

OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting held on Tuesday, 13 December 2022 commencing at 10.30 am and finishing at 3.35pm

Present:

Councillor Susanna Pressel – in the Chair

Councillors:

Felix Bloomfield	Nick Field-Johnson	Jane Murphy
Juliette Ash	Donna Ford	Michael O'Connor
Brad Baines	Stefan Gawrysiak	Glynis Phillips
Hannah Banfield	Andy Graham	Sally Povolotsky
David Bartholomew	Kate Gregory	Eddie Reeves
Tim Bearder	Jenny Hannaby	Judy Roberts
Robin Bennett	Damian Haywood	Alison Rooke
Liz Brighthouse OBE	Charlie Hicks	David Rouane
Mark Cherry	John Howson	Geoff Saul
Andrew Coles	Bob Johnston	Les Sibley
Yvonne Constance OBE	Liz Leffman	Nigel Simpson
Ian Corkin	Dan Levy	Roz Smith
Imade Edosomwan	Dr Nathan Ley	Ian Snowdon
Duncan Enright	Mark Lygo	Dr Pete Sudbury
Mohamed Fadlalla	Kieron Mallon	Bethia Thomas
Arash Fatemian	Ian Middleton	Michael Waine
Neil Fawcett	Freddie van Mierlo	Liam Walker
Ted Fenton	Calum Miller	Richard Webber

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.

102/22 MINUTES

(Agenda Item 1)

The minutes of the meeting held on 1 November 2022 were amended as follows:-

81/22 Minutes

Item 9 - Report of the Cabinet

In relation to a question from Cllr Liam Walker, Cllr Calum Miller explained the reasons why the programme for LED street lighting has been delayed but he had been assured that it would be completed by 2025.

86/22 – Petitions and Public Address

Petitions

Mary Totman–“..... many children were receiving inadequate educational provision. She refuted the suggestion that all of these problems were the result of national issues and said that the County Council’s policies were a contributory factor.”

Olivia Johnson – “.....could thrive and requested that the Council replaced its adversarial practices with collaboration with parents. She requested that the Council adhered to.....

and approved as a correct record.

103/22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

(Agenda Item 2)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ash, Bulmer, Champken-Woods, Gant, Ilott, Hanna, Leverton, Paule and Reynolds.

104/22 OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS

(Agenda Item 4)

The Chair read out the reply from His Majesty the King to the letter of condolence sent by the Council following the death of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.

The Chair reported on her recent and forthcoming engagements and congratulated the recipients of the following recent awards:-

- The Zero Emission Zone was the winner of the ‘Clear Air Projects’ category at the inaugural City Transport and Traffic Innovation (CiTTi) Awards (see [press release](#))
- The North Oxford Corridor improvements programme won a silver International Green Apple Environmental award
- The A40 Oxford North scheme won a silver International Green Apple Environmental award
- The Benson Relief Road scheme received the International Green Apple Environmental award ‘Green Champion of the year 2022’
- Catering Services – “Most Improved Service”

105/22 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda Item 6)

Petitions

Setareh Campbell presented a petition of some 1771 signatures calling on the County Council to save the 250 bus route from Bicester to Oxford.

John Tanner presented a petition of some 500 signatures calling on the County Council to ban private vehicles from Abingdon Rd whilst Botley Rd is closed and make the Park & Ride free during the closure

Public address

Naomi Waite, Oxford City Councillor for Hinksey Park Ward addressed the Council in support of the petition on Abingdon Road. Ms Waite expressed concern about the impact of the closure of Botley Road on traffic flow in Abingdon Road. Ms Waite gave examples of how congestion on Abingdon Road would affect various users of the road and said that bus priority and other measures should be introduced to ensure that access to key services in Hinksey Park Ward was maintained.

Caspar Henderson also addressed the Council in support of the Abingdon Road petition. Mr Henderson referred to the impact of the Botley Road closure on residents and the health and wellbeing benefits that could be realised if a more proactive approach was taken by the Council in alleviating the congestion issues on Abingdon Road.

Joanne Gilder addressed the Council in support of the Motions by Councillor Eddie Reeves (Agenda item 13) and Councillor Michael Waine (Agenda item 16). Ms Gilder considered that there had been systemic failings in the services provided by the County Council to children with special educational needs and disability and their parents. Ms Gilder suggested that the delivery of these services had breached the Children and Families Act 2014 and the SEND code of practice. Ms Gilder did not agree that a lack of funding was the primary cause of these problems. Ms Gilder said that the Council should provide for external moderation of SEND processes, that it should be held accountable for every tribunal case that was lost, that outcomes should be thoroughly monitored and that the SEND service should work collaboratively with parents.

106/22 QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

(Agenda Item 7)

Mr Sajjad Malik had given written notice of the following question to Councillor Andrew Gant:-

“Can the council explain why the LTN bollards around Temple Cowley have been capped off for weeks?”

The written answer from Councillor Gant was to be published in due course.

Mr Richard Parnham had given written notice of the following question to Councillor Andrew Gant:-

“Does the council intend to seek to have pollution monitoring stations re-installed around Marsh Lane / Headley Way, to allow for 2023 baseline data to be captured, ahead of the planned installation of the Marston Ferry Road traffic filter?”

The written answer from Councillor Gant was to be published in due course.

Mr Peter West had given written notice of the following question to Councillor Andrew Gant:-

“In light of the revelations about traffic monitoring at the Enfield LTN legal dispute, can the council confirm whether or not their traffic monitoring sensors can detect traffic travelling across them at 10 miles per hour or less?”

The written answer from Councillor Gant was to be published in due course.

Mr John Skinner had given written notice of the following question to Councillor Andrew Gant:-

“How does Oxfordshire County Council intend to relieve the extra traffic, pollution and bus delays, caused by the East Oxford LTNs, around St Clements during 2023?”

The written answer from Councillor Gant was to be published in due course.

Ms Susanne McIvor had given written notice of the following question to Councillor Calum Miller:-

“This Council has recently proposed the area of land opposite Oxford Parkway Station and known as ‘the Triangle’ as an alternative potential location for Oxford United’s new stadium. Councillor Liz Leffman has stated publicly that the new site (proposed by the Council itself) “improves things because there’s more space between this site and Kidlington and it’s also got additional roads between it and the town”. We cannot understand how this ‘improves things’ at all. The new site – one of the last remaining areas of Green Belt between Oxford and Kidlington – shares many of the same concerns from the local community that apply to Stratfield Brake, as well as being directly adjacent to/part of a 2006 Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act S41 area. It also raises new concerns, particularly for North Oxford residents given the closer proximity of the site to this area. Given such widely shared concerns; the scale of this potential construction project and community impact; and the fact that the Cabinet previously recommended a public engagement exercise before allowing Stratfield Brake to be considered as a site, will the Council undertake that before formal negotiations are approved for the new site, an appropriate public consultation

will also be undertaken which is accessible to all local residents; ensures local residents' views are properly and fairly heard; and designed in such a way to ensure that it does not give unequal weight to OUFC supporters from across the County (and beyond) who will not be impacted by any new stadium on this site in contrast to local residents?"

The written reply from Councillor Miller was to be provided in due course.

Ms Victoria Shepherd had given written notice of the following question to Councillor Duncan Enright:-

"Noting that HIF2 has been withdrawn, and that HIF1 faces similar if not greater risks given its scale, rising interest rates, and construction industry challenges, not to mention opposition from the Environment Agency, and opposition from the 5 most affected Parish Councils, does the Council Leader agree that it would be logical to withdraw current HIF1 plans - contentious, and outdated - to allow time to amend and re-scope the scheme focusing on lower Carbon, more sustainable transport options?"

Councillor Enright replied:-

"The A40 improvements known as HIF2 have not been withdrawn. While the previous HIF2 Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) has now been withdrawn, OCC's commitment to improving the A40 corridor remains and a revised HIF2 scheme proposal – and refreshed CPO – will be being brought forward in early 2023.

The increased funding for HIF1 was agreed relatively recently - in early 2022 – and while the challenges, especially inflation, are similar across all infrastructure programmes, we are confident that the final scheme will be both affordable and with an increased focus on our priorities such as those mentioned.

The HIF1 programme is planned to enter its Detailed Design phase shortly and this will be a further opportunity to manage costs effectively but also review how it meets OCC's priorities"

In reply to a supplementary question from Ms Shepherd, Cllr Enright said that he hoped that the mitigations would not be withdrawn from the scheme and thanked the residents of South Oxfordshire for their views expressed.

Mr Gregory O'Broin had given written notice of the following question to Councillor Pete Sudbury:-

"In light of the recent statement by Sinisa Galac of National Highways on carbon emissions for the lower Thames crossing (www.newcivilengineer.com) and this Council's Climate Emergency Declaration and LTCP policies, does the Council Leader agree that all Capital projects should require and publish an independently verified reconciliation of Capital Carbon emissions for the materials supply chain, transport and construction process calculating the quantity of embodied

carbon for each Project using an objective technique such as the “environmentally extended input output” (EE-IOE) methodology as published by Leeds University along with an estimate of Operational carbon emissions so there is solid data for the carbon burden and reductions required to achieve net zero in the transport system by 2050?”

Councillor Sudbury said that the Council did monitor carbon emissions from capital projects with a view to reduction but this was a journey in progress.

In response to a supplementary question from Mr O’Broin, Councillor Sudbury said that the Council’s objective was to achieve net zero Carbon emissions from construction projects but this could only be achieved by offsets.

Ms Judith Harley had given written notice of the following question to Councillor Andrew Gant:-

In order to evaluate whether traffic has "evaporated" inside the East Oxford Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs), do you think it fair and ethical to use roads which have been physically blocked off as part of the East Oxford LTN trial (such as Divinity Road) for evaluation as opposed to adjacent roads where traffic has been diverted?

The written response from Councillor Gant was to be published in due course

Ms Victoria Campbell had given written notice of the following question to Councillor Calum Miller:-

Does the Council believe it is appropriate to be so actively involved in the site selection for a stadium for a privately-owned commercial organisation, particularly when the site suggested by the Council is Green Belt and appears to contradict the Local Plan covering this area?

Councillor Miller replied:-

“Thank you, Ms Campbell, for your question and your sustained interest in Kidlington’s growth and development.

Officers at Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) were approached in 2021 by Oxford United FC (OUFC) with a request to enter negotiations on the lease of land at and adjacent to Stratfield Brake. In March, Cabinet asked officers to enter discussions with OUFC to find out more about their proposals. Cabinet specifically asked that the club consider alternative sites. The club has written to OCC explaining why other sites are not suitable. As part of this dialogue, officers requested that the club narrow the focus of its initial request to consider ‘the Triangle’. This reflected a view that there were considerable challenges relating to the Stratfield Brake site.

OCC officers are not involved in site selection. They are responding to a proposal from OUFC and seeking to establish the facts around that proposal before making a recommendation to the Cabinet on 24 January 2023. A timetable towards the January meeting was published last week. The club has shared with stakeholders information it gave to OCC last month. Planning considerations, including the green belt and local plan, apply to all new development proposals. I would expect the advice from officers to Cabinet to cover these, alongside other considerations relating to OUFC's proposals."

In reply to a supplementary question from Ms Campbell, Councillor Miller said that the report to Cabinet would give details of all factors taken into account in consideration of the potential sites.

107/22 QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

(Agenda Item 8)

37 questions with Notice were asked. Details of the questions and answers and supplementary questions and answers will be set out in the Annex to the minutes

In relation to question 3 (Councillor David Bartholomew to Councillor Andrew Gant) Councillor Enright undertook to liaise with Councillor Gant to provide further details on how responses to statutory highways consultations were considered by the Council.

In relation to question 17 (Councillor Nick Field-Johnson to Councillor Andrew Gant) Councillor Enright undertook to provide a written response on the bus services to be funded or part-funded in West Oxfordshire in 2022/23 and what steps the Council could take to prevent services such as the S1 from being withdrawn.

In relation to question 20 (Councillor Brad Baines to Councillor Andrew Gant) Councillor Enright undertook to provide a written response on the bus prioritisation measures to be considered at the workshop on 15 December 2022.

In relation to question 21 (Councillor Brad Baines to Councillor Andrew Gant) Councillor Enright undertook to provide a written response on the number of Schools streets to be introduced in the second round of the scheme.

In relation to question 26 (Councillor Liam Walker to Councillor Duncan Enright) Councillor Enright undertook to provide a written response on the cost of the compulsory land purchase agreements for the A40 Access to Witney at Shores Green scheme.

108/22 APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE AND DESIGNATION AS HEAD OF PAID SERVICE AND RETURNING OFFICER

(Agenda Item 9)

Council had before it a report and recommendations from the Remuneration Committee regarding the appointment to the permanent post of Chief Executive and Head of Paid Service.

RESOLVED (on a motion from Councillor Liz Leffman and seconded by Councillor Liz Brighouse and approved nem con) to:-

1) approve:

(a) The appointment of Chief Executive and Head of Paid Service position to Dr Martin Reeves with a start date to be confirmed.

(b) A spot salary designation of £225,000 following a process of external benchmarking. The County Council pay policy should be amended to reflect this.

(c) The designation of Dr Martin Reeves as Returning Officer for all elections with effect from the post holder commencing their role.

2) record the Council's appreciation to Mr Stephen Chandler for his work as Interim Chief Executive prior to the appointment of the permanent postholder

109/22 REPORT OF THE CABINET

(Agenda Item 10)

Council received the report of the Cabinet.

In relation to a question from Councillor Liam Walker, Councillor Duncan Enright said that a written response would be provided on the costs of compulsory purchase associated with the HIF 2 scheme.

110/22 ELECTORAL REVIEW: COUNCIL SIZE

(Agenda Item 11)

Council had before it a report regarding the initial stage of the Electoral Review of Oxfordshire which would identify and confirm the number of elected members to serve on the Council from May 2025.

RESOLVED (on a motion by Councillor Stefan Gawrysiak and seconded by Councillor Andrew Coles) to agree to the Council Size submission attached

to this report which recommended to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) that:-

- a) The number of elected members should be increased by 6 from 63 to 69 (36 voting in favour, 16 abstentions and 0 against)
- b) There should be single-member Divisions if possible (51 voting in favour, 2 abstentions and 0 against).

111/22 REVIEW OF COUNCIL GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

(Agenda Item 12)

Council had debated and agreed a motion at its meeting on 1 November 2022 to ask the Director of Law and Governance to instigate a Full Governance Review of the County Council as soon as practicable, with any recommended changes to the Council's Executive and Governance structure to be decided by Full Council and fully implemented by May 2024.

Council had before it a report on the proposed approach for the Governance Review including the establishment of a Working Group to consider options and make recommendations to Cabinet and Full Council.

RESOLVED (on a motion by the Chair and seconded by the Vice-Chair, 43 voting in favour and 10 against) to:-

- a) undertake a review of the Council's governance arrangements as proposed in Annex 1.
- b) establish a 'Future Council Governance Working Group' comprising a minimum of 9 members (4 Liberal Democrat Green Alliance, 3 Conservative Independent Alliance and 2 Labour & Cooperative Party) that reports to the Audit and Governance Committee which will make any recommendations to Council.
- c) request Group Leaders to nominate members to the working group

112/22 MOTION BY COUNCILLOR DAMIAN HAYWOOD

(Agenda Item 14)

With the consent of Council, Councillor Damian Haywood moved and Councillor Mark Cherry seconded the following motion:-

“Banbury is working currently towards joining the Global Network of Age-friendly Cities and Communities led by a partnership group coordinated by Age UK Oxfordshire. This council looks to support this initiative through the following actions:

Promote positive images of ageing in all of our communications to tackle the narrative around ageing. We call on people, services and partners to recognise the need to change both the language and images used when talking about (and with) older people.

Support ongoing activity to raise awareness of the benefits of older workers, encouraging employers to change their approaches to recruiting, reskilling and retaining older employees. Council further supports the need for innovative and radically new ideas and options to support people aged 50-64 who are out of work, to enable them to age well, live well and improve their overall quality of life.

Champion more age-friendly activity and infrastructure in our neighbourhoods, so more older residents can age well in their local communities, with access to the right services, housing, information, infrastructure and opportunities - social, cultural or economic. The voice of older people must be heard to ensure that they continue to contribute to and take a leading role where they live.

We ask that these actions are referred to Cabinet for implementation”

Following debate, the motion was put to the vote and was carried unanimously (49 votes to 0)

RESOLVED:- (49 to 0)

Banbury is working currently towards joining the Global Network of Age-friendly Cities and Communities led by a partnership group coordinated by Age UK Oxfordshire. This council looks to support this initiative through the following actions:

Promote positive images of ageing in all of our communications to tackle the narrative around ageing. We call on people, services and partners to recognise the need to change both the language and images used when talking about (and with) older people.

Support ongoing activity to raise awareness of the benefits of older workers, encouraging employers to change their approaches to recruiting, reskilling and retaining older employees. Council further supports the need for innovative and radically new ideas and options to support people aged 50-64 who are out of work, to enable them to age well, live well and improve their overall quality of life.

Champion more age-friendly activity and infrastructure in our neighbourhoods, so more older residents can age well in their local communities, with access to the right services, housing, information,

infrastructure and opportunities - social, cultural or economic. The voice of older people must be heard to ensure that they continue to contribute to and take a leading role where they live.

We ask that these actions are referred to Cabinet for implementation

113/22 MOTION BY COUNCILLOR EDDIE REEVES

(Agenda Item 13)

With the consent of Council, Councillor Eddie Reeves moved and Councillor Arash Fatemian seconded the following motion:-

“This Council acknowledges the difficulties experienced by certain parents and students in the delivery of its SEND service and pays tribute to the testimonies of parents heard at Full Council on 1 November 2022.

This Council places on public record the importance of delivering timely assessments, reviews and information-sharing to parents and resolves to improve its service delivery and working practices as soon as reasonably practicable.

This Council resolves to recommend the Cabinet to include as wide a range of consultees as possible in drawing up such improvement plans which may include a politically proportionate, cross-party advisory group of Councillors, together with parent-guardian delegates with direct experience of the Council's SEND service.

To ensure that this matter is kept front of mind, Council resolves to ask, via the Chairman of the People Overview and scrutiny committee, that said committee make it a priority of the utmost importance and urgency to place this as standing item on the agenda.”

Councillor Richard Webber moved and Councillor Ian Middleton seconded the following amendment to the Motion as shown in bold italics and strikethrough below:-

“This Council acknowledges the difficulties experienced by certain parents and students in the delivery of its SEND service and pays tribute to the testimonies of parents heard at Full Council on 1 November 2022.

This Council places on public record the importance of delivering timely assessments, reviews and information-sharing to parents and resolves to improve its service delivery and working practices as soon as reasonably practicable.

~~This Council resolves to recommend the Cabinet to include as wide a range of consultees as possible in drawing up such improvement plans which may~~

~~include a politically proportionate, cross-party advisory group of Councillors, together with parent-guardian delegates with direct experience of the Council's SEND service.—~~

~~To ensure that this matter is kept front of mind, Council resolves to ask, via the Chairman of the People Overview and scrutiny committee, that said committee make it a priority of the utmost importance and urgency to place this as standing item on the agenda.~~

This Council recalls its motion, adopted on 7 October, that noted the systemic underfunding of SEND by national government. It renews its call for adequate funding of these essential services.”

Following debate, the amendment by Councillor Richard Webber was put to the vote and was carried by 28 votes to 20 with 2 abstentions.

The substantive motion, as amended, was carried by 32 votes to 0 with 17 abstentions.

RESOLVED (32 to 0 with 17 abstentions):-

This Council acknowledges the difficulties experienced by certain parents and students in the delivery of its SEND service and pays tribute to the testimonies of parents heard at Full Council on 1 November 2022.

This Council places on public record the importance of delivering timely assessments, reviews and information-sharing to parents and resolves to improve its service delivery and working practices as soon as reasonably practicable.

~~This Council resolves to recommend the Cabinet to include as wide a range of consultees as possible in drawing up such improvement plans which may include a politically proportionate, cross-party advisory group of Councillors, together with parent-guardian delegates with direct experience of the Council's SEND service.—~~

~~To ensure that this matter is kept front of mind, Council resolves to ask, via the Chairman of the People Overview and scrutiny committee, that said committee make it a priority of the utmost importance and urgency to place this as standing item on the agenda.~~

This Council recalls its motion, adopted on 7 October, that noted the systemic underfunding of SEND by national government. It renews its call for adequate funding of these essential services.”

114/22 MOTION BY COUNCILLOR SALLY POVOLOTSKY

(Agenda Item 15)

With the consent of Council, Councillor Sally Povolotsky moved and Councillor Nick Field-Johnson seconded the following motion:-

“Council notes that:

1. Thames Water discharged raw sewage into Oxfordshire rivers 5,028 times in 2021. All 10 Oxon based works discharged into the rivers in 2021;
2. Calculations indicate Oxford and Witney treatment works can only cope with 62% of the capacity need, and in Banbury for just 49% of requirements;
3. Discharges have become routine, rather than emergency response to exceptional conditions.

This council believes that:

1. The rules on sewage discharges must be tightened and enforcement improved, in conjunction with the Environment Agency;
2. The Government must make capital funding urgently available to address these issues;
3. Solutions cannot be local, as sewage output in one geographic area affects other areas.

Council recommends the Cabinet:

1. the Leader to write to Rt Hon Therese Coffey MP, requesting an acceleration in the capital programme to lower risks of untreated sewage discharges into our rivers, and an assurance that housing developers will be expected to fund water infrastructure to meet needs of new housing;
2. the Leader and Chief Executive to work with other local authorities to call on the Government to provide guidance and funding to local planning authorities to challenge water companies to deliver the urgent upgrades required to water treatment capacity.

Council resolves:

- to set up a county-wide water resilience working group that will develop appropriate policy to guide planning application determination and enforcement in areas where sewage treatment is insufficient, policy which incorporates legislation, integration, prevention, rectification at source, and the polluter pays principle.”

Following debate, the motion was put to the vote and carried by 48 votes to 1.

RESOLVED (48 to 1):-

Council notes that:

1. Thames Water discharged raw sewage into Oxfordshire rivers 5,028 times in 2021. All 10 Oxon based works discharged into the rivers in 2021;
2. Calculations indicate Oxford and Witney treatment works can only cope with 62% of the capacity need, and in Banbury for just 49% of requirements;
3. Discharges have become routine, rather than emergency response to exceptional conditions.

This council believes that:

1. The rules on sewage discharges must be tightened and enforcement improved, in conjunction with the Environment Agency;
2. The Government must make capital funding urgently available to address these issues;
3. Solutions cannot be local, as sewage output in one geographic area affects other areas.

Council recommends the Cabinet:

1. the Leader to write to Rt Hon Therese Coffey MP, requesting an acceleration in the capital programme to lower risks of untreated sewage discharges into our rivers, and an assurance that housing developers will be expected to fund water infrastructure to meet needs of new housing;
2. the Leader and Chief Executive to work with other local authorities to call on the Government to provide guidance and funding to local planning authorities to challenge water companies to deliver the urgent upgrades required to water treatment capacity.

Council resolves:

- to set up a county-wide water resilience working group that will develop appropriate policy to guide planning application determination and enforcement in areas where sewage treatment is insufficient, policy which incorporates legislation, integration, prevention, rectification at source, and the polluter pays principle.”

115/22 MOTION BY COUNCILLOR MICHAEL WAINE

(Agenda Item 16)

With the consent of Council, Councillor Michael Waine moved and Councillor Eddie Reeves seconded the following motion:-

“This Council welcomes the changes to its scrutiny function generally and the creation of dedicated People, Place and Performance & Corporate Services committees offering more targeted scrutiny of specific workstreams.

Notwithstanding the successes of the People committee in providing effective scrutiny of the very significant challenges facing Adult Social Care and Children’s Services, Education and Schools issues have, at times, appeared to be marginalised.

Accordingly, Council resolves to ask Audit & Governance to consider the question of whether the Education Scrutiny Committee should be re-established as part of its review of the Council's scrutiny function in any governance review so as to ensure that Education policy issues can be more fully addressed by members on a deliberative and cross-party basis.”

Following debate, the motion was put to the vote and was carried by 26 votes to 15, with 3 abstentions.

RESOLVED (26 to 15 with 3 abstentions):-

“This Council welcomes the changes to its scrutiny function generally and the creation of dedicated People, Place and Performance & Corporate Services committees offering more targeted scrutiny of specific workstreams.

Notwithstanding the successes of the People committee in providing effective scrutiny of the very significant challenges facing Adult Social Care and Children’s Services, Education and Schools issues have, at times, appeared to be marginalised.

Accordingly, Council resolves to ask Audit & Governance to consider the question of whether the Education Scrutiny Committee should be re-established as part of its review of the Council's scrutiny function in any governance review so as to ensure that Education policy issues can be more fully addressed by members on a deliberative and cross-party basis.”

116/22 MOTION BY COUNCILLOR EDDIE REEVES

(Agenda Item 17)

The time being 3.35 pm, this Motion was considered dropped in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 15.1

..... in the Chair

Date of signing

