise the Director of Law and Governance in consultation with the Leader and Chief Executive to agree the terms of reference of the Joint Committee, which will include making recommendations regarding the initial functions of the Implementation Executive, and to make this council's appointments to the Joint Committee.
- (i) In light of the above decisions, and the absence of unanimity among the current local authorities, confirm that the Cabinet does not support the proposals for a Mayor and Combined Authority as being the best structure for Oxfordshire.

28/17 FINAL OFRS COMMUNITY RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN 2017-22

(Agenda Item. 7)

Cabinet considered a report that set out a new Community Risk Management Plan (CRMP) 2017-22. The plan showed how Oxfordshire Fire & Rescue Service (OFRS) has identified, assessed and evaluated the risks. The CRMP is required by the Fire & Rescue National Framework Document 2012.

The report also detailed a number of projects within the Fire Authority's Community Risk Management Plan (CRMP) action plan for the fiscal year 2017-18.

Cabinet expressed their appreciation for the work undertaken by OFRS not only in responding to major incidents but in their wider community safety work with children and vulnerable adults. A Cabinet Member praised the Junior Citizen work. Their work in respect of body retrieval for the registration service was also commended.

Cabinet commented on specific projects and in response were advised:

- That in respect of the whole-time shift duty system review OFRS had revised the project on the basis of feedback already received and wanted to listen to their workforce;
- That OFRS wanted to communicate to MP's and the wider public their wider role and strong links to county council colleagues and services.
- That OFRS were consulted on new development and would go back post development if invited.
- That no decision had yet been made in respect of whether Chipping Norton would no longer be a key station and officers were happy to discuss it with the local councillor.

The Leader proposed the recommendations.

RESOLVED: to approve the CRMP 2017-22 strategic document and projects within the 2017-18 Action Plan.

29/17 FORWARD PLAN AND FUTURE BUSINESS

(Agenda Item. 8)

The Cabinet considered a list of items 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 2017