CABINET

MINUTES of the meeting held on Tuesday, 19 June 2018 commencing at 2.00 pm and finishing at 4.05 pm

Present:

Voting Members:	Councillor Ian Hudspeth – in the Chair Councillor Mrs Judith Heathcoat Councillor Lawrie Stratford Councillor Steve Harrod Councillor Lorraine Lindsay-Gale Councillor Yvonne Constance OBE Councillor David Bartholomew Councillor Hilary Hibbert-Biles Councillor Mark Gray
Other Members in Attendance:	Councillor Liz Brighouse (Agenda Item 10) Councillor John Howson (Agenda Item 7) Councillor Glynis Phillips (Agenda Item 6 & 8) Councillor Laura Price (Agenda Item 10) Councillor John Sanders (Agenda Item 9) Councillor Emma Turnbull (Agenda Item 7) Councillor Michael Waine (Agenda Item 7) Councillor

Officers:

Whole of meeting	Nick Graham, Director of Law & Governance; Sue Whitehead (Resources Directorate)
Part of meeting	
Item	Name
6	Katy Jurczyszyn, Strategic Finance Manager (Strat and Mon)
7	Lucy Butler, Director for Children's Services; Neil Darlington, Admissions and Transport Services Manager,
8	Lucy Butler, Director for Children's Services; Debbie Rouget, Early Years Sufficiency and Access Service
9	Peter Day, Minerals & Waste Policy Team Leader
10	Sam Shepherd, Senior Policy Officer

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

57/18 MINUTES

(Agenda Item. 3)

The Minutes of the meetings held on 22 May and 4 June 2018 were approved and signed as a correct record.

On a point of information Councillor Bartholomew referred to reference to Clause 5.5 in the preamble to minute 56/18. Subsequent discussion with Nick Graham following the meeting had clarified that the Clause was correct and would not be re-drafted. Nick Graham confirmed that reference to Chief Executive in that Clause was correct rather than employee as s113 agreements allowed the loaning of staff. He confirmed that if the arrangement was ended the Chief Executive would revert to the originating authority.

58/18 QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS

(Agenda Item. 4)

Question received for the meeting on 22 May 2018.

At Cabinet, the following question was submitted to the meeting on 22 May and in error was not processed. Cabinet agreed that the question and response be included in the addenda for the next meeting

Councillor Howson had given notice of the following question to Councillor Hibbert-Biles:

"In reply to a question posed at Cabinet on 17th June 2014 about whether the then Cabinet member would make representations to the regional school commissioner and Ofsted as to the very high non-attendance at St. Gregory the Great School, the then cabinet member replied that the School Improvement officer had been sent into the school to try and establish the underlying cause of the high absence rate. She had further requested that an analysis of poor attendance be undertaken on a class by class and year by year basis. This has been successful in improving attendance in the past. Should this not improve attendance, she would then consider contacting Ofsted?

Can the current cabinet member offer any explanation as to why this school, now an academy, should have had the worst attendance figures for any school in Oxfordshire for the autumn term of 2017 despite being declared 'inadequate' by Ofsted during the previous school year and the actions following on from my earlier question?"

Councillor Hibbert-Biles replied:

"Trish Murphy is the allocated school liaison officer for the County Attendance team and started in her role in December 2017. She was allocated St Gregory the Great, by Jo Goodey, the new interim Education Inclusion Manager at a time which coincided with the Ofsted report.

Trish has been into the school on three occasions, the first being with Rachael Etheridge on the 27th February 18 to meet with Elizabeth Lutzeier and Anita Whyte. This meeting was delayed for various reasons including other county representatives going into the school. Since then Trish has repeatedly tried to go into the school on several occasions, twice the school have cancelled the meeting prompting further delay.

Trish visited the school on the 9th May shadowing the LCSS link worker identified for the school. Trish again visited on 23rd May and met with Anita to go over the school attendance, there is showing some improvement with attendance and new systems are in place to track attendance and behaviour within the school. Fixed term exclusions are starting to come down which is having a positive impact on PA's.

Weekly attendance reports are now being produced for the Head of Years to have a better oversight of the students, Trish reports that the school seem to be offering more support to students.

The County Attendance team continue to receive referrals from St Greg's. There are some signs of improvement in attendance, the school were set an initial target of 91% by Rachael Etheridge, they are currently at 90.7% according to the data.

Clearly efforts have been impacted on by the struggle to get into the school, Trish has been asked to wait for the exams to finish before going into the school again.

David Clarke, new Deputy Director for Education contacted the RSC office to raise this issue with them and they are very much aware of this and other issues. Following the recent Ofsted monitoring visit this has now been raised at Ministerial level. Regular meetings have been established at the school to monitor progress being made. The first took place in May and the next meeting is next week. David has asked to be invited to these and future meetings to be able to represent our concerns especially in relation to attendance and gain a greater understanding of how we could hold the school and system to greater challenge in order for the outcomes to improve. The RSC officer further explained that the school is in the process of being merged with another Multi Academy Trust but this is still in the discussion phase."

Supplementary: Councillor Howson stated that he had met with governors and understood attendance was improving. However, given the importance of the issues involved including safeguarding he asked that everything possible be done to ensure the figures continued to improve. Councillor Hibbert-Biles replied that officers including the new Deputy Director would be visiting the school regularly. Recently the Government had recognised the difficulties Local Education Authorities had in asserting authority over academy schools but she was pleased to say that the Council had a good rapport with the school.

Questions received for meeting on 19 June 2018

Councillor Howson had given notice of the following question to Councillor Lindsay-Gale:

"In the last 2 Property Data Survey Condition reports to the DfE what Grades were assigned to Northfield School in each survey and when were the returns sent to the government?"

Councillor Lindsay-Gale replied:

The PDS condition surveys were initiated by DfS in response to Michael Gove's request to establish the public-sector liability in terms of managing the education estate. They were undertaken by private technical advisors employed by DfS.

OCC did not participate and submit these PDS Condition Survey reports to DfS. We also do not have these reports in our possession or have access to any such reports on Northfields.

We do have our own condition surveys with the last one being undertaken earlier this year, this has been the basis of current action on the Northfield site.

These surveys were organised and run by the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) (Condition Data Collection programme: information and guidance - GOV.UK; https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/property-data-survey-programme), we are not aware that OCC provided condition data to any third party.

Supplementary: Responding to concern that the County Council had not taken part in the DfS initiated surveys and asking what condition had been assigned to Northfield School under our own survey Councillor Lindsay-Gale explained that the survey that had been carried out for us under the previous contract had not been good enough. The Council was still investigating and councillors would be kept informed.

Councillor Phillips had given notice of the following question to Councillor Constance:

"Oxford City -Controlled Parking Zones - Future Programme.

I welcome your decision on 7 June to include Sandhills and Risinghurst in the list of areas assigned priority 2 status for Controlled Parking Zones consultations. Would it be possible to publish the timetable for this programme given the limited budget and capacity within the Directorate to manage this programme?"

Councillor Constance replied:

“Following the approval of the CPZ priorities on 7 June officers are developing a programme for all the new zones. Implementing CPZs involves a number of different teams across the council and their input will be required to identify a deliverable programme. The intention is to publish the programme in late June or early July. Local members will be kept informed and will be sent the proposed programme before it is published.”

Supplementary: Councillor Constance responding to a further question confirmed that she expected to be the decision maker.

Councillor Phillips had given notice of the following question to Councillor Constance:

'Oxfordshire Growth Deal

At the last Oxford City Localities meeting on 24 May we were briefed on the emerging development sites for Growth Deal investment.

I was pleased to see that the Collinwood Road Crossing in Risinghurst was included in this list. As you know the crossing is required to provide a safe route for pedestrians and cyclists across the A40 dual carriageways. However, it also provides a great opportunity to provide a cycleway linking the communities of Barton and Risinghurst. Could I be advised on the progress of the decision making process with specific reference to the Collinwood Road crossing?'

Councillor Constance replied:

‘Thank you for your question regarding the Collinwood Road Crossing over the A40.

You are correct that the scheme is included in the Growth Deal Investment schemes and is contained within a programme of work, grouped together as ‘Oxford City Wide Cycle and Pedestrian Routes’.

The Collinwood Road Crossing scheme is currently being reviewed, along with several other suggestions for schemes from various stakeholders, which will all be assessed for deliverability and likely costs by the end of July. A decision on the actual schemes that will be taken forward to feasibility design stages will be shared with the stakeholder groups in August this year.’

Supplementary: Councillor Phillips asked who would make decisions regarding priorities and Councillor Constance indicated that this should be known by the end of July.

59/18 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda Item. 5)

The Chairman had agreed the following requests to speak:

Item	Speaker
6. Provisional Revenue and Capital Outturn 2017/18	Councillor Glynis Phillips, Shadow Cabinet Member for Finance (5 mins)
7. Home to School Transport and Travel Policy	Damian Haywood, Chair of the governing body at Mabel Prichard School – Mr Haywood also submitted a petition. Phillip Middlewood David Mytton Keith Strangwood Jane Pargeter Councillor Marie Tidball City Executive Board Member for Supporting Local Communities Councillor John Howson Councillor Emma Turnbull, Shadow Cabinet Member for Public Health & Education Councillor Michael Waine, Chairman of Education Scrutiny Committee
8. Change to Policy on 25 Hour Early Years Funded Places	Councillor Emma Turnbull, Shadow Cabinet Member for Public Health & Education
9. Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Site Allocations – Issues and Options Consultation	Councillor John Sanders, Shadow Cabinet Member for Environment
10. Corporate Plan 2018-2021	Councillor Laura Price, Opposition Deputy Leader Councillor Liz Brighouse. Chairman of Performance Scrutiny Committee

60/18 PROVISIONAL 2017/18 REVENUE AND CAPITAL OUTTURN

(Agenda Item. 6)

Cabinet considered a report that presented and provided commentary on the provisional revenue and capital outturn position for 2017/18 prior to the formal closure of the accounts. Cabinet also had before them revised Annexes 1, 1a, 1b and 1c set out in the addenda to the meeting.

Councillor Phillips, Shadow Cabinet Member for Finance, highlighted the number of underspends and referred to recommendation (c) seeking approval to transfer of under and over spends to general balances. Although accepting the need for reserves to deal with unexpected events there was a current and urgent need for services. Councillor Phillips stated that decisions to move funds to general reserves be on a case by case basis with a far more nuanced approach being taken. Councillor Phillips asked that Cabinet reconsider recommendation (b) relating to the remaining transition fund and asked that the funding be used for open access. Councillor Bartholomew, Cabinet Member for Finance responding to the points raised stated that general balances were crucial to financial flexibility in delivering a balanced budget. He pointed to the result obtained of a 99.8% accuracy against the budget which was an outstanding result. The underspend on the transition fund was to go back to full Council for a decision.

Councillor Bartholomew introduced the contents of the report and thanked the Director of Finance, Katy Jurczyszyn, Emma Greenland and the Finance Team for all their work.

During discussion Cabinet commended a remarkable result particularly given that many of the County Council services were reactive and had to respond to increased demand. Support was expressed for the recommendation to put the underspend on the transition fund into l reserves so that it was available if needed later in the year. Councillor Gray, Cabinet Member for Local Communities explained that with recommendation (d) the intention was to bring it back to Council with a view to ensuring that the money was available as required to ensure the sustainability of existing provision.

RESOLVED: to:

(a) note the provisional revenue and capital outturn for 2017/18 along with the year-end position on general balances and earmarked reserves as set out in the report;

(b) note the virements as set out in Annex 2a;

(c) approve the transfer of over and under spends to general balances as set out in paragraph 12;

(d) recommend Council to approve the use of £0.1m underspend on Transition fund for open access children's services which will be

transferred to the Budget Priorities Reserve until required as set out in paragraph 13; and

(e) agree that the surplus on the On-Street Parking Account at the end of the 2017/18 financial year, so far as not applied to particular eligible purposes in accordance with Section 55(4) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, be carried forward in the account to the 2018/19 financial year as set out in Annex 4.

61/18 HOME TO SCHOOL TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL POLICY

(Agenda Item. 7)

The Council had proposed and consulted upon a number of changes to its home to school transport policies applying to Post 16 students and to those of statutory school age. Cabinet considered a report seeking approval of the changes and revised Home to School Transport and Travel Policy. Cabinet also had before them the comments and recommendations of the Education Scrutiny Committee, which had considered the Cabinet report at its meeting held on 18 June 2018.

Damian Haywood, a parent of a child with special educational needs (SEN) and Chair of the governing body at Mabel Prichard School spoke against the recommended changes relating to SEN students. Mr Haywood spoke of the importance of respite care for parents of vulnerable children and the impact that loss of transport to or from respite care would have on his and other families. If transport was curtailed it would affect his and others working lives. Families were really scared of the implications for their family circumstances. Mr Haywood also referred to the implications for the Education and Health Care Plan process, that was already under pressure and the changes would mean a need to review plans. Mr Haywood feared that the changes would restrict the life opportunities of young people and would lead to increased pressure on adult social care in future. Mr Haywood submitted a petition against the changes signed by 2,500 people, picking out the comment of one signatory that young people with SEN were entitled to live a full life despite their disabilities.

Phillip Middlewood, as a parent with two children with learning difficulties spoke against the changes relating to SEN students, Mr Middlewood explained the difficulties his family would face if transport to specialist out of school provision was removed. He indicated that as a family with a car they were unlikely to qualify for a spare seat under the policy and even if they did it was guaranteed only for one term at a time. Financially it was unlikely they would receive support if they did not get a seat on the bus and it was likely that either he or his wife would need to give up working.

David Mytton, speaking as a parent of a son with severe learning disabilities, spoke against the proposals as they affected SEN pupils. He outlined his son’s difficulties and stressed that the local college was not suitable and he was unable to travel alone to the suitable provision. He detailed the impact if

transport was withdrawn and that although happy to pay a contribution he and others like him would not qualify for any help. His family was part of the special needs community and they stood together. Many families were intensely anxious about the proposals.

Keith Strangwood, in speaking against the recommendations supported earlier speakers in everything they said. He detailed the effect on families with children with SEN by reference to the circumstances of his daughter. She was in employment but if she lost transport for her son would be likely to lose that employment. The proposals were not cost neutral. Mr Strangwood commented that the papers made no reference to Frank Wise School. He queried whether the proposals complied with the DDA and the Council's responsibilities to children with special needs. He suggested that more could be done to make savings through the service providers and that the information was not detailed enough so it would be reasonable to defer the decision for further information.

Jane Pargeter, as a parent with a child at Frank Wise School described for Cabinet what it was like to have a child with disabilities and the difficulties faced by families. However, she had met amazing people through the provision at Frank Wise School. There was nothing suitable in her local area. Transport enabled access to the school and was the glue holding everything together. Without it things would unravel. There were no guarantees and she queried whether transport could be organised, or guaranteed, whether it would be safe, whether she would still be able to work and whether her son would still be able to get to school.

Councillor Marie Tidball, City Executive Board Member for Supporting Local Communities spoke in support of free SEND transport which had enabled her to access education from a rural location. Oxford City Council strongly opposed the changes to essential SEND transport. Without it young people with disabilities faced reduced independence. The County Council already faced challenges around the numbers of young people with SEND being excluded from schools. In contrast SEN transport had been singled out as a strength. Councillor Tidball asked Cabinet to reconsider ending free transport for most Post 16 SEND students and suggested an increased use of the Council's own transport fleet.

Councillor John Howson, local councillor for St Margaret's in supporting the recommendations of the Education Scrutiny Committee asked that discussion be held with Henley College to find a way forward with assistance from the College. He commented that two years after supporting a budget on the basis of avoiding further extensive reductions in services he found himself speaking on another cut in services. He stated that the rules on home to school transport were illogical, steeped in history and not suited to the current rules regarding education to 18. The government had failed to act when increasing the education age requirements. Councillor Howson referred to the position in London where free transport was widely available to children and young people. He believed that any young person should be presumed to need transport unless good reason was shown to the contrary.

He queried the meaning of recommendation 1(a) and in particularly how the limit would be drawn on continuing to provide transport assistance to all Post-16 students who would otherwise be unable to access education. It was the wrong time to take proposals forward with the SEND and high needs reviews ongoing.

Councillor Emma Turnbull, Shadow Cabinet Member for Public Health & Education, spoke against the SEND proposals that she felt were ill conceived, harmful and unnecessary. Councillor Turnbull suggested that the proposals were a blatant disregard of the Equalities Act 2010 and queried whether they constituted unlawful discrimination. She noted that following other authorities was not necessarily the right course of action as they were not necessarily lawful. The proposals were unnecessary to produce the saving required when it was possible to overhaul a wasteful procurement model. She suggested that a more efficient model would be to bring it in-house and to run an integrated transport service. Alternative options such as in-house provision or alternative procurement models and not been considered in the SCIAs. Councillor Phillips queried why SEND transport was not included in the transformation programme and why it was not part of the SEND and high needs review.

Councillor Michael Waine, Chairman of Education Scrutiny Committee, explained the reasons behind the decision of the Committee to scrutinise the report carefully. The Committee had accepted that much of it was a tidying up except for the proposals relating to SEND transport. The Committee had looked at whether what was being proposed was fair and equitable and that all options had been explored. They also considered why SEND transport costs were increasing. He highlighted that a significant number of students to Bardwell Special School travelled between them 130,000 miles per year. Of those a large majority lived within 2 miles of a local school. It was not just about the cost factor but about the impact on those children's lives. Councillor Waine queried why the changes were being proposed in isolation from the SEND and high needs reviews and whether the lack of local places was pushing up travel costs. The Committee had not found satisfactory answers to their questions and concerns and found the report unsatisfactory. Councillor Waine added that he had witnessed the arrival of children at Bardwell School and found the experience humbling. In conclusion Councillor Waine suggested that there were not places available at local schools and the change in policy penalised those children placed elsewhere.

Councillor Hudspeth, Leader of the Council, thanked all the speakers. Councillor Steve Harrod, Cabinet Member for Children and Family Services also particularly thanked parents for the courage they had shown in coming forward to speak today and sharing their moving stories.

Councillor Harrod, in introducing the contents of the report appreciated that the recommendations were contentious. However, he had spoken to officers and was convinced it would not impact on existing provision. It addressed the funding of existing provision. All children would be encouraged to meet their full potential and no child would be left without transport.

Lucy Butler, Director for Children's Services, summarised the proposals noting that the proposals were not just about Post 16 SEND transport and not about the County Council withdrawing transport. Transport would still be provided to college or school but the Council would be looking for a contribution from some people. She referred to the bursary scheme detailed in the report and added that if a family came back to the Council having failed to secure support their case would be looked at. No child would be unable to get to school. Lucy Butler went on to outline the fund set up to support access to respite and after school activities. She confirmed that this policy only related to Home to School Transport and that travel in relation to respite was dealt with under different arrangements. She corrected the recommendation on Henley College that should have referred to subsidised rather than free travel. Lucy Butler responded to questions from Councillor Harrod. She set out the travel training programme that would be available to support pupils, where appropriate, with travelling to school. She confirmed that the policy was not discriminatory and was in line with national policy. Different models of provision had been looked at. Neil Darlington, Admissions and Transport Services Manager, added that part of the transport was already provided by a direct labour organisation. However, this was not seen as the most economic way to deliver transport across the County.

Lucy Butler responding to questions from Cabinet Members:

1) Refuted the suggestion that it would affect choice. It was about making a contribution to the costs.

2) Detailed what would happen if parents were unable to pay given the policy was quite prescriptive. Lucy Butler explained that some people were exempt and others would make a contribution. Where there was a difficulty the Council would look at it. Asked about timescales for decisions on the bursary Neil Darlington advised that the decision could be taken in a number of days once they had the information. All schools had bursaries.

3) Confirmed the information in paragraph 16 that the changes to Post 16 SEND transport would not take effect until September 2019.

4) The Council would work with schools and parents to identify and provide the travel training to those children for whom the support would be appropriate.

5) Separate arrangements are in place for respite care.

6) The costs set out in the table at paragraph 35 was the contribution expected from parents not the full cost of provision and was in line with other charges. She confirmed that the charges were as set out and that parents of children requiring more specialist transport and support would not pay more. Their transport needs would be considered alongside

other needs as part of their assessment rather than as part of the home to school transport process.

7) Confirmed that there were no changes to transport for 5-16 year old pupils with SEND.

Councillor Harrod, responding to concerns that there would be insufficient spare seats stated that if there were not sufficient seats the Council would provide more seats.

Councillor Hibbert-Biles, Cabinet Member for Public Health and Education, spoke against the proposals commenting that her original worries had not gone away. She would have liked to have deferred the decision for further work with the Heads of special and mainstream schools as they had wanted and which had not happened. They had responded to the consultation. She was saddened that she was unable to support but felt that SEN transport should be included in the SEND and higher needs reviews. As a councillor, she would be willing to give up her allowance in order for children not to be impacted by the changes.

A number of Cabinet Members expressed themselves satisfied with the responses they had received from officers. They were clear about the way it would operate and were reassured that transport would not be taken away from anyone and the intention was to seek a contribution from those that could afford it.

Councillor Harrod, in moving the recommendations with the amendment to the recommendation on Henley College, stated that no children would be denied transport to school as a direct result of the recommendations.

RESOLVED: (by 7 votes for to 2 against) (1) to agree the following proposals for SEND students:

(a) To agree the ending of the current arrangements giving free travel to Post 16 students who have special educational needs and/or disabilities, levying the ‘spare seat’ charge where the Council provides transport, and implementing this change from September 2019. In addition, it is recommended that the Cabinet agrees to continue to provide transport assistance to all Post-16 students who would otherwise be unable to access education and to encouraging low income parents of Post 16 students to apply to their school or college for a 16–19 bursary to defray the costs of transport.

(b) To agree to the setting of a specific cash limited budget for supporting access to after school clubs for those who have the most complex needs or are identified as being from vulnerable families who do not have access to transport. The eligibility criteria should be similar to those for supporting access to holiday activities for this group of children and young people who are aged 5 to 17.

(2) to agree the following proposals for all students:

(a) To agree the ending of the current arrangements giving subsidised travel to Post 16 students to Henley College and to implement this change from September 2018.

(b) To agree that from September 2018 free travel should be provided for those students who have been placed at an alternative education provider if the places have been paid for by Oxfordshire County Council and the distance from home to the placement is over the statutory walking distance or the route is unsafe to walk even if accompanied, as necessary, by a responsible adult.

(c) To confirm the increased charges for the Spare Seat Scheme for 2018/19 and 2019/20 and agree an increase in the charges for the Spare Seat Scheme of 2% in 2020/21, 2% in 2021/2022 and a further 2% in 2022/23.

(d) To agree to the continuation of free travel for children of secondary school age who live at RAF Benson to Icknield Community College and to agree to annually review this arrangement.

(e) To introduce the new Home to School Travel and Transport Policy for those aged 5 to 16 and the new Post 16 Home to School/College Transport Policy from September 2019.

62/18 CHANGE TO POLICY ON 25 HOUR EARLY YEARS FUNDED PLACES

(Agenda Item. 8)

The statutory universal free early years entitlement for 3 and 4 year old children is for 15 funded hours a week when offered term time only. The Council also currently offers a 25-hours a week, term time only, free childcare place for children of reception age, where they are not yet statutory school age and have not taken up a school place. This is funded through the government through the Early Years block of the Dedicated Schools Grant. The free place can be accessed at private, voluntary and independent providers (pvi) who are part of the Early Education Funding scheme and also in some maintained nursery provision. The Department for Education is ceasing to fund this provision at the end of March 2019. Cabinet considered a report on the implications for the Council and for families who may be eligible for the 25 hours funding.

RESOLVED: to approve a change to the policy on Full Time admissions for Reception Aged 4 Year Olds to remove the 25-hour funding offer for children deferring or not taking up a school reception place, with effect from 1 April 2019.

63/18 MINERALS AND WASTE LOCAL PLAN: SITE ALLOCATIONS - ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION

(Agenda Item. 9)

Following adoption of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy, the County Council must now prepare Part 2 of the Plan, the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Site Allocations. The programme for preparing the Sites Plan in the Council's Minerals and Waste Development Scheme, December 2017 sets a target date of November 2020 for adoption. The first key stage is public consultation on site options (issues and options consultation), which is timetabled for June – July 2018.

The issues and options consultation is about inviting views on what the plan should cover and what issues it should address, and establishing the site options and seeking information that will help in assessing those options. Cabinet considered a report that put forward possible consultation questions about the nominated sites. The views of the Mineral and Waste Cabinet Advisory Group have informed the report.

Councillor John Sanders, Shadow Cabinet Member for Environment, in endorsing the recommendations queried whether there would be further stakeholder consultation under the duty to co-operate. He highlighted the apparent contradiction in paragraphs 7 and 20 about the availability of sites and welcomed that there were no changes to the deadlines. Councillor Sanders highlighted Question 5 in Annex 5 which raised concerns he had always had about site extensions. Councillor Sanders commended the work undertaken by Peter Day, both his diligence and his accuracy and attention to detail.

Peter Day responded to the technical points raised by Councillor Sanders and highlighted that paragraphs 7 and 20 referred to different things. Responding to a question from Councillor Constance, Peter Day highlighted the difference between a site taking a longer period to work for a number of reasons and requests for site extensions where fresh land was added. He confirmed that both required planning applications and consultation. Peter Day corrected an error in the report: paragraph 22 should be consistent with the recommendation. He also clarified on paragraph 33 that the consultation period was to the end of September 2018.

During discussion Cabinet stressed the importance of the restoration process for local communities.

RESOLVED: to authorise the Director for Planning & Place, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment, to approve the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Site Allocations Plan Issues and Options Consultation Document for publication for public consultation, the document to include the site options listed in annexes 3 and 4 and the consultation questions at paragraphs 25 – 28 and annex 5 of this report, following consultation with the Minerals and Waste Cabinet Advisory Group.

64/18 CORPORATE PLAN 2018-2021

(Agenda Item. 10)

The Corporate Plan sets out the County Council's overarching strategy for the period 2018-2021. It states the Council's updated vision for 'thriving communities' in Oxfordshire and describes the Council's main priorities and the specific actions that will be taken in the period to March 2019.

The Corporate Plan 2018-2021 expands on the messages in the prospectus, published in October 2017drawing together the vision, values and the key areas of focus for the coming year.

Councillor Laura Price Deputy Leader of the Opposition, referred to the previous discussion on home to school transport for children with special educational needs and stated that this raised real concerns for her over what had previously been a largely positive response to the Corporate Plan. She was pleased the Plan was shorter, more balanced in its content and a better document from working together. She welcomed the realistic approach to the scale of the challenges the Council faced. She had been keen to see the need for democratic input from residents and officers had listened to the challenge. However, she hoped that it would inform the Council's approach. She felt that given the decision making today some of that would ring hollow with residents. There was a challenge back to councillors to be familiar with the document and to take it into every meeting and see it applied to decisions being taken. She suggested that the Working Group have the final say on any final additions or changes. A Cabinet Member responded that following a robust discussion on home to school transport there had been a clear split. The decision had been taken very seriously.

Councillor Brighouse, Chairman of Performance Scrutiny Committee, referred to the history of the document that had failed to gain approval at a previous Council meeting. The current document was excellent and the content would be discussed by Performance Scrutiny Committee before consideration by full Council in July. She looked forward to that discussion and thought that the time taken had made for a much better document.

Councillor Judith Heathcoat, Deputy Leader of the Council, commented that a cross part working group had been involved both before Council in February and since. They had responded to the views expressed for a shorter, more focussed document that included achieving future plans and priority outcomes. Councillor Heathcoat outlined the Corporate Plan document and Annex B that would be used to monitor and manage performance. She stressed that the document was very much a living document and she would be working with officers to find innovative ways to raise awareness of it. In response to the point raised by Councillor Price that final changes should lie with the Working Group, Councillor Heathcoat stated that the changes referred to were only about editing changes to correct typos and not about changes to the structure of the document.

RESOLVED: to:

(a) note the Draft Corporate Plan 2018- 2021;

(b) **RECOMMEND** that the Draft Corporate Plan be agreed by Council; and

(c) delegate authority for final additions and changes to be agreed by the Leader and the Chief Executive on behalf of Cabinet.

65/18 APPOINTMENTS 2018/19

(Agenda Item. 11)

Cabinet considered a report on member appointments to a variety of bodies which in different ways support the discharge of the Council's Executive functions.

RESOLVED: to:

(a) agree appointments to the bodies set out in the revised Annex included in the addenda; and

(b) agree that following a review of appointments a further report is submitted to the October meeting of Cabinet.

66/18 FORWARD PLAN AND FUTURE BUSINESS

(Agenda Item. 12)

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

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

..... in the Chair

Date of signing 2018