

CABINET

MINUTES of the meeting held on Tuesday, 29 January 2013 commencing at 2.00 pm and finishing at 4.10 pm.

Present:

Voting Members: Councillor Ian Hudspeth – in the Chair
Councillor Rodney Rose
Councillor Arash Fatemian
Councillor Nick Carter
Councillor Louise Chapman
Councillor Melinda Tilley
Councillor Hilary Hibbert-Biles
Councillor Mrs J. Heathcoat
Councillor Kieron Mallon

Other Members in Attendance: Councillor Zoe Patrick, (Agenda Item 6)
Councillor Alan Armitage, (Agenda Item 8)
Councillor Jenny Hannaby, (Agenda Items 10 and 11)

Officers:

Whole of meeting Joanna Simons (Chief Executive)

Part of Meeting

Item	Name
6	John Courouble, Corporate Policy Manager
7	Sue Scane, Assistant Chief Executive & Chief Finance Officer; Lorna Baxter, Deputy Chief Finance Officer
8	Huw Jones, Director for Environment & Economy; Tom Flanagan (Planning & Transport Policy)
9	Huw Jones, Director for Environment & Economy; Tom Flanagan (Planning & Transport Policy)
10	John Jackson, Director for Social & Community Services; Sara Livadeas, Deputy Director Joint Commissioning
11	Lucy Butler, Deputy Director, Adult Social Care
12	Alexandra Bailey, Research & Major Programmes Unit Manager
15	Sue Scane, Assistant Chief Executive & Chief Finance Officer; John Jackson, Director for Social & Community Services; Sara Livadeas, Deputy Director Joint Commissioning; Simon Kearey, Programme Manager

The Committee considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting, together with a schedule of addenda tabled at the meeting, and decided as set out below. Except insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda, reports and schedule, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.

1/13 MINUTES

(Agenda Item. 3)

2/13 QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS

(Agenda Item. 4)

Councillor Jean Fooks had given notice of the following question to Councillor Rodney Rose:

“The addenda to Cabinet on Dec 18th listed key announcements in the Chancellor’s Autumn Statement. Under capital investment, paragraph 18 mentioned an extra £1bn funding for the road programme and £42m for cycling infrastructure. There is also the Community Linking places fund and money for Improving Cycle Safety at junctions.

I should very much like to know what bids for cycling projects the County Council has made to these funds – which projects were successful and which might be on the long list for which extra money was announced on November 28th 2012?

Please can you give me the details?”

Councillor Rose replied:

“We have bid to the DfT Cycle Safety Fund for a scheme in the Wotton Road area of Abingdon, one of the main objectives being the need to reduce casualties at this location. The scheme value is just over £300,000. At present, there are no further bids planned for purely cycling schemes, as we are focusing resources on securing investment for larger infrastructure projects, for example from the national pinch-points funding programme.

The extra £1bn that was announced in the Autumn Statement was mostly allocated to a small number of large national trunk road schemes (none of which are in Oxfordshire or neighbouring areas), but some of it is funding the Local Pinch Point Fund, for which we are preparing a bid for converting Milton Interchange into a “hamburger” design.

Although “extra” funds were allocated for cycling infrastructure in the statement part of this appears to be through additional funding being made for the Local Sustainable Transport Fund and part through making funding available to match fund private initiatives to which the County Council is not eligible to bid.”

Supplementary: Councillor Jean Fooks found the answer disappointing and asked whether it was not thought a good idea to apply for all possible funding from central government to give greater priority to cycle safety. Councillor Rose replied that they were applying for all possible funding but with the proviso that it did not affect the effectiveness of the highway network for all users. Careful consideration was also needed where funding required match funding.

Councillor John Goddard had given notice of the following question to Councillor Rodney Rose:

“Today’s papers for Cabinet rightly give prominence to transport policy and improvements but there is a an ominous silence on the A40 between Witney and Oxford, the previously mentioned link between the A40 and the A44 just west of the Wolvercote roundabout and the consequent reduction of overload on that dangerous and accident-prone roundabout.

Will the Cabinet member explain what priority he will give to obtaining funding for this link and its early implementation as an essential part of any strategic plan for transport improvement in the county?”

Councillor Rose replied:

“The problems on the A40 west of Oxford and as it passes through North Oxford are recognised as among the most serious transport problems that we need to deal with in order to unlock the potential of the Oxfordshire economy and protect the county’s environment. However the solutions to these problems are going to be extremely expensive and the opportunities to bid for funding to solve them are likely to be scarce. The A40-A44 link has been included as part of the county’s City Deal bid and we will continue to look for appropriate means to fund these schemes. In the meantime, as part of the review of the Local Transport Plan planned for this year our intention is to produce a document which centres on a clear, justified, costed and prioritised picture of the infrastructure needs of the county which will place us in a better place to take advantage of future funding opportunities.”

Supplementary: Councillor Goddard expressed thanks that the seriousness of the problem was recognised and asked whether in view of that whether Councillor Rose would give it priority in the forthcoming review to ensure it was carried out in his time in office. Councillor Rose replied that there could be no guarantees but that he was doing what he could and it was high on the list of priorities.

Councillor Roz Smith had given notice of the following question to Councillor Rodney Rose:

“As you know London Road, Headington, is the major approach road into Oxford City from London and experiences a very high volume of traffic. The road surface is in an appalling state and drainage problems are experienced during heavy rain. Could the cabinet member consider bringing forward plans to alleviate the drainage problems and improvements to the road surface from the centre of Headington upto the Green Road roundabout?”

Councillor Rose replied:

“A scheme is planned for London Road, Headington for 2014/15. This is a combination scheme whereby Improvement to bus lane widening (from the Policy & Strategy Unit) and carriageway resurfacing (Asset Management) will

take place. Both teams have been liaising to find the optimum time to carry out the works and some temporary patching has been necessary pending the official start date that seeks to minimise disruption by combining the two elements of work.

The current programme anticipates that utility diversion works will commence in January 2014 and the bus lane widening and full-depth reconstruction works will follow in April 2014. It is not possible to bring this forward from the date due to the need to liaise with the utility companies and complexities involved with a combined delivery which is satisfying two differing needs.”

Supplementary: Councillor Smith was disappointed in the answer and added that buses were avoiding the bus lane as it was crumbling. The surface drainage in the completed section was poor and had yet to be put right. She invited Councillor Rose to undertake a site visit with her and asked whether he would consider bringing forward remedial work to the completed section. Councillor Rose indicated that he would consider the request.

Councillor Susanna Pressel had given notice of the following question to Councillor Rodney Rose:

“Highway maintenance -- Please can you tell me how you can possibly justify dividing the money available for day-to-day highway maintenance equally between the five districts? Surely the money should be allocated according to *need*? We must look at the *number* of buses, pedestrians, cars, cyclists and other road and pavement users, since this dictates the level of wear and tear. Some of the roads and pavements in my division (and of course elsewhere in the City) are in a disgraceful state, especially some sections of the most heavily used bus lanes. Will you please stop being so blatantly unfair in your allocation of the available budget?”

Councillor Rose replied:

“The County allocates the day-to-day highways maintenance money for the classified network (A, B & C roads) based on road length within the county. The unclassified road network (all other adopted roads) forms approximately 5.5% of the county’s total road network (based on roads length) which receives an allocation based on this fact. The City Council chooses to undertake the Section 42 responsibilities and 6% (5.5% rounded up for the unclassified network) is paid directly to the City Council for the unclassified network, and they have total discretion in how to spend this on the unclassified network.

In addition to the day-to-day highways maintenance budget, the County receives a capital allocation grant that is prioritised by need on the total network and delivered via the Structural Maintenance programme, as do all other districts. The City Council provides a list of non-classified road schemes (footways and carriageways) to the County for consideration each year and receives funds for these (which varies from year to year dependent on countywide needs factors). The County also provides the 6% of the

surface dressing capital allocation to the City Council which is assessed and prioritised by the City Council engineers.”

Supplementary: Councillor Pressel commented that her question had not been answered and queried why no account was taken of the length of footway as well as roads. Councillor Rose replied that Councillor Pressel should be speaking to the City Council who had Section 42 responsibility for the unclassified network. If the City Council chose it could relinquish its responsibilities for this work.

Councillor John Sanders had given notice of the following question to Councillor Rodney Rose:

"If the LTB is to be comprised of members of the ruling party, what measures does the cabinet propose to ensure adequate scrutiny of its decisions by opposition party representatives?"

Councillor Rose replied:

“The Assurance Framework appended to the report sets out the intention for the work of the Local Transport Board (LTB) to be as open and transparent as possible. I would particularly refer Cllr Sanders to clauses 16-17 and 21-23. The proposal is to establish the LTB under the auspices of the Spatial Planning & Infrastructure Partnership (SPIP) whose work is currently scrutinised by the Growth & Infrastructure Scrutiny Committee on which opposition councillors are well represented. As Cllr Sanders is aware there is a Corporate Governance Review underway and he is at liberty to make suggestions as to how the scrutiny function should operate going forward and I look forward to hearing his proposals.”

Councillor Gill Sanders had given notice of the following question to Councillor Arash Fatemian:

“Could the Cabinet Member for Adult Services please assure me that they he will monitor carefully the impact of the proposed increases to day centre charges and, if the figures show a significant fall in the numbers of people attending the centres, will he be prepared to review any decisions on increases that the Cabinet may make today?”

Councillor Fatemian replied:

“I have already given a commitment that we will monitor closely the use of the centres. If there are any significant changes then we will consider carefully what we shall do in response. Any proposals will come forward for consideration by members.”

Supplementary: Councillor Gill Sanders asked for and received an assurance from the Cabinet Member that he would give frequent updates to the Scrutiny Committee and Cabinet on the numbers using Day Centres after the increases and on any issues of viability due to a fall off in numbers.

3/13 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda Item. 5)

The following requests to speak had been agreed by the Chairman

Item 6 – Councillor Zoe Patrick, Opposition Leader

Item 8 – Councillor Alan Armitage, Opposition Deputy Leader

Item 10 - Councillor Jenny Hannaby, Shadow Cabinet Member for Adult Services

Item 11 – Councillor Jenny Hannaby, Shadow Cabinet Member for Adult Services

4/13 OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL CORPORATE PLAN 2013/14 - 2017/18

(Agenda Item. 6)

Cabinet considered a draft of the Corporate Plan for 2013/4-2017/18 together with a report that provided the detail of what changes had been made to the Plan in this edition.

Councillor Zoe Patrick, Opposition Leader, commented that the Corporate Plan was a chance for the Leader to make his mark and highlighted and commented on a number of aspects in the Plan. In particular she referred to the Leader's reference to Thriving Families where examples of its impact would be helpful; the need to address problems on the A34; that she felt there was little evidence of progress on improving skills; and that in welcoming the close working on bus transport she noted the lack of an Oyster type card.

The Leader in introducing the contents of the Plan responded to the points made. He stated that in this his first Plan he had not wanted a major overhaul. On the A34 he indicated that he had worked with the City Council to include improvements in the City Deal bid. With regard to public transport there was a lot going on in relation to the rail network. Now that the technology was capable he was keen to support the introduction of an Oyster type card going forward.

RESOLVED: to approve the draft Corporate Plan going before Council on 19 February 2013.

At this point Cabinet agreed to vary the order of the agenda to take the next two items before the Service & Resource Planning report.

5/13 CARE HOMES FEES

(Agenda Item. 10)

The Council has a statutory duty to make arrangements for persons aged 18 or over who it assesses are in need of care and attention which is not otherwise available to them. Consequently the Council pays for approximately 1,700 older people in care homes for older people at any one time, at a cost of circa £48m per annum. Each year we set a rate for care home fees Cabinet considered a report that proposed that the Banding System for Care Home Fees in Oxfordshire be simplified.

Councillor Jenny Hannaby, Shadow Cabinet Member for Adult Services, stated that at the last review when there had been a reduction in fees concerns had been expressed at the Scrutiny Committee about the possible impact on the quality and viability of homes and on the quality of nursing and care. She welcomed the current review and the efforts to consult providers. She noted the disappointment of officers at the lack of response to the consultation and queried whether this was either a lack of interest in what was being offered by the Council or a feeling that their views would not be taken on board. Councillor Hannaby expressed concern that Homes would top up their income from self funders. She referred to the letter from OCA that expressed the concerns she also had.

Responding to questions from Cabinet Members Councillor Hannaby clarified that she was not saying that self funders should be subsidised but rather that a business would need to cover its costs and someone would pick up the slack and that this could be the self funders. She could not confirm that the Liberal Democrat would pay more indicating that they were putting their budget proposals together.

Councillor Fatemian, introduced the contents of the report emphasising that extensive work had been undertaken to come to a robust answer. He noted that through out the country self funders pay more than local authority users. He accepted that care homes needed to make a profit and that they kept a close eye on homes; overall Oxfordshire care homes were financially healthy. He expressed disappointment that more care homes did not take part in the consultation. They did not engage and did not share data. The model used was based on the National model and he proposed the recommendation to Cabinet as the right solution for Oxfordshire.

John Jackson, Director for Social and Community Services, detailed the contents of the report. He explained that the report set out a number of factors that had been considered including the results of the consultation. He highlighted the issues and key points set out in the report. These included:

(1) The Council had received very limited information from only 5 providers. As a result there is not sufficient information to justify the significant increase that providers are seeking.

(2) The County Council's service and resource planning process had identified that there were significant pressures on the older people's budget. As a result there is a need to focus resources for the benefit of an increasing number of vulnerable people. Increasing spending on care home services goes against the Council's stated business strategy for the future.

(3) A legal case last year suggested that local councils could take into account the availability of resources when determining the outcome of a price review and given the financial pressures that the Council faces and will face in the future it is believed that increasing spending in this service area for 2012/13 beyond the increased expenditure this year is unsustainable.

(4) However these are clearly challenging times for both providers and purchasers and it is important to the council to make sure that there is a sufficient provision to meet existing and increased future service demands.

(5) Two possible models have been considered but whatever cost model is used the resulting figure generated is only an aid to discussion. This is why there are discussions with providers for each placement to agree the precise figure that will be paid.

(6) Of the two models on balance the ADASS model is preferable as it offers a cost of capital that reflects the council's market view of no growth. The council has used the ADASS model with a £6.70 hourly rate to arrive at a weekly residential cost of £452. The Funded Nursing Care element is then applied to arrive at a Nursing Rate of £560. These are the banding rates included in the recommendations.

(7) The Service and Community Impact Assessment explained how the impact of any decision to increase care home fees was the least worst option because the impact of making savings elsewhere would have a more detrimental impact on the protected groups.

John Jackson referred to a letter sent by Mr George Tuthill, Chairman, Oxfordshire Carehomes Association to members of the Cabinet. He commented that Mr Tuthill referred to the amount that the Council pay to the Orders of St. John. Officers did not believe that this was comparable information. The Oxfordshire Care Partnership took over the responsibility of the former County Council homes knowing that very significant capital investment would be required to bring these homes up to an acceptable standard. This is reflected in the bed price that is paid.

RESOLVED: that in view of the information considered:

(a) for 2012/13 and for Care Home Placements in Oxfordshire to:

1. Confirm the 3% uplift agreed as an interim payment for all existing placements in care homes from April 2012.
2. Confirm the 3% uplift agreed as an interim payment for all new placements in care homes from April 2012.

- (b) for 2013/14 to:
- Revise our Target banding Rates from April 2013 and
 - (i). Delete the Residential-Substantial Target Banding Rate
 - (ii). Increase the Target Banding rate for the Residential-Extensive Specialist Category to £452 per week for new placements.
 - (iii). Increase all existing weekly Residential payment rates that are currently paid below £452 per week to £452 per week
 - (iv). Delete the Nursing - Substantial Target Banding Rate
 - (v). Increase the Nursing-Extensive Target Banding Rate to £560 per week
 - (vi). Increase all existing weekly Nursing Extensive and Substantial rates that are currently below £560 per week to £560 per week.
 - (vii). Retain the Nursing-Specialist Target Banding Rate at £630 per week
 - (viii). Continue to use these rates as a guide to secure a care home placement at a funding level as close to the Target Banding Rate as possible.
 - (ix). The above to apply from April 2013 and for care home placements in Oxfordshire.
- (c) to consult the care home providers in Oxfordshire on the above points (b) (i)-(ix); and
- (d) to review the Equality Impact Assessment once the outcome of the consultation is known. Fee setting is a function to which section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 applies, and the Equality Impact Assessment is the method by which the Council will have due regard to the needs set out in section 149.

6/13 DAY OPPORTUNITIES AND TRANSPORT CHARGING MODEL

(Agenda Item. 11)

Cabinet considered a report that provided details of the consultation that took place on day opportunities and the transport charging model; it included who took part, stakeholder feedback, comments and suggestions. The report gave a financial summary of the implications of the proposals and set out recommendations with regards to the proposed increases of charges.

Councillor Jenny Hannaby, Shadow Cabinet Member for Adult Services, expressed her great disappointment at the proposals which dealt with the most vulnerable people. The health & wellbeing centres and day centres provided a real feeling of community with companionship, skills training, and health and wellbeing benefits. She highlighted the Social and Community Impact assessment which noted concerns with rising prices. The prices people would pay would be higher as they did not include lunch and there would be a reduced 3 hour day which was disappointing.

Councillor Fatemian, introduced the report and stressed his total, resolute and unwavering commitment to day care services. He was in no way considering privatisation over the course of the Service & Resource Plan. The most vulnerable people received support through personal budgets and anyone struggling should contact the Social & Community Services Directorate. He accepted that any price increase needed to be carefully considered but pointed out that the charges had not been increased for so long that he could find no record of any increase. Councillor Fatemian referred to the extensive consultation process thanking all those that took part. There was a good response rate and over two thirds of respondents said that they would continue to attend and a majority would not reduce the numbers of times they attended. He added that even with the increase in charges there was a 50% subsidy for attendance and 75% for transport. He had taken on board requests to phase the increase.

During discussion Cabinet noted the impressive number of respondents and that the consultation had highlighted how valuable these services were. People had recognised the need for increases but had been afraid of it going up immediately and this fear had been addressed.

Councillor Carter commented on the need to monitor centres that were within Oxfordshire but administered outside to ensure that there was some degree of comparability.

RESOLVED: to approve the proposals set out in paragraphs 53 and 54 of the report.

7/13 BUSINESS STRATEGY AND SERVICE & RESOURCE PLANNING REPORT FOR 2013/14 - 2017/18 - JANUARY 2013

(Agenda Item. 7)

Cabinet considered the final report in the series on the service & resource planning process for 2013/14 to 2016/17. It provided information on budget issues for 2013/14 and the medium term. The report set out the latest information on the Council's financial position, including the treasury management strategy for 2013/14 and an updated capital programme.

Cabinet also considered: a report by the Leader of the Council which set out the basis for the Cabinet's proposals and an addenda by the Assistant Chief Executive & Chief Finance Officer on the collection rate.

During discussion Cabinet noted that there was still uncertainty and that information was still to be received from central government. Cabinet thanked Sue Scane, Lorna Baxter and the Finance Team for their work during a difficult and challenging process. The Leader also thanked Councillor Charles Shouler who before ill health had been Cabinet Member for Finance and had done a lot of preparatory period during that period.

RESOLVED: to:

- (a) (in respect of revenue) **RECOMMEND** Council to approve:
- (1) a budget for 2013/14 and a medium term plan to 2016/17, based on the proposals set out by the Leader of the Council;
 - (2) a council tax requirement (precept) for 2013/14;
 - (3) a council tax for band D equivalent properties;
 - (4) virement arrangements to operate within the approved budget;
- (b) (in respect of treasury management) **RECOMMEND** Council to approve:
- (1) the Treasury Management Strategy Statement ;
 - (2) that any further changes required to the 2013/14 strategy be delegated to the Chief Finance Officer in consultation with the Leader of the Council.
- (c) **RECOMMEND** Council to approve the Prudential Indicators as set out in Appendix A of Annex 7.
- (d) **RECOMMEND** Council to approve the Minimum Revenue Provision Methodology Statement as set out in Appendix B of Annex 7.
- (e) (in respect of capital) **RECOMMEND** Council to approve:
- (1) the updated Capital Strategy, Corporate Asset Management Plan and Transport Asset Management Plan;
 - (2) a Capital Programme for 2012/13 to 2016/17; and
- (f) delegate authority to the Leader of the Council, following consultation with the Chief Finance Officer, to make appropriate changes to the proposed budget.

8/13 FUTURE DEVOLVED GOVERNANCE: LOCAL TRANSPORT BOARD

(Agenda Item. 8)

Cabinet considered a report that detailed proposals from the Department of Transport to devolve local major scheme funding to functional economic areas and the requirement to establish a Local Transport Board with a detailed Assurance Framework, that set out the governance and working arrangements, to manage the capital grant that will be received should the County Council opt to become the accountable body.

Councillor Alan Armitage, Opposition Deputy Leader, welcomed the proposals if they were a manifestation of localism and commented that it was sensible and desirable to dovetail local plans. He agreed with specific recommendations about the role of the Spatial Planning & Infrastructure Partnership Board (SPIP), the County Council as accountable body and as the legal body. However he felt that there was a gap in terms of democratic

transparency and scrutiny and suggested that this was best filled by the Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor Rose replied that that was something that would need to be looked at. In moving the recommendations Councillor Rose that it was the start of an interesting and fruitful journey that would bring in additional funding.

RESOLVED: to approve the following:

- (a) that the County Council supports the proposal to devolve the funding of local major schemes and facilitates the creation of a Local Transport Board under the auspices of the SPIP Board.
- (b) the County Council seeks views on the Assurance Framework set out in the Annex from District Councils, the Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership, the SEMLEP, Network Rail, Highways Agency and the public transport operators;
- (c) that the Director of Environment & Economy, in consultation with the Deputy Leader, be authorised to develop the Scheme Prioritisation Process and progress the Assurance Framework to completion for submission to the Department of Transport in accordance with their timetable in consultation with the Section 151 and Monitoring Officer.

9/13 SOUTH WEST BICESTER NEW PRIMARY SCHOOL - FUNDING AGREEMENT

(Agenda Item. 9)

Cabinet considered a report that sought approval to authorise officers to enter into a funding agreement with the Diocese of Oxford for their direct delivery of the school construction project and enables transfer in stages of a maximum capital grant of £6.664m from S106 resources forward funded from the Council's capital programme reserve, having deducted any direct costs incurred by the County Council in supporting delivery of the project.

RESOLVED: to:

- (a) authorise the Director of Environment & Economy to enter into a funding agreement with the Diocese of Oxford which enables transfer in stages of a maximum capital grant of £6.664m; and
- (b) transfer (in accordance with such funding agreement) funds from developer contributions forward funded from the Capital Programme reserve, having deducted any direct costs incurred by the County Council in supporting delivery of the project.

10/13 EQUALITY POLICY 2012-17: ANNUAL UPDATE

(Agenda Item. 12)

Cabinet considered a report that set out the Council's progress in the first year of the 'Equality Policy 2012-2017'. There is also a legal obligation to regularly provide information about actual or potential users and the annex detailed new information about the people of Oxfordshire from the 2011 Census.

RESOLVED: to

- (a) accept the first update on the 'Equality Policy 2012-2017'; and
- (b) agree to the adjustment of the reporting timetable for future updates on the 'Equality Policy 2012-2017'

11/13 FORWARD PLAN AND FUTURE BUSINESS

(Agenda Item. 13)

The Cabinet considered a list of items for the immediately forthcoming meetings of the Cabinet together with changes and additions set out in the schedule of addenda.

RESOLVED: to note the items currently identified for forthcoming meetings.

12/13 DELEGATED POWERS OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE - JANUARY 2013

(Agenda Item. 14)

RESOLVED: to note executive decisions taken by the Chief Executive under the specific powers and functions delegated to her under the terms of Part 7.4 of the Council's Constitution - Paragraph 1(A)(c)(i).

13/13 EXEMPT ITEM

RESOLVED: that the public be excluded for the duration of item 13 in the Agenda since it is likely that if they were present during that item there would be disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) and specified in relation to that item in the Agenda and it is considered that, in all the circumstances of each case, the public interest in exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

PUBLIC SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS FOLLOWING THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

14/13 DEVELOPING THE PROJECT AGREEMENT WITH THE OXFORDSHIRE CARE PARTNERSHIP

(Agenda Item. 15)

The information contained in the report and annexes is exempt in that it falls within the following prescribed category:

3 – information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)

It is considered that in this case the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information, in that such disclosure would distort the proper process of free negotiations between the authority with another party for the purposes described and would prejudice the position of the authority in those negotiations and other negotiations of a similar nature in future.

Cabinet considered a report that set out proposals for developments in the relationship that the Council has with the Oxfordshire Care Partnership for the provision of services for the care and support of older people in Oxfordshire. Meeting recent challenges required some revision of the Project Agreement so that the Partnership continued to have a secure basis from which to operate therefore ensuring the contract remained viable. The report summarised the proposed revisions to the Agreement and the service developments that will be supported by these changes.

Cabinet agreed the proposed revisions and service developments as set out in the exempt report.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing