



PERFORMANCE & CORPORATE SERVICES OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the meeting held on Friday, 5 December 2025 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 1.29 pm.

Present:

Voting Members:

Councillor Glynis Phillips - in the Chair
Councillor Ian Middleton (Deputy Chair)
Councillor Brad Baines
Councillor Will Boucher-Giles
Councillor Laura Gordon
Councillor Tom Greenaway
Councillor Kieron Mallon
Councillor Roz Smith
Councillor Bethia Thomas

**Other Members in
Attendance:**

Cllr Liz Leffman, Leader of the Council
Cllr Kate Gregory, Cabinet Member for Public Health & Inequalities
Cllr Dan Levy, Cabinet Member for Finance, Property and Transformation
Cllr Andrew Gant, Cabinet Member for Transport Management

Officers:

Martin Reeves, Chief Executive
Kim Sawyer, Programme Director: Devolution
Ansaf Azhar, Director of Public Health
Paul Fermer, Director of Environment & Highways
Carys Alty, Head of Migration Policy and Partnership
Kate Holburn, Deputy Director of Public Health
Kathy Wilcox, Head of Corporate Finance
Matthew Timms, Team Leader (Engagement) – Highway Maintenance
Paul Wilson, Operations manager (Operations)
Phil Whitfield, Head of Network Management
Sam Read, Public Health Programme Manager
Sean Rooney, Head of Highway Maintenance and Road Safety
Tom Hudson, Scrutiny Manager

The Council considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting and decided as set out below. Except insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda and reports, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.

39/25 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

(Agenda No. 1)

Apologies were received from Cllr Shiri, substituted by Cllr Thomas, and from Cllr Ley, substituted by Cllr Gordon.

40/25 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

(Agenda No. 2)

There were none.

41/25 MINUTES

(Agenda No. 3)

The Committee **APPROVED** the minutes of the meeting held on 12 September 2025 as a true and accurate record.

42/25 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda No. 4)

There were none.

43/25 BUSINESS MANAGEMENT MONITORING REPORT - PUBLIC HEALTH

(Agenda No. 5)

Clr Kate Gregory, Cabinet Member for Public Health & Inequalities, Cllr Dan Levy, Cabinet Member for Finance, Property and Transformation, Ansa Azhar, Director of Public Health, Kathy Wilcox, Head of Corporate Finance, Kate Holburn, Deputy Director of Public Health, Sam Read, Public Health Programme Manager, and Carys Alty, Head of Migration Policy and Partnership, were invited to present a report on the Business Management Monitoring Report focusing on Public Health.

The Director of Public Health clarified that his remit included statutory public health, communities and asylum and migration. The report covered the ring-fenced public health grant budget and related functions including asylum, domestic abuse, and additional grants for drug, alcohol and smoking cessation. Performance across these areas was outlined, with amber-rated issues identified for discussion.

The Head of Corporate Finance reported that, as of October, there was no forecast variation for public health against a gross budget of just under £43 million, which included the £37 million ring-fenced public health grant and other grants such as domestic abuse and drug and alcohol treatment. An underspend of £0.9 million for 2024/25 had been transferred to the public health reserve, now totalling £4.6 million, with a forecast drawdown of £2.7 million for 2025/26. The scale of public health funding within the council's overall budget was emphasised.

The Deputy Director of Public Health introduced the children and young person's substance misuse service, describing it as a small team with dedicated workers in family centres. The service provided psychosocial interventions for prevention, early intervention, and treatment, supporting both young people using substances and

those affected by others' use. Interventions ranged from brief advice and drug diversion schemes to structured treatment, with clinical support rarely required. National reporting focused only on structured treatment, which represented just part of the service's work.

Victims of domestic abuse assessed for refuge accommodation were required to agree to the move, with decisions influenced by factors such as proximity to an ex-partner, children's schooling, or financial circumstances. Data on those declining a space existed and could be provided, with reasons often linked to personal and practical considerations.

The County Council had established a domestic abuse partnership with district councils, including a dedicated safe accommodation working group involving housing officers and service providers. This group met regularly to address challenges in securing suitable housing for families leaving refuge. Difficulties persisted, particularly for larger families and in finding appropriate move-on accommodation, sometimes resulting in families remaining in refuge longer than ideal and affecting the availability of spaces for new arrivals.

The 12-month health visiting check, a statutory requirement, had a local target of 87%, with Oxfordshire achieving around 84%. Performance had improved since the pandemic and was comparable to statistical neighbours. Including parents who declined or did not attend would raise the figure to 96%. Efforts continued to understand and address non-attendance, especially in deprived areas.

Smoking prevalence in Oxfordshire had fallen significantly to about 7.5%, down from 11%. The reduction was particularly notable among routine and manual workers, though rates remained high among people with mental health conditions. The ambition to become smoke-free by 2025 had been disrupted by the COVID-19 pandemic, but national legislation and targeted local strategies had supported the decline. Persistent high rates in some groups remained a focus for further work.

The council focused on three of the eight Marmot principles: best start in life, employment, and healthy standard of living. Work with the Institute of Health Equity had highlighted the need to address gaps, such as attainment for children on free school meals. While it was too early to specify financial implications, investment in tackling inequalities had already been made, with an aim to maintain momentum and partnership funding despite financial pressures.

The NHS health check programme operated on a five-year recall cycle, aiming to offer checks to 20% of the eligible population each year, with an 18% annual target. This approach ensured that all eligible adults would be offered a check over five years, with the target reflecting the recall system rather than an inability to reach certain groups.

The public health grant was ring-fenced and mainly spent on five mandated services, leaving little discretionary funding. The council's role included delivering statutory functions and influencing the broader health system. Additional NHS and partner resources were mobilised for prevention and tackling inequalities, such as through

Marmot Place and joint forums. Regular collaboration with NHS partners aimed to align budgets and strategies for maximum population impact.

Vaping played a positive role in helping routine manual workers quit smoking, but there was concern about young people starting to vape without prior smoking history. These were considered separate issues: vaping was beneficial for smoking cessation but problematic as an entry product for non-smokers, especially youth. National efforts were underway to regulate advertising and packaging, and local trading standards were also addressing the issue.

The next phase of work on Marmot Place principles involved engaging other council directorates and the wider health and care system. A cultural shift was required, but enthusiasm for Marmot principles was growing. The council was reviewing the social value aspect of contracts, with public health working alongside procurement teams to ensure a focus on health inequalities, including using contract social value to address local or service-related inequalities.

The national 10-year drug strategy had recently evolved its indicators, introducing a new “treatment progress” measure about 18 months prior. There was not yet a full year of data for 2023–24, hence the reported figure of zero for the proportion of opioid users in treatment making substantial progress. Data was expected to be released soon. Local drug and alcohol services performed very well nationally on successful completion rates.

Addressing health inequalities was a long-term goal, but the immediate focus was on engaging people with the concept, building a social movement, and ensuring staff were trained to consider health inequalities in their work. The Marmot principles provided an evidence-based lens for reviewing data and identifying local inequalities. By the end of the two-year programme, system-wide recommendations would be produced, with shared responsibility for delivery across all partners.

Preparations for a government move towards a sponsorship-focused approach for asylum seekers and refugees had included engagement with community sponsorship, but accommodation challenges in Oxfordshire had prevented some cases from proceeding. The Homes for Ukraine scheme was host-based with a specific financial system, but lessons would be considered for future plans. The council’s “council of sanctuary” status meant proactive support for migrants, using services like libraries, and the approach would continue to evolve as national policy changed.

The Committee **AGREED** to recommendations under the following headings:

- The committee recommended taking forward lessons learned from the Homes for Ukraine scheme to inform future approaches to asylum and immigration policy.
- They suggested a follow-up on the inequality agenda, requesting consolidated data and a progress update in about a year, recognising the work as ongoing.

- It was proposed to establish a clear timeline for agreeing common approaches and follow-up actions on Marmot principles across the system.
- The committee recommended adding targets related to vaping use, especially among people who had not previously smoked, to complement existing smoking reduction targets.

The Committee **AGREED** to the following action:

- The Deputy Director of Public Health to send over data concerning treatment progress 2024/25 drug data when available

44/25 DEVOLUTION

(Agenda No. 6)

Cllr Liz Leffman, Leader of the Council, Cllr Dan Levy, Cabinet Member for Finance, Property and Transformation, Martin Reeves, Chief Executive, Lorna Baxter, Executive Director of Resources and Section 151 Officer, and Kim Sawyer, Programme Director: Devolution, were invited to present a report on Devolution.

The Leader introduced the devolution agenda, outlining progress towards submitting an expression of interest to government for a Mayoral Strategic Authority (MSA) covering Oxfordshire and Berkshire. The region's economic significance and the need for a strategic approach to transport, energy, and water were highlighted, with regional collaboration seen as essential. All council leaders from Oxfordshire and Berkshire had expressed support, aiming to promote inclusive growth and improved opportunities for residents. Despite recent government announcements delaying devolution elections, the Leader recommended that preparations continue, including the establishment of a board to define regional priorities ahead of any mayoral election.

The Programme Director clarified the distinction between Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) and devolution. LGR involved consolidating county and district council services into unitary authorities to simplify governance and deliver daily services, such as children's and adults' services and waste collection. Devolution, by contrast, entailed the creation of new powers and the transfer of existing ones to a new regional body, a Mayoral Strategic Authority. The MSA's purpose would be to provide a strategic framework for the region, enabling investment and granting local control over funding decisions.

The Programme Director explained that the expression of interest served as an invitation to government to discuss how devolution might work for Oxfordshire, with the process still at an early stage. The MSA would focus on strategic growth, planning, transport, skills, and public sector reform, supporting the business ecosystem and improving infrastructure for residents. Oxfordshire's strong innovation ecosystem, where universities, entrepreneurs, and risk capital combined to drive growth, was cited as an example. The MSA would not deliver local services directly but would create an investment framework to support them, aiming to enable inclusive and sustainable regional growth.

Discussion turned to the absence of a list of councils in the report and expression of interest, with members seeking clarification on why councils were not explicitly mentioned and how this related to the membership of the devolution board. It was explained that the letter would be signed by the Leader, representing Oxfordshire, and the Leader of Bracknell Forest Council, Councillor Mary Temperton, representing Berkshire, rather than by all individual council leaders. The letter would refer to the Oxfordshire joint leaders and the equivalent Berkshire group, thereby covering all relevant councils.

Members enquired whether the Expression of Interest (EOI) would be amended in light of the government's recent announcement to postpone the first round of devolution. The Chief Executive responded that, as the EOI had already been substantially approved by various councils, there was a desire to avoid making material changes out of respect for those decisions. However, it was advised that, given the government's announcement, the EOI should still be submitted, and councils should proceed as if they were already acting as a strategic authority. Emphasis was placed on continuing cross-council collaboration and focusing on acting as a region in the spirit of devolution, rather than becoming preoccupied with the timing of mayoral elections.

Clarification was sought regarding the wordings of the recommendations to Scrutiny and Cabinet, where one referred to the "potential" benefits of an MSA, while the other used the term "substantial" benefits. Members questioned whether the use of "potential" indicated any reticence by the administration and whether the language could be made more positive. It was clarified that the recommendation had not yet come to Cabinet and therefore did not reflect the administration's final view. The point about consistency of language was acknowledged, and it was stated that this would be considered when the matter came before Cabinet, with an emphasis on ensuring clarity and alignment throughout the documents.

Concerns were expressed that some of the language in the expression of interest, such as references to economic decline and stagnation, appeared unnecessarily pessimistic. While it was important to highlight the risk of missed opportunities, members suggested the letter could be more optimistic and express greater confidence in local businesses and residents. In response, it was explained that there had been a decline in productivity since the pandemic, and the risk of businesses relocating if infrastructure and support were lacking was real. However, the importance of balancing the narrative was acknowledged, and feedback on the tone would be taken on board to ensure the message to government was both realistic and appropriately positive.

The committee considered how the public and councillors would be kept informed throughout the governance board process, especially given the open-ended timetable and the risk that uncertainty could undermine staff and business confidence. It was noted that the devolution board would likely meet in private, raising concerns about the sharing of minutes and ongoing communication. The process was not yet fully defined, but there was agreement on the importance of keeping everyone, particularly businesses and residents, updated on developments. A commitment was made to ensure regular and transparent communication as the process progressed.

The Committee **AGREED** to recommendations under the following headings:

- That the Leader seeks agreement from other Councils to list append a list of member councils at the bottom of the Expression of Interest letter to the Secretary of State and Cabinet amends its report to detail the names of Councils who will form the Devolution Board
- That the Cabinet amends its report to ensure consistency across the report and Expression of interest letter of the significant benefits accruing from devolution.
- That the Leader seeks clarity from partners over how stakeholders - including elected members, businesses, and the public – will be informed of outcomes and progress relating to devolution.
- That the Cabinet recognises the high degree of uncertainty within the devolution process for staff, businesses and other key stakeholders and commits to clarifying details as soon as they are announced.

The Committee adjourned for a short break at 11:23 and reconvened at 11:32.

45/25 PARKING PERMITS

(Agenda No. 7)

Cllr Andrew Gant, Cabinet Member for Transport Management, Paul Fermer, Director of Environment & Highways, and Phil Whitfield, Head of Network Management, were invited to present a report on Parking Permits.

The Cabinet Member opened the discussion on parking permits, noting that the committee had previously reviewed the issue in September and was now returning for a more substantive discussion. He explained that main parking permits had been digital for three years, with the visitor system moving online the previous December.

Paul Fermer and Phil Whitfield presented the item, highlighting that the report addressed all previously raised concerns, particularly the proposal to extend the current contract by two years. This extension would allow time for due diligence and a thorough procurement process for a new system. Improvements had already been made to the system based on committee and user feedback, focusing on user-friendliness and efficiency. Ongoing discussions aimed to review and challenge the system's performance, ensuring it met expectations for the remainder of the contract. Both officers stressed the importance of continuous improvement and responsiveness to user concerns.

Concerns were expressed about the Council's travel permit websites, which were described as unintuitive, text-heavy, and confusing in terms of login steps. Members questioned the use of email notifications instead of SMS and suggested that a more intuitive website would reduce the need for guides and drop-in sessions. Officers responded that improvements had been made based on feedback, but some limitations stemmed from integration with the main civil enforcement back-office system. While emails were currently used for notifications, the system's capabilities

and user experience remained under constant review. Officers confirmed that a more user-friendly system would be a priority in future procurement and that ongoing discussions aimed to address these issues for the remainder of the contract.

The possibility of shortening the contract extension for the digital permit system to one year, rather than two, was discussed. Officers explained that the contract allowed for a 1+1 year extension, so a shorter extension was possible. However, a longer extension would provide sufficient time for market engagement, encourage competition, and ensure a better system could be procured. Officers emphasised the need for due diligence and market engagement but confirmed that a shorter extension could be considered if circumstances allowed.

The removal of physical paper permits raised concerns about how residents could check if a vehicle's registration had a valid permit for the correct controlled parking zone (CPZ). Officers explained that, under the digital system, the public could check if a vehicle had a permit, but not whether it was valid for a specific CPZ, due to data protection (GDPR) considerations. Enforcement officers could be called to check permits, and officers indicated they would explore whether trusted community volunteers could be given special access to help address this issue.

Members requested data on the number of permits issued in each category, the number of paper scratch cards issued, ease of obtaining them, revenue generated, and the contract's cost or profit margin. Officers acknowledged these requests and committed to providing the details in the minutes or in writing after the meeting, ensuring councillors would receive the requested breakdowns and financial information for further scrutiny.

Risks associated with having two major systems, such as the parking permit system and another key service, delivered by the same provider were discussed. Officers noted that while there were risks in relying on a single provider, using one system could offer consistency for residents and avoid confusion. The balance between risk and user experience was acknowledged, and officers confirmed that these considerations were being managed as part of ongoing procurement and service delivery.

Clarification was sought on the breakdown of where Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) were being issued, as the report stated that 26% were issued in CPZ areas and 12% in contravention of shared bays, accounting for only 38% of the total. Officers committed to supplying the full breakdown in writing after the meeting to allow councillors to understand the distribution of PCNs across different categories and locations.

The extent to which the current software's capability was being fully utilised was questioned, with some criticisms attributed to either software limitations or the council's implementation. Officers responded that some issues had resulted from the council's implementation, and improvements had been made where possible. The software still had more potential, and the team was confident it could support additional or different permit types if required, though some architectural limitations remained.

Anecdotal evidence suggested that email enquiries about permits had decreased considerably and calls to the customer service centre were now being met within service level agreements, with the complexity of queries also reducing. Improvements in speed for visitor permits had led to more straightforward queries and fewer complaints. Officers noted that official statistics would be needed to confirm these trends and offered to provide figures after the meeting.

Members sought a statistical breakdown of the reasons for PCNs, noting that current reporting tools did not allow for detailed quantitative assessment and relied on qualitative information from enforcement officers. Officers explained that the system provided some breakdown, but its configuration limited the level of detail available, particularly for PCNs issued in CPZ areas. For future contracts, it would be possible to require a greater level of breakdown, such as using drop-down lists for enforcement officers to select reasons, improving data collection and reporting. Further information would be provided after the meeting.

GDPR's impact on residents' ability to check whether a vehicle was legitimately parked in a CPZ was discussed, as paper permits had been replaced by digital ones. Officers explained that, after consulting with data protection colleagues, the public did not have a legitimate need to access this information due to GDPR. However, options such as giving certain community volunteers access would be explored.

The procurement process was described as muddled and not joined up, with issues arising from different procurement timelines for the back-end database and the permit system. Officers explained that the congestion charge had not influenced the timing, and the permit system had always been planned to support traffic filters. Challenges became more apparent after the introduction of visitor permits, and the complexity of aligning multiple contracts and incremental extensions contributed to the lack of synchronisation.

Future procurement would prioritise customer interaction and usability, with officers endorsing the committee's recommendation to make quality a key criterion. Lessons learned indicated that quality, particularly user experience, should be prioritised over price, and the intention was to explore the market for better solutions to address current usability concerns.

The scheme's financial position was clarified, with the council aiming for a break-even point rather than generating a significant surplus. Income and costs were roughly balanced, with any revenue generated primarily used to cover operational costs.

Consideration of the application system in decision-making was questioned, given known complexities and potential difficulties. Officers rejected the suggestion that decisions were made knowing they would cause problems, emphasising that the move to a digital system was necessary as the previous paper-based approach was unsustainable. While difficulties existed, it was asserted that the system worked overall and decisions were not made to worsen known issues.

The Committee **AGREED** to recommendations under the following headings:

- Extend the current contract by one year instead of two.

- Involve committee members in reviewing the IT system to identify and resolve faults.
- Explore the potential for super users to check on CPZ permit areas.
- Review the timing and interaction of enforcement contracts, especially regarding resident impact.
- Ensure residents without email receive letters about permit expiry. Engage with GPs about their role in supporting unregistered carers.
- Prioritise quality over price in future procurements.
- Review and share quality measures for front-end software.
- Embed software decisions into policy design from the earliest stage.
- Revisit the CPZ and parking strategy.

The Committee **AGREED** to the following actions:

Written answer to questions raised by the Committee in relation to statistical breakdown of number of permits issued, type of permits issued, and the financial impact of the cost and revenue of the permit system.

46/25 FIXMYSTREET

(Agenda No. 8)

Clr Andrew Gant, Cabinet Member for Transport Management, Paul Fermer, Director of Environment and Highways, Sean Rooney, Head of Highway Maintenance and Road Safety, Paul Wilson, Operations manager (Operations), and Matthew Timms, Team Leader (Engagement) – Highway Maintenance, were invited to present a report on FixMyStreet.

The Head of Highway Maintenance and Road Safety introduced the FixMyStreet item, explaining that the platform enabled the public to report highway defects and issues, and had seen around 41,000 reports since January. While acknowledging the system's imperfections, he emphasised its role within a wider transformation programme aimed at improving customer experience, with several workstreams underway to address known issues. Ongoing collaboration with colleagues was highlighted, alongside recognition that not all users were satisfied with the service.

Reports from residents about submissions disappearing, allegedly due to a system "cleanse," were discussed. The Head of Highway Maintenance and Road Safety confirmed that a cleansing exercise had taken place, typically closing older reports that had been inspected multiple times or were no longer relevant. He clarified that closures could also occur if issues were moved to planned works or deemed not immediate safety concerns but acknowledged confusion over language and process.

The committee discussed the report's reference to "disproportionate reporting by high active users." Officers clarified that active reporting by residents was encouraged and valued, and that the phrase referred to data analysis for benchmarking and understanding usage patterns, not to discourage participation. The aim was to ensure satisfaction and usage statistics were interpreted in context, recognising that some individuals or areas might report more frequently.

The process and uptake of becoming a FixMyStreet super user were examined. Members noted that some individuals completed training but did not become active super users and requested figures on this. Officers indicated that the exact numbers would be checked and reported back, but noted a significant increase in super users, with around 220 across the authority. The need for clarity and improvement in the process and follow-up for trained super users was acknowledged.

Suggestions were made to authorise other authorities in the county to act as "super users" under Section 42 agreements, as Oxford's Street cleansing teams currently do. Officers explained that Oxford City Council's ODS operated under a legacy Section 42 agreement for maintaining unclassified roads, and that similar arrangements with other districts would require those authorities to approach the county. ODS used a slightly different version of the FixMyStreet platform, and any expansion of delegated reporting or inspection roles would depend on legal agreements and district willingness.

Cllr Mallon left the meeting at this stage.

The use of aerial mapping and the WhatThreeWords system to improve defect reporting accuracy was discussed. Officers confirmed that WhatThreeWords had been used for some time and was valuable for pinpointing locations. Ongoing work with the platform provider aimed to integrate new technologies, including mapping and geotagged photos, as part of broader efforts to enhance reporting accuracy and efficiency.

Concerns were raised about potholes being repaired multiple times, with specific examples cited. Officers acknowledged the issue, explaining that repeated repairs were sometimes necessary due to location, network usage, or the need for interim fixes before permanent solutions. Inspection rates had been increased, and different repair techniques were used depending on the situation to improve long-term outcomes.

The committee explored whether officers routinely assessed surrounding areas for additional safety-related defects when repairing known problems. Officers explained that a "find and fix" approach was used where appropriate, but repairs were prioritised based on risk and contractual criteria. Expanding the scope of repairs could impact efficiency and resources, and contractors were instructed to fix only those defects meeting intervention criteria.

A case was described where a resident's defect report was closed on FixMyStreet but resolved within 24 hours after calling the emergency line, highlighting a communications gap. Officers acknowledged the need for improved communication and stated that efforts were underway to enhance updates and explanations for

residents, including better use of FixMyStreet notifications and clearer messaging about report closures.

Cllr Thomas left the meeting at this stage.

The prioritisation process for FixMyStreet reports and reasons for delays before works were carried out were explained. Defects were triaged according to risk, with urgent hazards assigned a two-hour or 24-hour response, while most repairs fell under a 28-day contractual timeframe. Reports were inspected within ten days, and if marked for repair, the total turnaround could be up to 38 days. Not all reported defects qualified for immediate action, as repairs depended on intervention criteria and available resources.

The possibility of giving highways crews more latitude to fix additional defects noticed while on site was discussed. Officers responded that some flexibility existed for urgent or dangerous defects, but generally, crews were not given free rein due to resource constraints and risk-based policies. New methods and technologies were being explored to improve efficiency, and the contract allowed for some expansion in the size of repairs undertaken in a single visit.

Improvements to the process for submitting FixMyStreet tickets were considered, including requiring photos for certain categories. Officers explained that while photo submissions were encouraged, they could not be made mandatory for all categories due to safety concerns. Conditional requirements for photos could be explored for safer categories, and ongoing improvements were being considered, including digitalising inspection routes and enhancing communication with residents.

Cllr Baines left the meeting at this stage.

Concerns were raised about the frequency and quality of inspections, particularly in the city, and difficulties in training as a super user. Officers responded that Oxford Direct Services (ODS), under a Section 42 agreement, were responsible for inspections and maintenance in the city, working to county policies and specifications. Concerns were acknowledged and would be taken up with city colleagues, though performance monitoring of ODS was beyond the immediate remit of the meeting.

Communication with local councillors regarding major issues, such as flooding caused by a fractured county pipe, was discussed. Officers explained that ODS operated under county policies and inspection regimes, with performance managed through a legal agreement with the city. Officers agreed to follow up with city colleagues about monitoring ODS's performance and encouraged councillors to contact the head of service directly for major concerns. Specific issues would be taken away for further review and response.

The Committee **AGREED** to recommendations under the following headings:

- Explore greater "find and fix" powers, including considering a trial similar to Devon County Council's approach.

- Increase the percentage of works that are quality assured, reviewing the current 20% level.
- Set a target to increase the use of FixMyStreet as a reporting tool, as the current 25% usage was considered too low.
- Improve communication with the public about the criteria for pavement repairs, as residents often do not understand why some pavements are not fixed.
- Use FixMyStreet to update residents, especially regarding temporary repairs, and keep notifications active until permanent repairs are completed.
- Provide clarity on the process for becoming a trained super user and what happens after training.
- Consider requiring photos for certain categories of reports where it is safe and practical, to improve the quality of initial submissions.
- Consider marking additional defects with spray paint to show residents that issues have been noted, even if not immediately fixed.

47/25 COMMITTEE ACTION AND RECOMMENDATION TRACKER

(Agenda No. 9)

The Committee **NOTED** the action and recommendation tracker.

48/25 COMMITTEE FORWARD WORK PLAN

(Agenda No. 10)

The Committee **AGREED** to its work programme with the following amendments:

- To invite Adult Social Care to be the focus on the BMMR report in April
- To take a report on the new Social Value Policy after the budget in January

49/25 RESPONSES TO SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS

(Agenda No. 11)

The Committee **NOTED** the Cabinet responses to the Performance and Corporate Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee reports on the Oxfordshire Strategic Plan, Hire Bike and Scooters, and Our People and Culture.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing

