

These notes indicate the decisions taken at this meeting and the officers responsible for taking the agreed action. For background documentation please refer to the agenda and supporting papers available on the Council's web site ([www.oxfordshire.gov.uk](http://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk).)

If you have a query please contact Colm Ó Caomhánaigh (Tel: 07393 001096; E-Mail: [colm.ocaomhanaigh@oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:colm.ocaomhanaigh@oxfordshire.gov.uk))

## COUNTY COUNCIL - TUESDAY, 7 NOVEMBER 2023

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AGENDA	DECISIONS	ACTION
<p><b>1. Minutes</b></p> <p>To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 12 September 2023 (CC1) and to receive information arising from them.</p>	<p>The minutes of the meeting held on 12 September 2023 were approved.</p>	<p>DLG (C Ó Caomhánaigh)</p>
<p><b>2. Apologies for Absence</b></p>	<p>Apologies were received from Councillors Ash, Edosomwan, Fatemian and Murphy.</p>	<p>DLG (C Ó Caomhánaigh)</p>
<p><b>3. Declarations of Interest - see guidance note</b></p>	<p>On agenda item 17, Motion by Councillor Gant, Councillor George Reynolds stated that, as he was the Chair of Cherwell District Council Planning Committee, he will be abstaining on the vote.</p>	
<p><b>4. Official Communications</b></p>	<p>The following statement was made on behalf of the County Council:</p> <p>“We share the grief and the fear of the many Oxfordshire residents with family and friends in Israel and Gaza. We stand in solidarity with all our communities across the county and call for the violence to end and for international law to be respected. We also condemn in the strongest terms the anti-Semitic and anti-Muslim attacks that have taken place here in the UK, including in Oxfordshire. These are profoundly wrong - there is no place for racism or intolerance in our county. Now, more than ever, we must stand together, united in mutual respect and understanding.”</p>	

**COUNTY COUNCIL - TUESDAY, 7 NOVEMBER 2023**

<i>RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AGENDA</i>	<i>DECISIONS</i>	<i>ACTION</i>
	<p>Some of Oxfordshire's most dedicated carers were celebrated at an event marking the significant milestones they have achieved while supporting others. Shared Lives is a scheme run by Oxfordshire County Council that matches caring households with adults who have additional care needs, offering them a place to stay and grow their independence. Around 20 households were recognised for between 10 and 30 years involvement with the scheme.</p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council and its long-term contractor Milestone Infrastructure have been recognised in three categories of the Highways Awards for their collaboration on the north Oxford corridor improvement project. The project won the Environmental Sustainability Award for de-carbonisation. Congratulations to all involved.</p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council has also won the award for the best climate action and decarbonisation initiative at the recent <u>Association for Public Service Excellence (APSE) Service Awards 2023</u>. It was recognised for its energy insights tool and energy flexibility trials, successfully demonstrating the crucial role local authorities can play in moving away from the use of polluting fossil fuels. Congratulations to all of the officers involved.</p> <p>The Chair also reported his attendance at a number of events across the county most notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hosted a St Frideswide event at County Hall followed by a service at Christchurch Cathedral.</li> <li>• Welcomed HRH the Princess</li> </ul>	

**COUNTY COUNCIL - TUESDAY, 7 NOVEMBER 2023**

<i>RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AGENDA</i>	<i>DECISIONS</i>	<i>ACTION</i>
	Royal during her visit to Henley River & Rowing Museum. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supported the Royal British Legion Poppy Appeal at Blenheim Palace.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>5. Appointments</b></p> <p>To make any changes to the membership of scrutiny and other committees on the nomination of political groups and to note any changes to the Cabinet made by the Leader of the Council.</p>	<p>Council approved the following changes to Committees:</p> <p>People Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee: Councillor Corkin to replace Councillor Walker</p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council &amp; Employees Joint Consultative Committee: Councillor Fawcett to replace Councillor Rooke</p> <p>Council noted the following change to the Shadow Cabinet notified by the Leader of the Opposition:</p> <p>Councillor Corkin to replace Councillor Ford as Shadow Cabinet Member for SEND Improvement</p>	DLG (C Ó Caomhánaigh)
<p><b>6. Petitions and Public Address</b></p>	<p><b>The following requests to speak were received:</b></p> <p><u>Item 18</u>            John Sanders            John Skinner            Danny Yee            Richard Parnham            Anne Stares            Anne Gwinnett            Robin Tucker            Clinton Pugh            Nigel Clarke            Zuhura Plummer            City Cllr Emily Kerr            David Henwood            Lily Martyn            James Schumann            Sarah Lockyer            Abby White            Duncan Parkes            City Cllr Jemima Hunt</p>	

...Decisions... Decisions...

## COUNTY COUNCIL - TUESDAY, 7 NOVEMBER 2023

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AGENDA	DECISIONS	ACTION
	<p><u>Item 21</u> Bernadette Evans</p>	
<p><b>7. Questions with Notice from Members of the Public</b></p>	<p>Seven questions were asked. The questions, responses and supplementary questions are recorded in an Annex below.</p>	
<p><b>8. Questions with Notice from Members of the Council</b></p>	<p>Twenty six questions were asked. The questions, responses and supplementary questions are recorded in an Annex below.</p>	<p>DLG (C O Caomhánai gh)</p>
<p><b>9. Scrutiny Annual Report</b></p> <p>Report by the Director of Law &amp; Governance</p> <p><b>The Council is RECOMMENDED to receive the Scrutiny Annual Report</b></p>	<p>Council received the report.</p>	
<p><b>10. Report of the Cabinet</b></p> <p>Report by the Leader of the Council.</p> <p>The report covers the Cabinet meetings held on 19 September 2023 and 17 October 2023.</p>	<p>Council received the report of Cabinet.</p>	
<p><b>11. Strategic Leadership Team</b></p> <p>Report by Chief Executive</p> <p><b>Council is RECOMMENDED to</b></p> <p>a) Approve the pay scale of £159,000 to £187,000 for the three proposed Executive Director roles; Executive Director of People, Executive Director of Place and Executive Director of Resources, which will form part of the Strategic Leadership Team;</p> <p>b) Appoint Stephen Chandler as permanent Executive Director of</p>	<p>Recommendations approved.</p>	<p>CE (M Reeves)</p>

**COUNTY COUNCIL - TUESDAY, 7 NOVEMBER 2023**

<i>RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AGENDA</i>	<i>DECISIONS</i>	<i>ACTION</i>
<p>People and Lorna Baxter as permanent Executive Director of Resources at ED3 within the pay scale set out in recommendation 1; and</p> <p>c) Approve the Council's Pay Policy being amended at the next annual review in 2024 (Annex 1) to reflect the changes set out in this report.</p>		
<p><b>12.Appointment of Section 151 Officer</b></p> <p>Report by Chief Executive</p> <p><b>Council is RECOMMENDED to confirm and approve the designation of Lorna Baxter, Executive Director of Resources, as Section 151 Officer, on a permanent basis from the date of this meeting.</b></p>	<p>Recommendation approved.</p>	<p>CE (M Reeves)</p>
<p><b>13.Changes to Constitution of Pension Fund Committee</b></p> <p>Report by Director of Finance</p> <p><b>The Council is RECOMMENDED</b></p> <p>a)</p> <p>to agree the proposed changes by the Pension Fund Committee to their constitution as set out below:</p> <p>(i) The addition of two voting members, appointed by the County Council (this increases the number of county councillors from 5 to 7 members).</p> <p>(ii) The deletion of the two non-voting positions representing the Academy sector.</p>	<p>Recommendations approved.</p>	<p>DLG (S Collins)</p>

**COUNTY COUNCIL - TUESDAY, 7 NOVEMBER 2023**

<i>RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AGENDA</i>	<i>DECISIONS</i>	<i>ACTION</i>
<p>b) <b>To instruct the Director of Law and Governance and Monitoring Officer to give consideration to the requirements of political balance as set out in the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 and present a report to Council at its next meeting for Council to consider nominations and confirm the relevant appointments to the Pension Fund Committee.</b></p>		
<p><b>14. Calendar of Meetings 2024-25</b></p> <p>Report by Director of Law &amp; Governance</p> <p><b>COUNCIL IS RECOMMENDED to approve the calendar of meetings for the 2024-25 council year attached to the report.</b></p>	<p>Council approved the calendar of meetings for the 2024-25 council year attached to the report with one amendment:</p> <p>The Council meeting in February 2025 will be on 11 February (instead of the 18 February).</p>	<p>DLG (C Ó Caomhánai gh)</p>
<p><b>15. Special Urgency Decision</b></p> <p>Report by Director of Law &amp; Governance</p> <p><b>Council is RECOMMENDED to note the use of Special Urgency for a Key Decision on 17 August 2023.</b></p>	<p>Recommendation approved.</p>	
<p><b>16. Motion by Councillor Liz Brighthouse</b></p> <p>This Council notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since the change in legislation regarding Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) in 2014 the partners delivering provision within the overall system have seen a reduction in resources, spiralling demand, a pandemic and major recruitment issues.</li> <li>• Academisation of our Schools has</li> </ul>	<p>The amendment by Councillor Eddie Reeves, as set out in the Schedule of Business, was carried by 45 votes to 13 with no abstentions. The substantive motion, as amended, was carried unanimously (58 in favour, 0 against, 0 abstentions)</p>	

...Decisions... Decisions...

## COUNTY COUNCIL - TUESDAY, 7 NOVEMBER 2023

<i>RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AGENDA</i>	<i>DECISIONS</i>	<i>ACTION</i>
<p>added to the complexity. In Oxfordshire all but one of our Secondary Schools are Academies and over half out Primaries Schools are Academies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Oxfordshire all schools struggle financially.</li> <li>• The Local Area Partnership inspection and similar inspections across the Country identified “systemic failures” across the whole system and families Children and practitioners are currently suffering.</li> <li>• The System in England is £3.4bn in deficit in Oxfordshire this will amount to over £50m by March 2024.</li> </ul> <p>45 years ago the The Warnock Report set out the expectations for the system and SEND Delivery framework. It is time for another such report.</p> <p>This Council asks the Leader to write to the Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Education requesting them to set up a Commission urgently to consider the current needs, resources and systemic change which is needed to reform the System in order to support Children and Young People with SEND.</p>		
<p><b>17. Motion by Councillor Andrew Gant</b></p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council is proud of our history of welcoming people seeking safety in our county. We believe that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• everyone has the right to seek safety, and everyone’s claim for asylum should be treated equally and fairly;</li> <li>• the Government’s ‘anti-refugee’ laws undermine internationally recognised rights for people fleeing war and persecution to seek safety;</li> <li>• people seeking safety should be</li> </ul>	<p>The motion was carried with 42 in favour; 15 against and 1 abstention.</p>	

...Decisions... Decisions...

## COUNTY COUNCIL - TUESDAY, 7 NOVEMBER 2023

<i>RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AGENDA</i>	<i>DECISIONS</i>	<i>ACTION</i>
<p>housed as our neighbours and as a part of our communities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the UK needs an asylum system that empowers people seeking safety to rebuild their lives and enables communities to welcome them;</li> </ul> <p>Council resolves to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. defend the right to seek safety from war and persecution in the UK by signing the national 'Fight the Anti-Refugee Laws' pledge;</li> <li>ii. call on the UK Government to repeal the Illegal Migration Act and the Nationality and Borders Act, withdraw the UK–Rwanda partnership,</li> <li>iii. request Cabinet to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• work with Local Authorities and communities to build a refugee protection system that treats all people with dignity and compassion;</li> <li>• continue to lobby against any UK Government plans to build or repurpose facilities in Oxfordshire to detain or warehouse people seeking safety;</li> <li>• work with local organisations and people with lived experience of the asylum system to identify ways to mitigate the effects of these measures in Oxfordshire;</li> <li>• consider joining the network of cities and towns which promote the inclusion and welfare of people who are fleeing violence and persecution and become a</li> </ul> </li> </ol>		



...Decisions... Decisions...

## COUNTY COUNCIL - TUESDAY, 7 NOVEMBER 2023

<i>RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AGENDA</i>	<i>DECISIONS</i>	<i>ACTION</i>
<p>recognised Council of Sanctuary</p>		
<p><b>18. Motion by Councillor Liam Walker</b></p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council no longer has support for the:</p> <p>i. Cowley LTN scheme; and ii. East Oxford LTN scheme.</p> <p>Council now requests Cabinet to urgently consider setting in train the necessary executive steps to remove the Cowley LTNs as agreed by the Cabinet Member for Environment (including Transport) on 21st January 2021 and the East Oxford LTNs as agreed by Cabinet on Tuesday 17th October 2023.</p>	<p>The amendment by Councillor Duncan Enright, as set out in the Schedule of Business, was passed with 38 in favour, 19 against and no abstentions. The motion as amended was carried unanimously (49 votes in favour, none against, no abstentions).</p>	
<p><b>19. Motion by Councillor Mark Cherry</b></p> <p>Council requests Cabinet to consider approving the Councils for Fair Tax declaration.</p> <p>This commits Councils to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lead by example and demonstrate good practice in our tax conduct, right across our activities.</li> <li>• Ensure IR35 is implemented robustly and contract workers pay a fair share of employment taxes.</li> <li>• Not use offshore vehicles for the purchase of land and property, especially where this leads to reduced payments of stamp duty.</li> <li>• Undertake due diligence to ensure that not-for-profit structures are not being used inappropriately by suppliers as an artificial device to reduce the payment of tax and business rates.</li> <li>• Demand clarity on the ultimate beneficial ownership of suppliers UK and overseas and their consolidated profit &amp; loss position, given lack of</li> </ul>	<p>The time being 4.00 pm, this Motion was considered dropped in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 5.2.</p>	

...Decisions... Decisions...

## COUNTY COUNCIL - TUESDAY, 7 NOVEMBER 2023

<i>RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AGENDA</i>	<i>DECISIONS</i>	<i>ACTION</i>
<p>clarity could be strong indicators of poor financial probity and weak financial standing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote Fair Tax Mark certification especially for any business in which we have a significant stake and where corporation tax is due.</li> <li>• Support Fair Tax Week events in the area, and celebrate the tax contribution made by responsible businesses are proud to promote responsible tax conduct and pay their fair share of corporation tax. .</li> </ul> <p>Council also requests the Leader of the Council to write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer supporting calls for urgent reform of UK procurement law to enable local authorities to better penalise poor tax conduct and reward good tax conduct through their procurement policies.”</p>		
<p><b>20. Motion by Councillor Donna Ford</b></p> <p>Councillors note the increasing number of vacant bank and building society buildings on our high streets, which are largely the result of technological change. The loss of community banking services is of concern to many residents, especially older constituents and those with disabilities and adaptive needs.</p> <p>Buckinghamshire Council has set up a Banking Hub in Buckingham library for people to access banking services in the town centre.</p> <p>Established in partnership with Buckinghamshire Council through its Buckingham and Villages Community Board, with the support of Buckingham Town Council and community representatives, the temporary Banking</p>	<p>The time being 4.00 pm, this Motion was considered dropped in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 5.2.</p>	

...Decisions... Decisions...

## COUNTY COUNCIL - TUESDAY, 7 NOVEMBER 2023

<i>RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AGENDA</i>	<i>DECISIONS</i>	<i>ACTION</i>
<p>Hub provides local people with access to banking services. This offers a counter service operated by the Post Office, where customers of all major banks and building societies can carry out regular cash transactions. It also offers a Community Banker service where customers can talk to their banking provider about more complicated issues. Community Bankers work on rotation, with a different bank or building society available on each day of the week, to ensure fair and equitable access to major banking and building society customers.</p> <p>Council requests the relevant Cabinet member for Community and Corporate Services and the Cabinet Member for Finance to take a lead from forward-thinking colleagues at Buckinghamshire Council and, working with its Town Council, and District Council partners, invite banks and building societies that have left – or are due to leave – our high streets to explore opportunities to work with this Council to set up similar banking hubs within appropriate Council libraries.</p>		
<p><b>21. Motion by Councillor Eddie Reeves</b></p> <p>This Council recognises that the voice of small and medium-sized enterprises ('SMEs') have, too often, been overlooked.</p> <p>This Council resolves to request the Leader of the Council to appoint a Small Business Champion to provide a single point of contact for local businesspeople and advise members attending Cabinet and relevant scrutiny committees of the impact of Council policies on the county's SMEs.</p>	<p>The time being 4.00 pm, this Motion was considered dropped in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 5.2.</p>	
<p><b>22. Motion by Councillor David Rouane</b></p> <p>Pride in the appearance of the public realm is important to our residents. Ensuring that</p>	<p>The time being 4.00 pm, this Motion was considered dropped in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 5.2.</p>	

...Decisions... Decisions...

## COUNTY COUNCIL - TUESDAY, 7 NOVEMBER 2023

<i>RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AGENDA</i>	<i>DECISIONS</i>	<i>ACTION</i>
<p>streets and pavements are accessible, level, without hazards, clear of weeds and vegetation is essential for preventing long term damage to the footways, improving accessibility for all, visibility, reducing the chances of accidents, and also allowing people to have pride in their neighbourhood.</p> <p>Council resolves to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Note the difficulties in maintaining weed clearance to a high standard in view of the expanding network of highways, and in the context of over a decade of budget cuts; and</li> <li>2. Acknowledge the justified phasing out of glyphosate and herbicide-based methods based on health and environmental grounds; and</li> <li>3. Recognise that the Council has a statutory duty to keep pavements free of weeds and hazards; and</li> <li>4. Request the Cabinet Member for Transport Management to consider options for alternative methods of weed removal, and scheduled maintenance that are both cost-effective and environmentally friendly, including supporting the work of towns and parishes, local groups and individuals, that can be developed and trialled around the county, and for ongoing consideration of other methods.</li> <li>5. Request that the Cabinet Member for Finance give due consideration to the findings of this report as part of the next round of budget setting.</li> <li>6. Embrace collection of green matter from weeding and grass cutting and ask the Cabinet Member for Climate</li> </ol>		

...Decisions... Decisions...

## COUNTY COUNCIL - TUESDAY, 7 NOVEMBER 2023

<i>RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE AGENDA</i>	<i>DECISIONS</i>	<i>ACTION</i>
<p>Change Delivery and Environment to consider reviewing a county owned Anaerobic digester facility.</p>		
<p><b>23. Motion by Councillor Liz Brighthouse</b></p> <p>Since the Alliance governing Oxfordshire collapsed on 24<sup>th</sup> Sept 2023 the Council now has a minority Liberal Democrat Green Alliance administration. This leaves Oxfordshire, its employees and those who rely on it for services in a difficult position. At any time unacceptable decisions could be called in to Scrutiny or a Special Council Meeting and the Leader could be subject to no confidence votes. This Council wants to ensure the good governance of Oxfordshire and therefore calls on the Cabinet to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that all Group Leaders and Spokespersons are equally involved in all issues relating to decision making and Governance of Oxfordshire.</li> <li>• Ensure that briefings are open to the Spokespeople of all three Groups.</li> <li>• Inform all Panels and Groups of any new arrangements that may be necessary as a result of no political group having overall control of the Council.</li> </ul>	<p>The time being 4.00 pm, this Motion was considered dropped in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 5.2.</p>	

## Questions from Members of the Public

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

<p><b>1. PETER WEST</b></p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member for Transport Management explain the rationale of only having a 6 week period for the Cowley LTN / ANPR consultation and 19 days for the Cowley Area LTNs and whether the periods allocated comply with the Gunning Principles?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>In a recent FOI response to the questioner, there was an error in the dates provided for one of the many consultations related to the Cowley LTNs. I can confirm that the county council complied with all relevant legislation in relation to the duration of all Cowley LTN consultations. There was, therefore, sufficient opportunity for consultees to participate in the consultations as per the Gunning Principles.</p>
<p><b>2. RICHARD PARNHAM</b></p> <p>Was it ethical/appropriate for Oxfordshire County Council and Oxford City Council to jointly agree to install additional NO2 pollution monitors - to evaluate the pollution impact of the East Oxford LTNs - on a) four roads that were later blocked off with LTN barriers b) one road that was already blocked off at both ends with a historic LTN, and c) at the opposite end of a (still open) road to where traffic now routinely queues?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>In order to monitor the impacts of the Low Traffic Neighbourhoods, Oxfordshire County Council reviewed the existing air quality sensor network with Oxford City Council and a methodology was agreed with the City Council AQ Officer. For the most part, the existing network effectively covered the LTN boundary roads. However, the existing network did not cover areas within the East Oxford LTNs. To better measure the full impact of LTNs on local AQ, new AQ sensors needed to be added to the existing air quality sensor network.</p> <p>To understand the impact of traffic filters on local NO2 levels within LTNs, new air quality sensors were located in several areas within the E Oxford LTNs and at control sites on residential roads in other parts of Oxford that would not be impacted by the LTNs. An explanation of these locations was provided in the council's answer to Mr Parnham's email of 5 October 2023 "East Oxford LTN evaluation report - significant factual error (and some suggestions)".</p> <p>In addition to these sensor installations within the LTNs, additional AQ monitoring</p>

<p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY</b></p> <p>Can Councillor Gant justify why pollution monitors on the boundary roads were installed nowhere near where the pollution actually occurs.</p>	<p>locations were identified on boundary roads that did not have good coverage from the existing air quality sensor network. Among these locations was LT4 on Morrell Avenue. This location was selected as there was historic data from an air quality sensor nearby that collected data in 2016 and 2017, but had been discontinued by the City Council.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b></p> <p>The answer to that is in the written answer and the answer is ‘yes’.</p>
<p><b>3. ANNE STARES</b></p> <p>On what date(s) was the decision made (i.e. operational approval given) and purchase approved (i.e purchase orders raised) for the Littlehay Road, Crescent Road and Littlemore Road/Crowell Road ANPR cameras?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>Use of ANPR cameras at these sites was approved at the Cabinet Member Decisions meeting on 22 June 2023. Operational approval for purchase was given following on from that meeting. Orders for cameras have not yet been raised however, it is anticipated that will be done this month.</p>
<p><b>4. BERNADETTE EVANS</b></p> <p>Were standalone business impact assessments produced for the Cowley and East Oxford LTNs. And if not, why not?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>Stand alone business impact assessments were not produced for the Cowley and East Oxford LTNs. For the most recent East Oxford LTN cabinet meeting and decision, all consultation responses, including those from businesses were published. The main Cabinet report also included feedback from specific businesses that responded highlighting the reported impact on those businesses.</p>
<p><b>5. LYNNE DAVIES</b></p> <p>How will carers get to all their old and disabled clients on time when the bus filters have been installed as they are having</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>Professional health care workers will be able to apply for a permit free of charge to drive their car through all six of the trial traffic filters when they are operating. The free permits will be for operational journeys only, not commuting or for personal</p>

<p>problems already?</p>	<p>reasons. We are expecting the traffic filters to reduce traffic and associated congestion so that operational vehicle journeys by carers will be quicker and more reliable than they are at the moment. It is exactly these types of essential journeys the traffic filters are designed to improve.</p>
<p><b>6. IAN YEATMAN</b></p> <p>ANPR cameras were previously authorised for the Cowley LTN scheme, but as of time of writing, bollards are still in place. Is this time being used to properly review the EQIA, which I highlighted as being inadequate at the time and concessions for blue badge holders, carers, district nurses etc. considered? If not, what is the reason for the delay?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>The ANPR cameras for Cowley LTNs are expected to be implemented in early 2024. The reason for the delay is a backlog of work, the procurement of cameras and the necessary survey and site works to enable installation.</p>
<p><b>7. MATHEW WEBB</b></p> <p>At the cabinet meeting on Tuesday, 19 July 2022 regarding the "COWLEY LTN EXPERIMENTAL TRO" the Council committed to community and stakeholder engagement activities. Please can you detail the community and stakeholder engagement activities that have been conducted since that time in relation to the Cowley LTNs.</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council has undertaken extensive stakeholder engagement in relation to ANPR (specifically with the emergency services etc.) and the subsequent consultation and approval of ANPR. Officers have also been liaising closely with the local community in the Westbury Crescent and Mayfair Road area to discuss potential changes in that local area. Officers have regular meetings with Oxford health groups and the emergency services as well as close liaison with local county councillors. As well as regular correspondence with residents and businesses, Cabinet Members have visited various businesses in the Cowley and East Oxford areas to listen to views and concerns.</p>



## QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

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

<p><b>8. COUNCILLOR EDDIE REEVES</b></p> <p>The Liberal Democrats now run this Council in coalition with the Green Party. On or about 2 October, her Green Deputy Leader was found to have retweeted a post, which made misogynistic remarks about Fiona Bruce and Laura Kuenssberg, two highly distinguished BBC journalists, with the Conservative Party referred to in the same post as having a "fascist ideology". Meanwhile, the Greens' Group Leader was reported recently as having asked a woman on Twitter/X if it was "the wrong time of the month" and referring to certain child actors as "plug ugly". Is her pact with the Greens one of principle or expediency?</p> <p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY</b></p> <p>Councillor Sudbury has only apologised for the misogynistic element of the tweet in question. He has not publicly apologised for, and I quote, "the Conservative Party having a fascist ideology". Will she now ask her Deputy Leader to publicly apologise for having endorsed such a tweet.</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR LIZ LEFFMAN, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</b></p> <p>Cllr Sudbury states in his feed that "RTs are not agreement". When contacted about the Tweet in question, he immediately acknowledged not having read it properly, that it could be seen as offensive, apologised, deleted the message, and thanked the journalist for bringing it to his attention.</p> <p>All but one of Cllr Middleton's tweets were made twelve years ago, a year before he became involved in politics and 10 years before he became a councillor. He has explained the context of the remaining tweet, made 10 years ago, but acknowledged that in isolation it could be seen as offensive. He has also apologised and deleted all the tweets in question.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b></p> <p>It is my belief that individuals have to take responsibility for the things they say and do. I am not going to be making an issue out of this. If Councillor Sudbury wishes to apologise, I am quite sure that he will.</p>
<p><b>9. COUNCILLOR MARK LYGO</b></p> <p>What is the potential legal liability of the</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>The Council recognises that the Oxfordshire Bus Enhanced Partnership makes</p>

<p>council towards the bus companies, in light of the fact that the council required to improve journey times for buses under the conditions of electric bus grant funding arrangements – also the LTN’s have made bus journey times in Oxford considerably worse?</p>	<p>legally binding commitments on both itself and bus operator partners to deliver improved bus services, customer service and journey time reliability.</p> <p>Both the Council and operators are fully engaged in projects to ensure these commitments are met, including delivery of the proposed experimental traffic filter and other Oxford core schemes which will reduce congestion and speed up bus journeys significantly.</p> <p>There has been no change to this position, which unlocks the zero-emission bus fleet for the Oxford Smartzone area; electric buses are already being built and charging infrastructure being installed with the first of the new buses due to arrive next month. The full fleet of electric buses is planned to be in service by summer 2024, in time for introduction of the traffic filter scheme upon the reopening of Botley Road.</p> <p>The evaluation of the impact of the LTNs on bus journey times showed a few significant delays at certain times of day in some locations and directions. Although an overall increase was shown, these effects were variable, with some locations showing improvements. The analysis showed that the negative impact on bus journey times in the most significantly affected location was considerably less in March 2023 than in November 2022, indicating an improvement over time.</p>
<p><b>10. COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE</b></p> <p>Noting there is to be new consultation about pedestrianizing the western end of Wantage Town Square, will there be proper research into the taxi licences, disabled spaces, and loading bays for HGVs and long wheel based vehicles who have no other access to the businesses in the square?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>The pedestrianisation of the western end of Wantage Market Place is a proposal from Wantage Town Council, together with their consultant Glanville. County Council traffic officers continue to work with both parties to ensure a suitable scheme. The Town Council and Glanville are aware and have been reminded of, the need to provide adequate levels of taxi bays, disabled persons’ parking places, and loading bays in the Market Place.</p> <p>Following the formal consultation undertaken in August / September 2023 I understand that the Town Council have met with the businesses likely to be affected and are rethinking their proposal. When a revised scheme is submitted</p>

<p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY</b></p> <p>Can I ask that taxi licences are respected when you deal with the pedestrianisation of the western end of Wantage?</p>	<p>County Council traffic officers will again ensure that all users of the Market Place are properly accommodated as part of the technical approval process.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b></p> <p>That will be taken into account as part of the decision-making process and I do discuss these matters in detail with the local councillors regularly.</p>
<p><b>11. COUNCILLOR EDDIE REEVES</b></p> <p>Is this Council prepared for its next ILACS inspection?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR JOHN HOWSON, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, EDUCATION AND YOUNG PEOPLE’S SERVICES</b></p> <p>There is a Head of Service in children and families who is currently dedicated to strategically leading practice improvement across all areas for the Children, Education &amp; Families (CEF) Directorate, they are directly involved in ensuring inspection readiness, their name is Laura Clements.</p> <p>The senior leadership team across CEF is wholly committed to ensuring that our social care teams are always Inspection ready, and this has been driven by what Oxfordshire’s Interim DCS, Anne Coyle, has described as “creating the conditions for good practice to flourish”. Much has been achieved to date to ensure that the conditions for consistently high quality support and intervention for children, young, people &amp; families are in place, but this takes time, and there is of course always more to do; Children Services are an ambitious service that now knows itself well, and continual improvement is driven through our “Delivering Quality Improvement in Practice &amp; Performance” (DQIPP) approach; this is a system-wide monthly forum in which managers come together and are held to account for the performance and quality of practice within their service areas. DQIPP is embedded in our Quality Assurance Framework, in which case and thematic audits are regularly undertaken across the Directorate, to identify areas of practice which are not yet consistently good and address these swiftly.</p> <p>Four Interim Strengthening Practice Leads are now within Children’s Social Care to support continual practice improvement, acting as critical friends to services across the system, and strengthening the impact of quality assurance activity. One Strengthening Practice Lead has a lead focus on child neglect, as an area which we recognise requires relentless drive to ensure timely and proportionate</p>

help for families where indicators of neglect are emerging. Whilst these posts are interim, we have been able to secure support for these positions to be part of our establishment and permanent recruitment is imminent

In January this year, Anne Coyle, in her previous role as Deputy Director for Children's Social Care led a mock-Inspection, to test our readiness for ILACS Inspection; all the key elements of the ILACS (Inspection of Local Authority Childrens Services) framework were incorporated into the mock Inspection, including the provision of all relevant performance data for Inspectors, the selection of children for close tracking who were subject to detailed audit & audit moderation, and mock-Inspector interviews with practitioners, managers, and leaders. The mock-Inspection enabled the leadership team to pinpoint areas of improvement, celebrate improvements made thus far, and ensure that efficient, well-co-ordinated business support arrangements are in place for when we are notified by OFSTED of Inspection, to ensure that the Inspection runs smoothly, and Inspectors are well supported throughout.

Inspection Readiness meetings now take place on a weekly basis in which practice, quality assurance, and business support leads come together to plan for Inspection, addressing all the necessary logistics required to ensure inspection readiness.

In Children's Social Care, social workers' caseloads have reduced to target levels across the system, and performance on key areas, including statutory visits to children in need, in need of protection and who are cared for, assessment timeliness, and frequency and quality of casework supervision have all improved significantly over the past year. The number of children cared for in unregistered provision has reduced considerably, with only 5 remaining, and the overall volume of children who are cared for and/or subject to care proceedings has reduced by 15%.

As such, CEF is working hard to ensure that we are always ready for ILACS and we welcome our next Inspection, to demonstrate the progress made to date, and to share our ambitions to continue to improve the experience of children and families in Oxfordshire with OFSTED.

<p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY</b> Will he resign if there is a subsequent adverse inspection report from ILACS so soon after the CQC and Ofsted report – yes or no?</p>	<p><b>RESPONSE</b> The answer is No because I will want to carry on to convert any poor report that we got. However, he is prejudging the issue because, as he will have seen in the answer, the officers are working very hard on the situation that we find ourselves in. We are well overdue for an ILACS report on our Looked After Children. The numbers of those children have come down from an unprecedented high of over 900 by more than a hundred and they would have come down more but for the fact that we are taking larger numbers of unaccompanied asylum seekers under the national scheme. If we get to our full quota on that, we will have 145 of those. I am confident that the work that is being done in preparation for the ILACS report by the officers will give us a satisfactory outcome of that report but we await the visit from Ofsted.</p>
<p><b>12. COUNCILLOR EDDIE REEVES</b></p> <p>The Council's Residents' Survey results made for painful reading. What does the Leader intend to do in response to such clear dissatisfaction?</p> <p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY</b> Are the Council's priorities still the right ones?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR LIZ LEFFMAN, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</b></p> <p>We greatly appreciate the time people have taken to provide their feedback to our recent residents' survey. We are listening and we take the results of the survey very seriously.</p> <p>Overall, satisfaction levels with the council have fallen and we are taking active steps to improve residents' experience of our services as well as the service they receive when they contact us. We have an action plan in place and we are using the valuable insight provided in the survey to help shape our service plans and inform our budget setting process for the year ahead.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b> Yes I believe that the Council's priorities are the right ones. I certainly believe that putting climate change at the heart of everything we do is the right way forward. I was very sorry that the Chair chose not to read out one of the notices today which has actually given us an award for the work we are doing to tackle the climate emergency. I absolutely get that for many people in this county there have been other things that are on their minds. First of all, the cost of living crisis. Secondly, health issues. We know that they are priorities for our residents. Those are things that we have worked with other councils to tackle and we continue to work with our health partners to tackle those issues as well. But I would say one thing here and that is, what is visible to most of our residents</p>

	<p>is the appalling state of our roads – and I take no pride in that at all – but I would say that this Conservative government has done absolutely nothing to support our highways. We are £30m a year short of what we need to maintain our roads. We are working hard to make sure that we find new techniques for filling potholes but we are getting no support from this government on this and our roads continue to deteriorate. That is what our residents are seeing and I can completely understand their concern that the Council is not able to do more. I wish we could. We will look at our budgets carefully to make sure that we can do more to support our road network but the fact is that this government has let, not just us, but every single council across the country, down when it comes to managing transport and roads.</p>
<p><b>13. COUNCILLOR DONNA FORD</b></p> <p>Can you advise the average retention period for staff within SEND?</p> <p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY</b> Can you confirm how many of these leavers, in the staggeringly high level of leavers, leave the Council within the first six months of employment?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR KATE GREGORY, CABINET MEMBER FOR SEND IMPROVEMENT</b></p> <p>Please find data below* showing the average headcount, number of leavers, annual turnover rate, and average number of years' service for SEND staff over the last two years. The data shows that the turnover rate has decreased, and retention has improved on last year. Workforce action plans continue to support further improvements of the recruitment and retention of staff in the SEND service and across Children Education and Families.</p> <p>Do contact us if you require any further information.</p> <p>*Table is shown below the list of questions</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b> I don't have that information to hand but I will get a written response for you.</p>
<p><b>14. COUNCILLOR DONNA FORD</b></p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p>

<p>Can you advise why 20mph is being proposed for strategic main routes around Bicester?</p> <p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY</b> Can you confirm that you will not ignore residents in their responses to the consultation around 20mph limits around Bicester when they come forward?</p>	<p>This is not the case. Whilst 20mph speed limits are proposed on the main radial routes, this will only apply to the sections close to the centre where the geography and environment currently restrains speed to around this level. The outer sections of radial routes will remain as they are and the peripheral routes will remain at 40mph. The extents of all proposed changes to speed limits can be seen on the accompanying scheme drawings.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b> Yes I can confirm that I won't ignore residents. I spend a lot of my time reading consultation responses. It's extremely illuminating but if the councillor wants to take part in that process and makes the case for higher speed limits in the centre of her town, she is welcome to do that. The judgement will be made on officer advice and safety guidance and on the principles and the policies of this Council as it always is.</p>
<p><b>15. COUNCILLOR IAN CORKIN</b></p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council job adverts are appropriately written and all include a footnote referencing OCC's commitment to EDI, which includes: "Everyone is accepted for who they are, regardless of age.....". Sadly, this is not reflected in the images used on social media when advertising vacancies.</p> <p>The following are all taken from X (formerly Twitter) since the 1<sup>st</sup> of September this year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Climate policy &amp; programme team leader</li> <li>• Climate outreach officer</li> <li>• Young person team support officer</li> <li>• Social worker</li> <li>• Independent reviewing officers or child protection chairs</li> </ul>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR NEIL FAWCETT, CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE SERVICES</b></p> <p>I thank Councillor Corkin for the question. I have asked for a review of how we select photos with the aim of a more balanced approach towards age representation in the future.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service manager, fostering</li> <li>• Senior health and safety officer</li> <li>• Casual deputy registrars</li> <li>• Family solutions team manager</li> <li>• MASH assistant team mananager</li> <li>• Quality assurance LPS lead</li> </ul> <p>In all cases, older people are not featured in any of the associated images. Could the Cabinet Member for Community &amp; Corporate Services please confirm whether this is as a result of unconscious bias, or a more determined attempt, contrary to The Equality Act 2010, to manage the age demographic of applicants?</p> <p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY</b> There probably should be a better balance of the seven protected characteristics as well. I wonder would you take that on board as you go forward?</p>	<p><b>RESPONSE</b> I did have an exchange of emails around the broader issues as well and I am hoping that the review will cover that. For what it is worth, my best guess is that the choice of images that we have been using reflects the standard available images for these kinds of purposes rather than any deliberate choice on the part of our officers. I am grateful to him for raising the issue. We are looking at all aspects of it.</p>
<p><b>16. COUNCILLOR SUSANNA PRESSEL</b></p> <p>Oxfordshire is proud to host asylum seekers in our county. The government has placed many of them in hotels, which is unpleasant for them. We now hear that -- instead of clearing the backlog -- the government will simply be closing some of the asylum hotels in the UK, with apparently no alternative provision. If that happens here, what are our plans for housing those people who become homeless, as a result of the government's</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR LIZ LEFFMAN, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</b></p> <p>The County, District and City Councils, alongside the Voluntary &amp; Community Sector, health services and other agencies, continue to work together through the Migration Partnership to support and maintain an Oxfordshire refugee and asylum migration system that aims for a warm welcome for all new arrivals and embraces and supports independent living for those staying in the county.</p> <p>The Home Office has a legal obligation to provide accommodation to asylum seekers who would otherwise be destitute. The Home Office can therefore not remove those who's claims are yet to be processed from hotels without making alternative provision. Our understanding is that the Home Office intends to close</p>





	<p>ensure that there is accommodation for homeless people. Some properties have been bought in Chipping Norton and in other parts of the county. So we are not expecting people to come into the city to seek support but we do want to make sure that we have the support available to both asylum seekers and homeless people around the whole of the county and we are working closely with our partners on that.</p>
<p><b>17. COUNCILLOR DAVID BARTHOLOMEW</b></p> <p>Over many months, the Didcot &amp; Henley Localities Group has repeatedly and unsuccessfully asked for data to support the county's 30mph to 20mph sign-changing exercise.</p> <p>The latest answer from the relevant officer is as follows:</p> <p><i>"...I don't have the resources for written material. In fact, we have little analysis on the bulk of new limits as again we haven't had the resource for such undertakings..."</i></p> <p>How can the Cabinet Member justify steaming ahead spending £8m of Council Tax-payers money in the absence of on-going data generation to support such a huge expenditure?</p> <p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY</b></p> <p>Do you still stand by your decision that you would rather spend £8m on a sign-changing exercise when you have absolutely no idea whether it works or not or will you actually start collecting some data to see if it is</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>The response was given to you verbally in one of the locality meetings. I would like to reiterate the further information that was also presented at that meeting. We have several control sites where we continue to consider the impact of the introduction of measures on the reduction of speed. On these sites it has been found that a reduction of circa 5 mph has been achieved.</p> <p>With the large number of sites where we have introduced 20 mph schemes, it was never the intention to have full assessment of before and after speeds. The value of the introduction is the safety and wellbeing of those residents and communities where the limits have been introduced as well as the reduction in carbon emissions generated from vehicular movements.</p> <p>National guidance, and information from the Welsh Government, supports the decision that we have taken in terms of adopting this policy.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b></p> <p>Yes I stand absolutely by the policy. The answer says "we have several control sites where we continue to consider the impact of the introduction of measures". This policy has been such a success that there are many hundreds of communities around our county where these schemes have been introduced, always with the active participation and request of the local county councillor</p>

<p>efficient or not.</p>	<p>including many in your own party. I am absolutely thrilled about that. Clearly it is not sensible to monitor every single one and that is what officers do as it says in the answer. But the point is that we believe that this policy makes people safer. It makes communities safer. It makes children safer and that is why so many councillors have asked for it in their own communities with the support of the parish and town councils. There are plenty of academic studies to demonstrate that and to show the benefits of it. That is what our policy is based on and frankly that is what we need to be able to stand up here and say 'yes I do stand by that policy' and I am very proud that we have rolled it out so extensively.</p>
<p><b>18. COUNCILLOR DONNA FORD</b></p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member for Transport advise why, despite several requests, correspondence from a Bicester Town Councillor regarding Banbury Road Roundabout, Bicester in my ward, which you mentioned at your cabinet decision meeting, is still being withheld from me?</p> <p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY</b></p> <p>Do you agree that it is poor judgement for a committee chair to make a comment stating they are a committee chair without the committee having any idea what they are commenting on the committee's behalf.</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>Following the receipt of advice from officers that I should ask the sender's permission to share the email with you, I contacted them. I understand that they have already shared the email with you.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b></p> <p>Frankly I think this is a matter for you and your fellow members of Bicester Town Council not for me.</p>
<p><b>19. COUNCILLOR LIAM WALKER</b></p> <p>The developers behind the Witney North development for 1,250 homes have now removed the West End Link Road from the plans.</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</b></p> <p>The community engagement conducted by the developer of North Witney Strategic Development area does not appear to include the proposed West End Link Road. The proposed West End Link Road is a policy requirement of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 as shown in policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• POLICY T2: Highway Improvement Schemes</li> </ul>

<p>Can you ask county officers to look at this proposal again to ensure Witney is getting the right infrastructure with a development of this size?</p> <p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY</b> Can you confirm when the stakeholder engagement meeting is likely to start?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• POLICY WIT2: North Witney Strategic Development Area (1,400 homes)</li> </ul> <p>Should a planning application be submitted without the proposed West End Link Road infrastructure also coming forward as part of the development West Oxfordshire District Council (WODC) officers would need to take a view (in consultation with Oxfordshire County Council officers) on whether the application is in breach of policy.</p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council have recently conducted an Options Appraisal study of the Bridge Street and proposed West End Link area of Witney to ensure that any proposals are compliant with the Oxfordshire Local Transport and Connectivity Plan. Following an internal review of this work, officers will be engaging stakeholders in the outcomes of this study, with the conversation based on ensuring appropriate travel and transport infrastructure is provided to support the North Witney development.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b></p> <p>I am not sure. I will check with officers and come back to you with a written reply.</p>
<p><b>20.COUNCILLOR LIAM WALKER</b></p> <p>A number of smaller 20mph speed limit signs have been replaced in Witney for larger 20mph signs. Why has this work been carried out and can he confirm how much this has cost to replace these signs?</p> <p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY</b> Has the Council been forced to spend this sort of money in other villages and towns?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>The larger signs were installed to increase the visibility of the new speed limit due to continuing reported non-compliance. When such concerns are expressed, we consider increasing the size of signs, but only on major routes. The cost was around £11,000. I can confirm that all the signs removed will be reused on other schemes.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b></p> <p>I do not know the answer to that but I will look into it and let you know.</p>
<p><b>21.COUNCILLOR TED FENTON</b></p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</b></p>

<p>Can you confirm when the feasibility study for the Witney railway will be released. Given taxpayers money was allocated to fund the study it is only right for it be a public document. When will this be available?</p> <p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY</b></p> <p>Why has it taken so long to be able to get this information?</p>	<p>We expect to release the feasibility study reports later this month.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b></p> <p>I did query that with the officers and they had some extra additions that they wanted to make – information that came through after the report had been nearly finalised. They put the extra information in. I have seen the report is now final so it should be almost imminently being released.</p>
<p><b>22. COUNCILLOR BETHIA THOMAS</b></p> <p>I would like to draw attention to a local matter in my division. Recently I have been copied into a number of emails addressed to Martin Reeves in which residents express their disappointment that an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has not been considered in the application to redevelop a former quarry near Faringdon.</p> <p>Wicklesham Quarry was the subject of a planning application that had been submitted to Vale of White Horse District Council but was later withdrawn and resubmitted to OCC, as it had been deemed a ‘county matter’. Recently, as part of the process the application was subject to a ‘screening opinion’, which, as far as I understand, is the first step to assess the need for an EIA.</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR GEOFF SAUL, CHAIR OF THE PLANNING &amp; REGULATION COMMITTEE</b></p> <p>The proposed development at Wicklesham Quarry is a county matter by virtue of paragraph 1(1)(h) of Schedule 1 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended, as the site is in its aftercare period on the previous mineral permission. It is now for the prospective applicant to submit a planning application for their proposed development to the County Council for determination. They have not yet done so although they have sought pre-application advice. As part of the pre-application stage the applicant sought an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening Opinion under the provisions of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations.</p> <p>Having assessed the information submitted, the County Council determined that the proposed development would not be EIA development. Based on the information presented, the County Council determined the impacts that would arise would be localised to the site and immediate surrounds and therefore not at a scale that requires an EIA process to be undertaken. This included assessment of information provided by the applicant that set out how impacts on the geological SSSI would be mitigated. The Vale of White Horse also reached the same decision that the proposal would not be EIA development when they dealt with a previous screening opinion request from the applicant when they had</p>

<p>This screening has deemed that an EIA is not necessary at this stage and local residents cannot understand the decision not to proceed with this assessment and have highlighted that the site is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One of Special Scientific Interest &amp; Geological Conservation Review Site</li> <li>• Part of West Oxfordshire Heights Conservation Target Area</li> <li>• Within the Mid-Vale Ridge National Character Area</li> <li>• Contains Priority Habitat and is a breeding habitat for a European Protected Species - Great Crested Newts</li> </ul> <p>Obviously, I cannot claim expertise in these fields, but would like to understand more about the context of the decision, given that this site does seem to be significant ecologically and scientifically.</p> <p>Can the cabinet member please explain the context in which this decision has been made and reassure my residents that the special nature of the site will be considered in the normal course of the application?</p>	<p>thought the proposal was a district rather than county matter.</p> <p>Whilst it has been determined the proposed development does not require EIA, environmental impacts will of course be rigorously assessed through any future planning application by the County Council's planning team. The application would need to be accompanied by environmental information and subject to consultation with statutory environmental bodies as well as residents and other interested parties. The application information and consultation responses will then be assessed by the planning team and a recommendation made having weighed up all the considerations, including those concerned with the environmental impacts. The planning application process will also assess the proposal against all relevant development plan policy, which will include those contained in the County Council's Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Part 1, the Vale of White Horse Local Plan and Faringdon Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>In summary, due process has been followed with the EIA screening process in respect of the proposed development at Wicklesham Quarry. The next step would be for a planning application to be submitted, which once received will be subject to statutory consultation and assessment against all relevant policies and material considerations that will include rigorous review of environmental and all other impacts.</p>
<p><b>23. COUNCILLOR LIAM WALKER</b></p> <p>Can the cabinet member confirm if this council will be removing parking charges at our P&amp;R sites to help support the local</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>There are currently no plans to remove parking charges at either our or the City Council's Park &amp; Ride sites. I can confirm though that the discounted combined parking and bus ticket at the Park &amp; Rides will remain.</p>

<p>economy over the festive period?</p> <p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY</b> Has the Cabinet Member got any data to show that the discounted and combined ticket that he likes to talk about has actually increased any usage?</p>	<p><b>RESPONSE</b> I'm happy to take that away and come back.</p>
<p><b>24. COUNCILLOR SUSANNA PRESSEL</b></p> <p>The latest Residents Survey showed people in Oxfordshire are disappointed by the Council's current performance in fixing potholes on our roads. Can the Cabinet Member for Transport Management confirm how many potholes in the County are currently unfilled and how many are currently failing to be fixed within 28 days of being reported?</p> <p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY</b> Can the Cabinet Member confirm that the Cabinet has not allocated sufficient resources to fix all the defects across the county, both reported and unreported, and that is why our roads are in an appalling state as the Leader herself just admitted? So what are they going to do about it?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>An unprecedented number of highway defects have been recorded over the past year; in some months being 50% more than when compared to the same time last year. Significant additional resources have been deployed to deal with the increase. There are currently approximately 1000 defects recorded with instructions raised to our contractors for repair, none of which exceed the 28-day target for action.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b> I would refer the councillor to the answer Councillor Leffman gave. Do we have enough money to fix all the potholes in our county? Nothing like it. I join Councillor Leffman in calling on our Conservative colleagues to speak to central government and pass on that plea. The answer does point out that we are unfortunately very much at the mercy of the weather here and look at the tables that are produced on this. The number of reported defects month on month this year was in many months over double what it was the year before. Does central government reflect that in the amount of funding it gives us to replace them or repair them. Absolutely no it does not. It just ignores the problem. This is a crisis made in Whitehall, made in Westminster. This is a Tory pothole crisis.</p>
<p><b>25. COUNCILLOR SUSANNA PRESSEL</b></p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR PETE SUDBURY, DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR CLIMATE CHANGE DELIVERY &amp; ENVIRONMENT</b></p>

<p>This year the County Council has paid for only one cut to most of our highway verges. This has been extremely unpopular with thousands of residents. It is also <i>not</i> good for biodiversity. The ideal for biodiversity, as our own website makes clear, is two cuts per year, and the removal of the grass cuttings. What will the Cabinet member do to address these issues?</p> <p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY</b></p> <p>There are four main principles of nature friendly maintenance of urban grasslands. Number two is collect the cuttings to reduce fertility. We are not collecting the cuttings. Will the Cabinet Member agree that it is extremely disappointing that we are not in fact doing what we should be doing about biodiversity?</p>	<p>Our recently adopted Verge and vegetation policy outlines our approach to maintain verges and grassed areas. (Link to policy as below.) This policy was drawn up in consultation with our Biodiversity Team, and HERO and takes biodiversity into account. Everything we do is limited by the impact of 13 years of austerity, and this policy prioritised keeping pathways and vision splays clear in the first half of the year, and a single cut as late in the season as possible. Whilst the single cut approach has been the county standard for a number of years now and not just this year, cutting less (once or twice a year) and during late summer/autumn is generally better for biodiversity than frequent cuts and/or spring cutting, as it allows plants to flower and set seed. However, to increase to two cuts per year would require double the existing budget.</p> <p>We have trialled cut and collect at three small Roadside Verge Nature Reserve Sites (RVNRs) across the county. Going forward these three sites will be treated as cut and pile where the arisings are collected and placed in a discrete habitat/location on site. A further three RNVR sites will be added in the next round of verge cutting to bring the total to 6 cut and pile sites.</p> <p>It is intended to incrementally increase the number of sites in future however, the details are still under discussion.</p> <p>( <a href="https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/file/roads-and-transport-highway-management-policy/Vergeandvegetationpolicy.pdf">https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/file/roads-and-transport-highway-management-policy/Vergeandvegetationpolicy.pdf</a> )</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b></p> <p>You have heard the response given by both my colleagues about the funding for highways. The same thing applies. It would be great – it would be ideal to collect cuttings – in fact they should be piled up at the back so that they can form a habitat for invertebrates – but the reality is we have enough funding to keep vision splays and pathways clear most of the time and to do one cut a year and that is the best that is possible under current funding.</p>
<p><b>26. COUNCILLOR IAN SNOWDON</b></p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</b></p>



<p>Does the new cabinet member for Infrastructure and Development Strategy who is responsible for delivering the HIF 1 project now support the scheme or still stand by her position as a voting member of the planning committee that the current scheme should be refused?</p>	<p>The Cabinet collectively supports the HIF1 application for important highways infrastructure in South Oxfordshire.</p> <p>The Council's Planning and Regulation Committee had the opportunity to consider again the HIF1 planning application at a meeting on 27 September following the original decision of the Committee to refuse the planning application in July. The conclusion of the September meeting was to adopt a neutral position for the upcoming Public Inquiry. The reasons for refusal which were put forwards in July are no longer being pursued with any direct objection to the application although the Committee determined that it still had some technical concerns which have been put forward to the Inquiry.</p> <p>This was the agreed position of the Council's Planning and Regulation Committee as Local Planning Authority, considering the planning application on its merits, and following the officers' recommendation, and should not be confused with a policy position of the Cabinet.</p>
<p><b>27. COUNCILLOR IAN SNOWDON</b></p> <p>The previous administration set a target to reduce car journeys in Oxfordshire by one in four by 2030, can the Cabinet Member for Climate Change Delivery and Environment explain how data is being collected to support this aim and give an update on how well the council is doing in this ambition?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</b></p> <p>The Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP) adopted in July 2022 includes a set of headline targets. These include targets to replace or remove 1 out of every 4 current car trips in Oxfordshire by 2030 and replace or remove an additional 1 out of 3 car trips in Oxfordshire by 2040. Car trips were not previously monitored in the county and there is not a readily available data source. Work has therefore been conducted over the last year to develop a bespoke monitoring mechanism.</p> <p>Monitoring of the car trip target has been derived from a combination of automatic traffic counter data: Vivacity camera (object recognition cameras which provide counts by mode of transport) and INRIX telematics data providing a sample of trips within the county. By combining these data sources, a proxy for the number of car trips has been developed. It is important to note that this is a proxy and not an absolute measure of the number of car trips. It allows us to understand the percentage change from a sample of car trips but does not</p>

<p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY</b></p> <p>With many more people working from home in 2022 compared to the base line 2019, a 4.5% increase in car journeys is very disappointing. Will you share how many and where the cameras will be located so that it does not end up a tick-box exercise with selective data like the LTNs?</p>	<p>provide an overall countywide figure.</p> <p>For the first year's monitoring, there is only short-term data for 2022 so it is not possible to compare to whole year data from 2019. We have therefore selected 2 weeks from April 2022 to compare with the matching weeks in 2019. 2019 was chosen as the baseline year due to the impacts of COVID-19 on traffic flow in 2020 and 2021. In these matching 2 weeks, the number of car trips increased by 4.5% in 2022 compared to 2019. Further analysis and information regarding the methodology can be found in the LTCP monitoring report that was provided to cabinet on 17 October 2023.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b></p> <p>There will be an increase in ANPR cameras but it is not currently planned that the ANPR data will be used to inform the car trip monitoring methodology. However, we are reviewing the opportunities to improve the sampling size of the car trip monitoring methodology and will consider whether ANPR data could be included as part of this work. Similarly we are working to refine and improve LTCP monitoring for next year's monitoring report and will explore whether there are opportunities for ANPR data to inform any of the other LTCP KPIs. I personally think it would be of benefit for as many of the ANPR cameras' data to be included and I will push for that.</p>
<p><b>28. COUNCILLOR BRAD BAINES</b></p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member for Finance outline how he intends to formally engage with the other Political Groups, who represent a majority of people in Oxfordshire, in the budget development process before the draft budget is consulted upon?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR DAN LEVY, CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE</b></p> <p>Thank-you for your question. Firstly, I should assure you that I am available for discussion at any time as are officers. Not only is this sensible, but the constitution requires that officers provide support to all members. Additionally, the constitution sets out that the shadow cabinet members also have the right to request private briefings from officers. There are a number of specific engagement opportunities and support already scheduled which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An additional report to cabinet on budget and business planning in November, setting out details of the budget pressures at an early stage.</li> <li>• An additional Performance and Corporate Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee in November to consider the above report.</li> <li>• Briefing from the Section 151 Officer on the budget for individual Groups</li> </ul>

	<p>in November and further briefings as necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fortnightly meetings with Group Leaders and Deputy Leaders with budget as standing item.</li> <li>• Corporate Directors to allocate sufficient resource and time with opposition groups.</li> <li>• Support from the Section 151 Officer and the Finance Team in producing budget amendments.</li> </ul>
<p><b>29. COUNCILLOR BRAD BAINES</b></p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member for Transport Management confirm the traffic volume, journey time and bus reliability impacts of the closure of the Botley Road on the Abingdon Road?</p> <p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY</b> I am glad that the Cabinet Member acknowledges the significant ongoing impact</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>We have seen an average increase in traffic flows on Abingdon Road of 9% at Folly bridge and nearly 18% South of Weirs Lane. This is based on the 2022 yearly average flow compared to the post Botley Rd closure average flow.</p> <p>Current running data indicates that bus services on Abingdon Road are on average 16.0% slower than in 2019, with these figures being 17.4% in the weekday pm peak and 17.7% at weekends. The following changes have been made as a result:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Addition of extra vehicle resources into services 300, X1 and X32</li> <li>2. Removal of Oxford station connection from service X2 and transfer to service X1</li> <li>3. Increase in running time and journey spacing on services ST1 and 46</li> <li>4. Splitting of service X32 to mitigate impact of Oxford traffic unreliability on Harwell Campus to Didcot services.</li> </ol> <p>As additional buses have been required to deliver the same level of service, significant costs have been incurred by the bus company as well as seeing the network becoming substantially less appealing due to the increased journey times that have resulted.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b> There is no question but that the scale of the project at Botley Road and the railway station causes disruption. It will be a wonderful project when it is finished delivering huge amenity and advantage to Oxford but you can't undertake a</p>

<p>of the severe ingestion for residents along the Abingdon Road. What are you going to do about it before autumn 2024?</p>	<p>project of that scale without causing disruption. The councillor will be aware that during the LTN debate at Cabinet that report contained a fairly significant list of mitigations that this Council is bringing forward specifically in order to facilitate public transport in the period between now and autumn 2024. But I absolutely look forward to engaging with him and all other colleagues on all other possible avenues that we can take. Some of them have been discussed today – the issue of school traffic is an absolutely live one. So let’s continue that discussion.</p>
<p><b>30. COUNCILLOR BRAD BAINES</b></p> <p>Residents in Iffley, particularly in Cavell Road, Iffley Turn and the Augustine Way estate are facing a parking nightmare with their residential streets being dominated by non-residents cars and commuters using the area as a free park and ride. Not only is this being extremely disruptive to local residents lives, it is also becoming dangerous. Can the Cabinet Member for Transport Management confirm when residents in Iffley can expect a formal consultation on a Controlled Parking Zone for their area?</p> <p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY</b></p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member confirm whether tackling problem parking and protecting residents’ parking is a priority for this administration and if so, why is the County Council not providing any additional directives to deliver funding for this purpose?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>Officers are aware of the increase in parking issues around Cavell Road and Iffley Turn and are currently working with Oxford City Council to secure Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding to bring forward any parking restriction changes and a CPZ to the Iffley area. Once funding has been secured, officers will be in a position to work with Members and present a design that addresses the concerns and parking issues raised in the local area.</p> <p>We understand that the local County Councillor is currently undertaking his own informal consultation with residents and will await to see how this feedback may inform the potential options for parking controls in the future.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b></p> <p>The question of funding is slightly complicated because some of it is provided by CIL contributions from the City Council. The policy is to roll out CPZs across the whole of the city and indeed elsewhere where appropriate in due course and the funding arrangements are in place to do that in a measured way.</p>
<p><b>31. COUNCILLOR MARK CHERRY</b></p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member for Transport</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>We are aware of the need to maintain Warwick Road. As you note this is on the</p>

<p>Management note the continued decline of parts of Warwick Road from Parklands to town centre as we come into autumn winter 2023/2024. Warwick is on the highway maintenance schedule for road resurfacing however another harsh winter will need major patching work if the road deteriorates further. Would Cllr Andrew Gant commit to resurfacing work taking place in 2024 on the Warwick Road as road conditions give me serious concerns for cyclists and all road commuters?</p> <p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY</b></p> <p>Would the Cabinet Member note with Warwick Road, by the time Milestone has finished their surveying of roads like Warwick Road that are in dire need of resurfacing, the cost has gone up substantially thus meaning that you haven't got the money to resurface? We need to find a way forward on this.</p>	<p>proposed forward programme for 2024-25 for carriageway structural maintenance. This will be confirmed in the following months and is subject to budgets being confirmed in February. The wider planned programmes for your constituency can be viewed on our planned capital highway maintenance portal at <a href="http://highway-iams.uk">Map (highway-iams.uk)</a> . Any defects identified posing a potential safety concern between now and the resurfacing work will be assessed and repaired, if needed, as part of our reactive works programme.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b></p> <p>You question says: would I commit to resurfacing work taking place in 2023/24? Operational decisions are not taken by me and it's quite right that they are not. I'm sure Council would not expect them to be. Those are matters for our officers and contractors who prioritise things according to need.</p>
<p><b>32. COUNCILLOR TRISH ELPHINSTONE</b></p> <p>What the position is for blue badge and carers exemptions for the ANPR camera on the Littlemore Road?</p> <p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY</b></p> <p>Across Oxfordshire there is a need for blue badges and carers to be included in the exemptions. I would like to know when they</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>As per the recommendations, approved at Cabinet Member Decisions in June 2023, blue badge holders and carers were not given exemptions through the proposed ANPR locations in Cowley. This is in line with the existing LTN bus gates on Bartholomew Road and Cornwallis Road in Cowley. As part of the East Oxford LTN decision, officers will be reviewing exemptions through LTN ANPR filters, particularly in relation to the implementation of trial traffic filters.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b></p> <p>All of these matters are kept permanently under review. I know that sounds like a go-to catch-all answer but it is true. Cabinet did make a commitment that the exemptions to the ANPR cameras in the LTNs would be kept under review –</p>

<p>are likely to be reviewed.</p>	<p>specifically in relation to the introduction of the traffic filters a year from now. That does not mean only then and it certainly does not commit to any particular outcome at that point but that is a commitment that we have made.</p>
<p><b>33. COUNCILLOR TED FENTON</b></p> <p>What alternatives to the Council’s website are there for residents, particularly the elderly or those with mobility difficulties, to make applications for such things as bus passes, blue badges etc.?</p> <p><b>SUPPLEMENTARY</b></p> <p>Does the Cabinet Member agree with me that the people applying for these services are the people least likely to be able to access digital services or possibly even get to a library and the more traditional methods perhaps ought to be concentrated on more for this kind of service than they would otherwise be.</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR NEIL FAWCETT, CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE SERVICES</b></p> <p>Thank you for this question, it was actually something I asked about in my first Cabinet Member briefing on the Customer Service Centre. It is vital that we maximise all the efficiencies we can from the digitisation of our services, but equally important that our services remain accessible to all our residents.</p> <p>Currently elderly customers or those who have mobility issues or those who are unable to use the Council website, are able to contact the Customer Service Centre, where a Customer Service Advisor will assist with or complete the application for Blue Badge, Concessionary Bus Passes and Parking Permits with them over the phone.</p> <p>At present 17 of our libraries spread across the County offer a validation service to assist customers who are unable to upload their documents or photos. Over the next 12 months we’re looking to roll out a ‘digital assist service’ that will provide an improved assisted service for those customers who most need our help.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b></p> <p>There are huge efficiencies to be gained from doing things via the website then by the phone, wherever that is possible and accessible but we always have to bear in mind there are those who will not find those routes easy and we always need to make sure that as many helpful alternatives are in place as possible.</p>

**Table for Question 6**

Service area	Oct 2021 - Sep 2022				Oct 2022 - Sep 2023			
	Average Headcount	number of leavers	Annual Turnover Rate	Average years of service	Average Headcount	number of leavers	Annual Turnover Rate	Average years of service
Casework Operations	34	13	38%	5.06	43.5	9	21%	4.59
Other SEND teams	246.5	50	20%	9.26	240	47	20%	9.95
SEND Service total	280.5	63	22%	8.69	283.5	56	20%	9.05