

# CABINET

**MINUTES** of the meeting held on Tuesday, 15 February 2022 commencing at 2.00 pm and finishing at 4.00 pm

**Present:**

**Voting Members:** Councillor Liz Leffman – in the Chair  
Councillor Liz Brighthouse OBE (Deputy Chair)  
Councillor Glynis Phillips  
Councillor Dr Pete Sudbury  
Councillor Tim Bearder  
Councillor Duncan Enright  
Councillor Calum Miller  
Councillor Jenny Hannaby  
Councillor Mark Lygo

**Other Members in Attendance:**

Councillors Brad Baines, David Bartholomew, Felix Bloomfield, Yvonne Constance, Donna Ford, Andy Graham, Charlie Hicks, Nick Field-Johnson, Stefan Gawrysiak, Nick Leverton, Michael O'Connor, Ian Snowden, Liam Walker

**Officers:**

Whole of meeting Stephen Chandler, Interim Chief Executive; Claire Taylor, Corporate Director, Customers and Organisational Development; Lorna Baxter, Director of Finance; Anita Bradley, Director for Law & Governance and Monitoring Officer; Colm Ó Caomhánaigh, Committee Officer.

*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.*

**14/22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

(Agenda Item. 1)

Apologies were received from Councillor Neil Fawcett.

**15/22 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

(Agenda Item. 2)

There were no declarations of interest.

**16/22 MINUTES**

(Agenda Item. 3)

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 January 2022 were approved with the following amendment:

Item 6/22, Page 4, add to the final paragraph:

“The previous Cabinet had always anticipated having to put some funding from the County Council into completing that project.”

## **17/22 QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS**

(Agenda Item. 4)

The questions received from County Councillors and responses are set out in an Annex to these Minutes.

## **18/22 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS**

(Agenda Item. 5)

### **Petition**

Mandy Rigault, Nuneham Courtenay Parish Transport rep, spoke of the death on the road through the village of two peafowl and a pet dog within the space of 3 weeks and the danger to pedestrians. The petition, presented to Councillor Robin Bennet and signed by over 200 people, asked the Highways Department for solar powered Vehicle Activated Signs at both ends of the village to warn approaching drivers there may be peafowl in the road ahead. Peafowl were particularly vulnerable as they were classified as a non-native species and, as such, were not entitled to veterinary care unless it was paid for.

**Councillor Tim Bearder** responded that the village could now ask for a 20mph speed limit following a recent decision by Cabinet. He also called on central government to devolve powers for installing speed cameras so that the Council can enforce speed limits.

### **Public Address**

The Chair agreed to the following requests to speak -

Item 6: Consultation and Engagement Strategy

Cllr Michael O'Connor

Cllr Charlie Hicks

Item 8: Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy (OxIS) Stage 1

Cllr Charlie Hicks

Item 9: Burford Experimental Weight Limit

Cllr Ian Snowden

Cllr Charlie Hicks

Rhys Williams

Burford Town Councillor John White

Dr Ken Gray

Hugh Ashton

Parish Cllr Mark McCappin

Parish Cllr Jan de Haldevang  
District Cllr Julian Cooper  
Cllr Yvonne Constance  
Cllr Stefan Gawrysiak  
Cllr Andy Graham  
Cllr Liam Walker  
Cllr Nick Field-Johnson

## **19/22 CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY**

(Agenda Item. 6)

Cabinet was asked to consider an overall approach to consultation and engagement.

Councillor Michael O'Connor reported the views of the Performance & Corporate Services Overview & Scrutiny Committee on the report. Their recommendations were set out in a Supplementary Document.

The strategy was a move in the right direction but a protocol was needed around which kind of consultation was appropriate for which kind of project. Transport and Active Travel schemes needed more focussed consultation and engagement including the use of representative polling. The scrutiny committee recommended more in-person engagement – particularly for hard-to-reach communities, as well as earlier involvement of councillors.

He added that the scrutiny committee had not been aware of the Social Value Policy coming to Cabinet and would like an opportunity to engage with it when it comes up again.

Councillor Charlie Hicks noted what he believed was minimal consultation on the Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN) schemes in his area. He recommended studying other councils' experience before deciding on the next round of LTNs. He drew Cabinet's attention to recommendations at a national level to use professional representative polling.

While the Central Oxfordshire area plan provided an opportunity for the Environment & Place department to work more closely with the consultation and engagement team, there should also be more engagement at the policy development stage.

Councillor Glynis Phillips, Cabinet Member for Corporate Services, thanked the scrutiny committee for the recommendations and responded as follows:

### **Recommendation 1:**

Throughout the strategy, the narrative underlines the value of canvassing both views and preferences as well as ensuring people's voices are heard as citizens.

To provide more detail about different types of audiences, explanations have been provided in footnotes. On page 4 of the strategy, in the 'Why consult?'

diagram, the word 'listen' has been added into the last point of the first column. The description of reaching diverse audiences has been strengthened, with a reference added to 'those for whom English is a second language'.

**Recommendation 2:**

The council's best practice consultation and engagement guidance is being refreshed. The updated document will distinguish between, and provide advice around, different types, scales and levels of consultation, from the controversial, sensitive, complex and/or statutory.

The refreshed guidance will include a workflow outlining responsibilities and timescales as well as any protocols and processes to help guide. Strategies and methodologies will be selected based on the type of engagement or consultation required and the level of participation desired based on an assessment of need. The use of more than one methodology is achievable and possible depending on the target audience(s).

**Recommendation 3:**

Communications and engagement strategies and plans are developed to support individual active travel schemes, which take into account any statutory requirements. They follow the principles of communications, consultation and engagement best practice and are tailored to the specific programme, project or scheme in question.

If there is a requirement for representative polling, the council will commission a qualified market research company to undertake this work using the council's contract procedure rules.

The strategy outlines that the council is working to embed a new digital platform for consultation and engagement, Let's Talk Oxfordshire. The council undertook a thorough and robust procurement exercise for the new platform and is confident in its technical and wider digital applications for all consultations as well as compliance with data security standards.

How best to engage local councillors will form part of supporting communications and engagement strategies and implementation plans for specific active travel schemes.

The Chair moved the recommendations from the Cabinet report.

**RESOLVED to:**

- a) **consider the contents of the draft strategy and provide feedback to the Cabinet lead member for corporate services, the corporate director for customers organisational development and resources and supporting officers; and**
- b) **endorse the content of the strategy.**

## **20/22 OCC SOCIAL VALUE POLICY**

(Agenda Item. 7)

Cabinet had before it a report to advise on progress towards introducing a Social Value Policy for Oxfordshire County Council.

Councillor Calum Miller, Cabinet Member for Finance, introduced the report which set out how social value will become an integral part of procurement policy. This implements the requirements of the 2012 Social Value Act which was necessary to do by 1 April 2022.

As a result the Council's significant budget for services will be used to shape the practices of suppliers for the common good and this will have an added benefit in being reflected in their work for other customers.

Councillor Miller described this proposal as a starting point and noted that there was great enthusiasm to go further. He advocated an evidence-based approach with regular reviews. He would ensure that scrutiny was involved in that process and apologised that they had not been involved in this first stage.

Councillor Pete Sudbury supported the proposal. He noted that in Figure 1 on Agenda Page 53, under climate action, "carbon emissions are reduced" was just one item on a long list. He believed that it should say "climate emissions" to ensure it included all contributors to global warming. He asked for an assurance that the BEIS guidance on carbon pricing will be incorporated in contracts and tenders at the earliest opportunity.

Councillor Miller responded that for each procurement exercise there will be an opportunity to choose from the menu of Themes, Outcomes and Measures. He believed that it would be open to the Council to include carbon pricing in procurement policy.

The Chair moved the recommendations.

### **RESOLVED to:**

- a) Approve the draft Social Value Policy, provided as an annex to this report;**
- b) Approve the planned implementation of the Social Value Policy, as outlined below.**

## **21/22 OXFORDSHIRE INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY (OXIS) STAGE 1 - ENDORSEMENT TO FINAL REPORT**

(Agenda Item. 8)

Cabinet considered a report introducing the completed, updated first stage of the Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy (OxIS), which covered the identification and prioritisation of strategic infrastructure needs to 2040.

Cabinet was asked to endorse Stage 1 of OxIS and to recommend its adoption as the basis for infrastructure assessment and prioritisation in other relevant workstreams.

Councillor Charlie Hicks, Chair of the Transport Working Group of the Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee, stated that the group was planning to look at the current situation, in order to take a view as to how to achieve targets in the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan. The intention was to bring a report to scrutiny in June and then take the issue to Cabinet.

Having looked at the Infrastructure Strategy in that context, Councillor Hicks believed that it did not meet the priorities in the LTCP and might make the targets more difficult to achieve. In particular, there was no mention of reducing car journeys. He asked Cabinet not to agree the recommendations until the scrutiny committee has reported. If they did agree the recommendations, he asked that they say when the scoring system and targets can next be reviewed.

Councillor Duncan Enright, Cabinet Member for Travel & Development Strategy, responded that the Infrastructure Plan was not in opposition to the aims of the LTCP, they just were not entirely in synch. The important advantage in OxIS was that the district and city councils were involved and working towards the same priorities as the county.

The projects listed were only those from existing local plans. The decision today was not to adopt those but to approve the framework provided by OxIS which was broadly in line with the Alliance's objectives.

Cabinet Members raised a number of issues as follows:

- The latest Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report emphasised that a change of focus was needed from growth to wellbeing.
- Future plans needed to determine how to remain resilient in the face of the effects of climate change.
- The Plan needed to reflect the priority of tackling inequality.
- The scoring system was weighted towards prioritising growth more than environment for example.

The Chair, as Oxfordshire County Council representative on the Future Oxfordshire Partnership and Chair of the Infrastructure Subgroup, assured Cabinet that they were aware of the difficulties with the definition of growth and they will be looking at that. In this plan the growth referred to was the existing plans for housing which needed certain infrastructure to make them viable.

The Chair proposed that Cabinet adopt the recommendations on the understanding that she will take the points made at this meeting back to the Future Oxfordshire Partnership. This was agreed.

**RESOLVED to:**

- a) **Endorse the OxIS Stage 1 as the framework for assessing and identifying strategic infrastructure priorities across the County to 2040, and**
- b) **Endorse the use of the OxIS multi-criteria appraisal (MCA) as the basis for the on-going assessment and prioritisation of infrastructure in relevant Council workstreams.**

## **22/22 BURFORD EXPERIMENTAL WEIGHT LIMIT**

(Agenda Item. 9)

Cabinet had before it a report from the Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee from its meeting on 2 February 2022 on the Burford Experimental Weight Limit decision which had been called-in following a decision by the Cabinet Member for Travel & Development Strategy on 5 January 2022.

Before discussing the item, Cabinet heard from a number of speakers.

Councillor Ian Snowden, Chair of the Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee, summarised the proceedings on the called-in item. The Committee considered the evidence base upon which the Decision was made, including the Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR), the Euro Classification data and the Tracsis Automatic Traffic Count (ATC) data.

At the end of the Committee's consideration of this issue, the Committee sought further clarification on the use of the different data used to inform the Cabinet Member's Decision and decided to refer the matter to Cabinet in the interests of transparency of the decision making process with reference to the Principles of Decision Making:

- (d) a presumption in favour of openness; and
- (e) clarity of aims and desired outcomes.

The scrutiny committee recommended that greater clarity be provided on the evidence base upon which the decision was made.

Councillor Charlie Hicks, Deputy Chair of the Place O&SC, added that there had been some discussion around the meaning of the reference in the Constitution to "material concerns" about a decision. In the end the Committee used the Principles of Decision Making in the Constitution as the basis for its discussions.

The Committee did not find that there was evidence of bias or pre-determination or that the decision should have been made by the full Cabinet. There were different opinions on the merits of including ANPR data in the report as there was only one data point available. The Cabinet Member told the scrutiny meeting that he had taken that data into account anyway in making the decision. In the end the Committee asked for more information to be provided on the basis of the openness and clarity.

Rhys Williams, Regional Operations Manager, Road Haulage Association, reiterated that his organisation strongly opposed the reinstatement of the Burford weight limit and, instead, strongly supported the need for an effective freight strategy that allows consumers across Oxfordshire to receive the goods they demand sustainably and efficiently.

Banning HGVs from Burford would simply displace large vehicles from a road designed to be suitable for them onto less suitable roads. It caused lorries to travel extra and needless miles. The RHA stood ready as a key partner to work with Oxfordshire County Council on a freight strategy.

Councillor John White, Burford Town Council, stated that responsibility for this decision should never have been imposed on or accepted by Councillor Enright because he was conflicted. Suggestions that Councillor Enright was bias towards the local haulage industry and that he only decided the way he did because he was a Witney Councillor did not come from Burford Town Council or its advisers.

The Town Council contended that Principle (f) which expressly required the decision maker to record a decision “which explains what options were considered and giving the reasons for the decision” was completely ignored. They suggested that the Council should make a new TRO with a limit of 18 tonnes and the expanded Permit Zone already agreed with Officers.

Ken Gray, Burford resident, stated that Councillor Enright cited very narrow criteria that the ETRO had to meet. He used an ATC traffic monitoring technique that cannot differentiate vehicles above and below the ETRO's 7.5 tonne limit. However, the ATC method can differentiate HGVs greater than 18 tonnes. Several on the Scrutiny Committee were surprised that this data was excluded from the report.

The ETRO had benefited every resident, visitor, property and the environment all along the 32 hilly miles of the A361 in Oxfordshire. HGVs had mainly been diverted to the straighter A34 or A429 from the ‘rat run’ through Burford with proven minimal harmful effects elsewhere.

Hugh Ashton, Burford resident with 40 years’ experience as a consultant in the transport sector, stated that there was clear evidence that the impact of the Burford Weight Limit was not only beneficial to Burford, but had relatively little adverse impact on surrounding communities.

Apart from an expected increase on the A44, all other A and B roads showed reductions. Through the Barringtons, the 14% increase in October equated to only one vehicle a day (from 7 to 8 a day), on a road which already had a 7.5t limit. He asked Cabinet to impose an 18 ton limit, with a widened Permit Area to meet the needs of local farmers and businesses. He agreed that an areawide solution was ultimately the best strategy but appealed not to go backwards in the short term.



Mark McCappin, Crawley Parish Councillor and representing Windrush Valley Traffic Action Group (WiVTAG), noted that the temporary order had already expired and the Cabinet did not have the power to reinstate it at this meeting. Providing more data, as requested by the scrutiny committee, would not alter that fact.

Villages and businesses in the area had been adversely affected by the restriction. He suggested that Cabinet should endorse the decision not to make the order permanent and develop instead a regional strategy.

Jan de Haldevang, Barrington Parish Councillor and also representing WiVTAG, stated that the points made about different data were largely irrelevant. A weight restriction simply diverts the problem to other towns and villages. What was needed was an area restriction that allowed local access while removing through traffic.

He also stated that Councillor Enright had been fair and transparent through the whole process and had given a full account to the scrutiny committee. He asked Cabinet to reaffirm the decision and urgently develop the regional strategy.

Councillor Julian Cooper, Woodstock & Bladon, West Oxfordshire District Council, stated that in looking at the data one had to take into account the time we live in. It was wrong to take a narrow view focused on Burford. There was clearly a need for a proper strategy for the county. He urged Cabinet to endorse Councillor Enright's decision.

Councillor Yvonne Constance, Shrivenham, agreed that a regional solution was ideal but would take time and she did not think that the Burford restriction should be cancelled in the meantime. The town experienced an improvement in quality of life and there were minimal diversions to other towns or villages and no evidence of increased air pollution.

She believed that the ATC data was not reliable and ANPR data was required for enforcement. It should be noted that freight traffic increased due to the pandemic. There was enough evidence to justify making the order permanent and extending the permit area.

Councillor Stefan Gawrysiak, Henley-on-Thames, emphasised that all decisions should be based on reason and data. He believed that it was unreasonable to say that ANPR data had been taken into account when there was no reference to it in the report.

The decision had implications for other towns that could introduce weight restrictions. He believed that cancelling the Burford restriction was the wrong direction of travel for this administration. The evidence showed reduced numbers of HGVs and improved air quality.

Councillor Andy Graham, Woodstock, described the restriction as a displacement policy which pitted one town against another and created inequality. Woodstock had seen a significant increase in traffic. It was more appropriate for the council to develop a regional freight strategy.

Councillor Graham was satisfied that the meeting for the delegated decision took all the available statistics into account and that the Cabinet Member took the correct decision. He called for a sustainable solution and an end to the displacement policy.

Councillor Liam Walker, Hanborough & Minster Lovell, supported the removal of the restriction and the development of a freight strategy. He noted that this was in line with a motion passed at November Council. He stated that there had been a lack of clarity at the scrutiny committee meeting over the reasons to support referring this back to Cabinet and it was only passed by the casting vote of the Chair.

The trial restriction had not reached its criteria for success and had had a detrimental impact in displacing traffic. Road hauliers were already facing difficulties with increasing fuel prices without having to add extra miles to their journeys. He urged Cabinet to support the Cabinet Member's decision.

Councillor Nick Field-Johnson, Burford & Carterton North, stated that the issue of imposing a ban had been under discussion for over 20 years. HGV traffic was damaging buildings and the streetscape in this historic town. It was also affecting the important tourist trade. He criticised the omission of critical ANPR data from the report which showed a significant reduction in 18 ton HGVs through Burford and other towns with no significant diversion elsewhere. This had to undermine the validity of the decision.

Councillor Field-Johnson also noted that the ATC data could not distinguish vehicle size correctly and included smaller delivery lorries that had greatly increased in number during the pandemic. There was also no mention of air quality in the report. He believed that there was a reasonable compromise in establishing an 18 ton limit and doubling the size of the permit zone. He asked Cabinet to instruct officers to look at the data again and work on implementing an 18 ton limit.

Councillor Duncan Enright, Cabinet Member for Travel & Development Strategy, responded that the data showed a mixed picture. He also believed that a delegated decision was appropriate and that he had no reason to recuse himself. Nobody complained when he extended the restriction in July for six months.

He welcomed the withdrawal of accusations of bias or pre-determination on his part and hoped that Burford Town Council would set the record straight in its newsletter rescinding comments previously made.

Councillor Enright stated that the debate had shown widespread support for an area-based strategy rather than point-based restrictions. He believed that

it was unjust that a town could implement a restriction because they had the money to afford it. The County Council should not be contracting out its responsibility.

He added that the problem with the ANPR data was that it was a single set with no comparison available. It also excluded foreign registration plates. With the ATC data there was before and after data available. The experiment failed on the three criteria set for success. It should also be noted that car traffic reduced during the pandemic which accounted for some of the improvement in air quality.

Councillor Enright believed that there was now a shared understanding of the HGV problem and that it was possible to arrive at a solution that everyone could get behind.

Councillor Pete Sudbury stated that he believed that the decision had been correctly made. There had been an asymmetry in the criteria which required a reduction of 50% at one point to be successful but required 50% increase in traffic at any one of a number of points to which traffic may be dispersed to fail. He had been particularly struck by the complaints from Gloucestershire County Council.

While there was an argument that this restriction could be retained as a bridgehead to an area strategy, he believed that there was significant evidence of harm and that the Cabinet Member made the correct decision in not extending the restriction.

Councillor Tim Bearder stated that he had huge sympathy for Burford given his own familiarity with a similar problem in Wheatley. There was a need to segregate HGVs from vulnerable road users. He welcomed the proposal for a wider strategy and, on balance, supported the Cabinet Member's decision.

Councillor Field-Johnson asked if his compromise proposal could be considered.

The Chair responded that the Cabinet had been asked to consider the referral from the Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee and seek greater clarity on the evidence base. She believed that Cabinet had done that.

The Chair noted that she had originally supported this restriction but could see that it had caused significant displacement. She also agreed with the argument that the criteria were unbalanced. There was a need to work with neighbouring counties on the wider strategy.

The Chair proposed that Cabinet endorse the decision made by Councillor Enright and this was agreed.

**RESOLVED: to endorse the decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Travel & Development Strategy on 5 January 2022:**

- a) **APPROVE** officers to consider the costs and benefits of developing area wide restrictions across Oxfordshire including close working with neighbouring authorities, as part of the county wide freight strategy, as soon as practicable. Noting any future approval of area wide weight restrictions would likely see existing environmental weight restrictions revoked subject to consultation.
- b) **REVOKE** the Burford Experimental Traffic Regulation Order of 7.5t weight restriction. Therefore, not making a permanent order.

## **23/22 FORMAL APPROVAL OF EARLY YEARS FUNDING FORMULA 2022/23**

(Agenda Item. 10)

Cabinet was asked to agree to set a funding formula for 2- year old and for 3 and 4 year old provision.

Councillor Liz Brighthouse, Cabinet Member for Children, Education and Young People's Services, introduced the report. The proposed increase in funding would be implemented for early years provision right across the county in nursery schools, classes and other settings.

There were issues around funding but also with sufficiency of provision as the pandemic had diminished provision. The proposal had already been approved at the Schools Forum.

Councillor Calum Miller, Cabinet Member for Finance, added that managing uncertain school numbers had always been a challenge but that there was provision to take forward funding from future years if the census showed higher numbers than anticipated. He was content that this was prudently managed from a financial point of view.

The Chair put the recommendations.

### **RESOLVED to:**

- a) **Pass the funding increase received by Oxfordshire onto providers in full and approve the 2022-23 Early Years funding formula for 3 and 4- year old provision with an underlying hourly rate of £4.35 (excluding the Deprivation supplement, SEN Inclusion Fund and Contingency).**
- b) **Pass the funding increase received by Oxfordshire onto providers in full and approve the 2022-23 Early Years funding formula for 2- year old provision at an hourly rate of £5.89.**

## **24/22 FORWARD PLAN AND FUTURE BUSINESS**

(Agenda Item. 11)

The Cabinet considered a list of items (**CA11**) 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 .....

## ITEM 4 – QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS

Questions	Cabinet Member
<p><b>1. COUNCILLOR CHARLIE HICKS</b></p> <p>With learning from the Cowley LTN experience of (lack of) consultation by the previous administration, Cllr O'Connor and I have worked hard on recommendation from Performance Scrutiny to Cabinet on the Consultation &amp; Engagement Strategy. Please could you let us know what Cabinet plans to do with this recommendation and how the substance of the recommendation will be put into practice for the development of the Central Oxfordshire Transport Strategy / Connecting Oxford policy?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR GLYNIS PHILLIPS, CABINET MEMBER FOR CORPORATE SERVICES AND COUNCILLOR DUNCAN ENRIGHT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRAVEL &amp; DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</b></p> <p>The consultation and engagement strategy has been updated to incorporate the recommendations from Performance Scrutiny at their meeting of 17 January. Wider responses to some of the detail within the recommendations will be provided to scrutiny officers to share with Scrutiny members.</p> <p>A number of communications and engagement strategies have already been developed, and will continue to be developed, to support individual travel and transport schemes. They follow the principles of communications, consultation and engagement best practice and are tailored to the specific project or scheme in question. This includes the Central Oxfordshire Transport Strategy / Connecting Oxford programme.</p> <p>This is a useful opportunity for us to begin honing our plans for LTCP stage 2 and the area strategies, which we hope will</p>

Questions	Cabinet Member
	<p>involve local members at their heart, and ongoing working groups, based on the current traffic advisory structures and city/county coordination group.</p> <p><b>Councillor Duncan Enright</b>            Connecting Oxford is now going to proceed as part of stage 2 of the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan work which is currently ongoing in its phase 1 with the 93 underpinning policies being consulted upon until March. This is followed on by the area strategies and, in this case, it will be the Central Oxfordshire Transport Strategy that will be under consideration. That's Oxford plus surrounding satellites and particularly transport routes. That is going to be the first one to come forward of the area strategies and be consulted upon this summer and a briefing for that in outline has already taken place with County Members representing the city. It's going to be overseen by the coordination group between the city council and the county council. It will come to local Members first because, as with the first phase of the LTCP, we want local Members to be very much the first to respond but also to be able to take the ideas out and then consult on them themselves within their patches.</p> <p>With the Central Oxfordshire piece, because Oxford is the service centre for a large swathe of the county, there will be interest from outside the city as well. We will make sure that</p>

Questions	Cabinet Member
<p><b>Supplementary</b>            Can you please let us know whether there will be any capacity improvement in the consultation and engagement team to deliver representative polling for transport projects and can you let us know at what point in the Central Oxford Transport Strategy / Connecting Oxford policy generation process there will be public input and councillor input?</p>	<p>an all-Member briefing happens in good time as well because we know that, for example, Witney county councillors such as myself will be interested and we will also be involving city and district councillors in all of this work. They will be seeing it early on but the public consultation will be this summer. Councillor Phillips may have more on the consultation and engagement side of things. We certainly have enhanced that and the signs of that are in the responses to the LTCP which are many times more interesting and numerous than for previous local transport plans.</p> <p><b>Councillor Glynis Phillips</b>            There will be increased capacity for consultation and engagement which was part of the budget agreed by Council on 8 February – not specifically for the work that you identified but as part of the overall team and I'll be discussing in more detail the types of methodologies available for consultation and engagement when I address Agenda Item 6.</p>
<p><b>2. COUNCILLOR BRAD BAINES</b></p> <p>Currently the necessary capital funding for the infrastructure elements of Connecting Oxford is accounted for as a £3 million element of the Bus Service Improvement</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR CALUM MILLER, CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE</b></p> <p>Connecting Oxford is a priority for this administration. We made a strong bid to Government for an ambitious Bus Service Improvement Plan and hope it will be supported.</p>



<b>Questions</b>	<b>Cabinet Member</b>
<p>Plan bid to the Department for Transport. Can the Cabinet Member confirm whether there is contingency available so the requisite funds could be made available as scheduled even if the BSIP bid falls through or funds are otherwise delayed beyond 2022/23? Similarly, would it be possible within the recently approved 2022/23 budget and MTFS for Connecting Oxford to be accelerated ahead of current timetables for delivery in 2022 or early 2023?</p>	<p>However, if our bid is not successful, the £3m it contained for traffic filters and other infrastructure will be made available from reserves.</p> <p>The scheme is being progressed at pace. The timeline includes important periods for public consultation and engagement. As a result, the key elements of the scheme will not be able to be delivered in advance of Spring 2023.</p>
<p><b>3. COUNCILLOR BRAD BAINES</b></p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member confirm whether Phase 1b School Street schemes, such as the St Ebbe's scheme in my Division, will be eligible for replacement ANPR enforcement before the end of the current school year, subject to the granting of Part 6 powers, and if so when is the Council aiming to install these?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR TIM BEARDER, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>Thank you for your continued interest and questions on this topic. You are a credit to your local residents, always fighting hard in their best interest. I am very aware of the effort and dedication volunteers have put into the School Streets schemes, not just in your Division but across the county. I would like to take this opportunity to thank them for all their hard work. I know with any voluntary process it is possible to face burn out and fatigue. I know that some of the schemes are facing difficult choices and concerns about their long-term sustainability. For this reason I am also keen to progress ANPR cameras to compliment the school streets project as a priority. But we are dealing with Government here and in every area there has been delay, postponement and ambiguity. We were told that these powers were going to be devolved in March and now that is likely to be May - if our bid</p>

<b>Questions</b>	<b>Cabinet Member</b>
	is successful. So any commitment I make here today would be a foolish hostage to fortune. All I can say is that it is a priority.

