

CABINET

MINUTES of the meeting held on Tuesday, 18 March 2014 commencing at 2.00 pm and finishing at 3.52 pm

Present:

Voting Members: Councillor Ian Hudspeth – in the Chair
Councillor Rodney Rose
Councillor Mrs Judith Heathcoat
Councillor Nick Carter
Councillor Melinda Tilley
Councillor Lorraine Lindsay-Gale
Councillor David Nimmo Smith
Councillor Arash Fatemian
Councillor Louise Chapman
Councillor Hilary Hibbert-Biles

Other Members in Attendance: Councillor Brighthouse, (Agenda Items 6 & 8)
Councillor Tanner (Agenda Item 6)
Councillor John Sanders, (Agenda Item 7)
Councillor Hards, (Agenda Item 7)
Councillor Harris, (Agenda Item 7)
Councillor Price, (Agenda Items 7 & 10)
Councillor Gill Sanders, (Agenda Item 11)
Councillor Owen, (Agenda Item 11)

Officers:

Whole of meeting Joanna Simons (Chief Executive); Sue Whitehead (Chief Executive's Office)

Part of meeting

Item	Name
6	Maggie Scott, Head of Policy
7	John Disley, Policy & Strategy Manager; Tom Flanagan (Localities, Policies and Programmes)
8	Richard Byard (Economy & Skills)
9	Joy White (Policy & Strategy)
10	John Jackson, Director for Social & Community Services
11	Diane Cameron (School Organisation & Planning)

21/14 MINUTES

(Agenda Item. 3)

The Minutes of the meeting held on 25 February 2014 were approved and signed.

22/14 QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS

(Agenda Item. 4)

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

“Following the reply to the question which I addressed to Councillor Hibbert-Biles at Cabinet on 25 February, I’ve been making enquiries about the “improved integrated sexual health service” to which the Cabinet Member referred.

Although the services will be provided in what might loosely be described as “premises in geographical locations where previous services were in place”, I understand that only the Banbury contraception & sexual health (C&SH) clinic will be in the same location as before and that many of the new locations are less well provisioned.

Taking Didcot as an example:

The new integrated sexual Health service provided at the Oak Tree Health Centre will:

- a. not have a dedicated confidential reception area – the proposal is for a table in the waiting area. Of course this may change in the future if pushed but has implications for both staff safety and patient confidentiality.
- b. Have a new computer system which will be unfamiliar to the genito-urinary medicine (GUM) and C&SH staff, which is not yet running, and for which no training has yet been given to staff in C&SH
- c. Have considerably less storage facilities for pills, antibiotics, dressings etc than is currently available in Didcot Health Centre despite the inclusion of GUM services in the clinic.
- d. Have a limited number of clinical rooms which will not be sufficient to provide the increased service and as well as accommodating the existing number of C&SH focused staff. This does not look like an enhanced service – it is an additional service for GUM but requires a contraction of the C&SH service.

What steps did the Cabinet Member for Public Health take to ensure that the tender specification was adequate, and that the contract which was signed fully met that specification?”

Councillor Hibbert Biles replied:

“The sexual health service will be delivered from a combination of community and secondary care locations in similar geographic locations to existing clinics. Unfortunately it is reported to us by the new providers that while they wanted to lease existing sites, they were not able to do so for all sites. However, all the new clinics which will house the new service will be based in the same towns as current services and meet the agreed specifications to give a wide coverage across the county.

Access to services is a priority of the commissioners and across the service as a whole there will be an increase in hours of service compared to current hours. The commissioners of this service believe that the new integrated service being implemented will provide improved sexual health services across Oxfordshire and will meet the changing needs of the residents of Oxfordshire.

Taking Didcot as an example:

The new integrated sexual Health service provided at the Oak Tree Health Centre will:

- a. Not have a dedicated confidential reception area – the proposal is for a table in the waiting area. Of course this may change in the future if pushed but has implications for both staff safety and patient confidentiality.*

Oak Tree Health Centre is CQC registered and has been serving the local community since 1997 and has many satisfied patients. We are not aware that staffs currently working at Oak Tree Health Centre are at risk to their personal safety any more or less than any NHS provider. Therefore we would have no concern that OUHT personnel operating out of the same site would be at any more or less risk to their personal safety unless the councillor is party to information we do not possess.

We have been assured that patient confidentiality is of the highest importance and that the all staff will be made aware of OUHT policy about confidentiality and information governance.

- b. Have a new computer system which will be unfamiliar to the genito-urinary medicine (GUM) and C&SH staff, which is not yet running, and for which no training has yet been given to staff in C&SH*

The NHS is comprised of several organisations who will have decided on different systems to manage their data and records. We have been satisfactorily assured by the new providers that they have the appropriate data handling and governance systems in place in support of their service. It is not uncommon for personnel moving to different employers in healthcare have to learn to work with new computer software systems. We are assured that staff transferring from OH to OUHT will receive appropriate support and induction.

- c. Have considerably less storage facilities for pills, antibiotics, dressings etc than is currently available in Didcot Health Centre despite the inclusion of GUM services in the clinic.*

In commissioning sexual health services, the procurement and management of assets to deliver safe quality care are the responsibility of the provider. We have no responsibility for the size of the storage facilities to assist their asset management and would not consider this a concern provided that all

regulations and guidelines are met to ensure the delivery of a quality service which does not compromise patient safety.

- d. Have a limited number of clinical rooms which will not be sufficient to provide the increased service and as well as accommodating the existing number of C&SH focused staff. This does not look like an enhanced service – it is an additional service for GUM but requires a contraction of the C&SH service.*

The Cllr is correct in the fact that this is not an enhance service but an integrated service. The current services which have been in place for some time have been split between two providers and the contracts for these services are due to terminate 31 March 2014.

At the start of the procurement process the sexual health needs of the population of Oxfordshire were examined and it was apparent that the services could be redesigned to better meet the needs of the population. The specified service which has been commissioned is in line with national guidelines for best practice for delivery of sexual health services and was designed in full consultation with all stakeholders including existing providers.

Using current activity for the service in Didcot as an indicator, we are assured that the clinic secured by OUHT will provide sufficient capacity to deliver future services for the local community.”

Supplementary: In response to a further question from Councillor Hards, Councillor Hibbert Biles stated that in respect of the new computer system staff had been trained, were positive about the new system and she was confident that everything would be ready for 1 April 2014.

Councillor Howson had given notice of the following question to Councillor Tilley:

“Can the Cabinet Member provide an estimate of how much revenue was collected from students aged 16-17 in bus and other travel income for journeys from home to schools and colleges in the first term of the current school year when these young people were required to remain in education or training as a result of the raising of the education participation age?”

Cllr Tilley replied:

“The total: £69,148 total income for September – December 2013.

It would not be possible to estimate the impact of the increase in the participation age as this would require an interrogation of individual students to ascertain whether, had the participation age not increased, they would have stayed on at school.”

Supplementary: Councillor Tilley responding to a supplementary question indicated that the Council would not be considering reviewing this charge.

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

“As Oxfordshire County Council is actively encouraging staff to use bicycles where possible, to reduce unnecessary car use, why has the Bike to Work scheme to assist in the purchase of bicycles been stopped?”

Councillor Rose replied:

“The Cycle to work scheme was withdrawn in 2012 due to the complexities of administering the scheme and changes to VAT legislation which meant that potential savings made by employees were significantly reduced. A number of local cycle shops do offer discounts to Oxfordshire County Council staff on the purchase of cycles and accessories.”

Supplementary: Councillor Fooks asked where the cycle shops were located, how staff knew and what else could be done to encourage cycling. The Councillor was advised that there was a dedicated web page on the intranet about staff benefits and Councillor Rose added that the budget agreed in February was totally taken up.

23/14 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda Item. 5)

Item 6 – Councillor Brighthouse, Opposition Leader
Councillor Tanner, Shadow Cabinet Member for Policy Co-ordination

Item 7 – Councillor John Sanders, Shadow Cabinet Member for Environment
Councillor Hards, Local Councillor
Councillor Harris, Local Councillor
Councillor Price, Local Councillor
Sarah Rawlinson, Didcot Resident

Item 8 –Councillor Brighthouse, Opposition Leader

Item 10 – Councillor Price, Shadow Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care

Item 11 – Councillor Gill Sanders,
Councillor Owen, Local Councillor
Graham Speke, the Business Manager at Carterton Community College

24/14 OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL CORPORATE PLAN - 2014/15 - 2017/18

(Agenda Item. 6)

Cabinet considered a draft of the Corporate Plan for 2014/5-2017/18 and the proposed Indicators of Corporate Performance for 2014/15 in advance of consideration by Council.

Councillor Brighouse, as Chairman of the Performance Scrutiny Committee commented that she had found the process for producing the Corporate Plan good. There had been an opportunity for it to be seen by Performance Scrutiny Committee and in other places and the Labour Group as the opposition had received a briefing and had the opportunity to discuss it.

Councillor Tanner stated that he was glad to see the County Council had a Plan. He asked what the Council would be doing to ensure that as referred to in the Leader's introduction we paid no more than our fair share of the burden of getting the national deficit down. He highlighted a number of areas of concern to him including lack of reference to revisions to the green belt and unconvincing references to tackle delayed transfer of care and the payment to care workers of the living wage. He welcomed the inclusion of targets but stressed that they must be SMART which many were not.

The Leader noted that the Council had had a Corporate Plan for many years. and responded to the individual comments.

Councillor Louise Chapman in moving the recommendation stated that as far as possible the process had been inclusive and that the final Plan reflected the Council's key priorities and the budget agreed by Council in February. She was grateful for the input from the Performance Scrutiny Committee and she took on board the comments from Councillor Tanner about deliverable targets. Maggie Scott added that the main points raised by the Performance Scrutiny Committee would be included in the final Plan.

RESOLVED: to:

- (a) note the proposed Indicators of Corporate Performance, and;
- (b) approve the draft Corporate Plan before it is taken to Council on 01 April 2014.

25/14 LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN: UPDATE

(Agenda Item. 7)

The Local Transport Plan 3 (2011-2030) was adopted by the County Council in 2011 as a 20-year strategy for Oxfordshire's transport system. Having an adopted Local Transport Plan and keeping it under review, is a statutory requirement on the county council, as set out in the 2000 Transport Act as amended by the 2008 Local Transport Act. It provides the framework for the county council's transport input into the Local Development Plan process and supports our ability to secure key infrastructure projects. It underpins our capital delivery programme, and the way in which we deliver our services. Owing to the long-term nature of the Plan it was agreed as part of the approval process that it would be regularly reviewed in order to keep it up to date and relevant. Cabinet had before them a report that updated five of the

area strategies within the LTP3's implementation plan: these are for Banbury, Bicester, Carterton, Science Vale and Witney.

Councillor John Sanders, Shadow Cabinet Member for Environment queried why there was no update for the Oxford area. He welcomed the proposal to ease traffic on the A40 near Witney and queried the timescale. He also commented on the Park & Ride at Eynsham and on the bus lane from Witney. The Leader replied that the Local Transport Plan was a strategic document and that these were particular areas in need of update now. However all areas would be updated over time. Councillor Nimmo Smith responded to the particular points made stressing that the Witney Transport Strategy provided a clear and coherent approach to the issues identified. He added that work was on-going to formulate the Local Transport Plan 4 and that this picked up new housing numbers.

Councillor Hards, Local Councillor for Didcot West, welcomed the large scale plans included but asked that the small schemes that made a difference to local people not be forgotten. He highlighted the impact of the continued development of Great Western Park over the next 15-20 years and that small highway improvement and road safety schemes would be needed. He added that in relation to the proposals to improve cycling and walking the Harwell Bicycle User Group were keen to talk to officers and to be engaged in the process. He was concerned that there was no master plan of cycle routes. Councillor Nimmo Smith responding agreed that there needed to be a balance between micro and macro schemes.

Councillor Harris, Local Councillor for Didcot Ladygrove, stressed that it was vital that the ring road be completed as a priority. Local residents had done a survey of the stretch of road and found that there was heavy use of the road including by heavy goods vehicles. The amount of traffic adversely affected the local residents of Ladygrove and he invited Cabinet Members to visit the area to see how vital the work was to local people. The Leader commented that he had visited the area on many occasions and the Cabinet Member for Environment noted that the piece of road referred to was in the updated plan.

Sarah Rawlinson, Didcot Resident, supported the views expressed by Councillor Harris and spoke of the noise and disruption local residents suffered. The road was not designed for the weight of traffic nor the size of vehicles and the completion of the northern perimeter road was long overdue.

Councillor Price, Local Councillor for Witney South & Central, welcomed the inclusion of Shores Green but asked for more detailed information on timing. In general she would have preferred to see a more holistic approach taken to Witney's transport problems. She referred to the high impact low cost schemes could have for pedestrian and cyclists and the importance of engaging with the bike user groups in Witney. The Leader explained that with regard to Shores Green the Council was waiting on the developer as until he put in an application there was no funding for the work. Councillor Nimmo

Smith gave an assurance that there were local cycle schemes under consideration and these would be discussed at locality meetings.

John Disley introduced the contents of the report. The Leader responding to comments from a Cabinet Member noted that the updates did not take account of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and that this would need to be reflected in LTP4.

RESOLVED: to approve the removal of the existing area strategies for Banbury, Bicester, Carterton, Science Vale and Witney from LTP3 and their replacement with the updated strategies in Annexes 1 to 5 of the report.

26/14 OXFORDSHIRE STRATEGIC ECONOMIC PLAN

(Agenda Item. 8)

Cabinet considered a report that gave an update on the Oxfordshire Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) including the SEP executive summary which captured the key themes, geographical focus and governance of the SEP.

Councillor Brighouse, Opposition Leader welcomed the Strategic Economic Plan which she found to be good. However one area which seemed to be missing was the impact on local communities of the economic growth, including factors such as low housing affordability and the level of skills in the local communities. These areas needed to be included in order to support future funding bids. The Leader welcomed the comments and commented that officers had worked to produce the document in just a few weeks. Richard Byard added that there was an emerging skills strategy.

A Cabinet Member asked that if the information was available it would be helpful to have a breakdown of investment by area. Joanna Simons replied that generally this information would not be available as spending was based on client groups rather than area. However she undertook to see what information was available.

A Cabinet Member asked that the final document be checked to ensure it was readable as the font size on some pages was too small.

RESOLVED: to:

- (a) agree the Strategic Economic Plan Executive Summary which captures the key themes, geographical focus and governance of the strategy;
- (b) request that the Director for Environment & Economy in consultation with the Council Leader should be authorised to approve any further amendments and approve the final Strategic Economic Plan that will be submitted to government on 31 March 2014.

27/14 TRAVEL PLANS

(Agenda Item. 9)

Travel Plans are long-term management strategies for sites, which seek to ensure that travel associated with them is sustainable. In accordance with national planning policy and local plans, Oxfordshire County Council requests travel plans from developers for sites which are expected to generate significant amounts of movement. Developers frequently ask for advice on preparing and implementing travel plans, and Cabinet had before them a draft standard guidance document to ensure consistency and efficiency. As there is effort involved in implementing travel plans, they are likely to be ineffective in achieving their targets unless they are monitored. Councils are permitted to charge fees to cover the costs of monitoring, and the draft Guidance set out proposed monitoring fees for approval.

Joy White responding to concerns from Councillor Hibbert Biles, Cabinet member for Public Health & the Voluntary Sector undertook to ensure that all Air Quality Action Plans were referenced in Guidance.

RESOLVED: to:

- (a) approve the Transport Assessments & Travel Plans Guidance Document and monitoring fee charging schedule for publication; and
- (b) approve the charging of fees to cover staff costs for other non-statutory Travel Plan related services on an hourly basis by agreement.

28/14 BETTER CARE FUND

(Agenda Item. 10)

Cabinet considered a report seeking agreement on the proposed use of the Better Care Fund in Oxfordshire, prior to submission to NHS England (as an integral part of the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group's Strategic and Operational Plans) by 4 April 2014.

The Better Care Fund will total approximately £37 million in Oxfordshire from 2015/16 onwards, and is not new money as it will be reallocated from within the health and social care system. However, a significant proportion may be newly accessible to adult social care, and can be used to protect services where it can also be demonstrated that there are benefits to health.

Councillor Price, Shadow Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, commented that the Fund was not new money. She queried what action was planned if the performance measure on delayed transfer of care figures was not met.

Councillor Heathcoat agreed that it would take resource and put Adult Social care under pressure. The Adult Services improvement Plan was looking at the impact of the Extra Care Bill. There were mechanisms in place to monitor progress including by the Older People's Joint Management Group and the

Health and Wellbeing Board. The partnership approach with a single assessment process was a key to success. John Jackson added that the Local Government Association was lobbying Government to provide additional funding for the new responsibilities in the Bill. On delayed transfer of care, it was important to keep on it but there were signs of progress.

During discussion Cabinet stressed that they took the delayed transfer of care situation extremely seriously and were aware of the efforts that all involved had made.

RESOLVED: to:

- (a) Agree the Better Care Fund Plan for Oxfordshire for submission to NHS England by 4th April 2014, subject to the inclusion of any necessary changes which may be required following consideration by the Health and Wellbeing Board and Clinical Commissioning Group Governing Body as agreed by Chairman (Leader of the Council) and Vice Chairman (Clinical Chair of the Clinical Commissioning Group) of the Health and Wellbeing Board;
- (b) In so doing, to agree the use of the Health Transfer to Social Care Funding in 2014/15 as set out in the financial template, and for this to form the basis of a section 256 agreement between the County Council and NHS England as agreed by the Director for Social & Community Services following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Adult Services; and
- (c) To receive an updated plan in March 2015 prior to implementation, reflecting performance in 2014/15 and any emerging pressures and priorities.

29/14 CARTERTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE EXTENSION OF UPPER AGE LIMIT TO ESTABLISH POST-16 EDUCATION

(Agenda Item. 11)

Cabinet considered a report seeking their views following a public consultation on a proposal by the Governing Body of Carterton Community College to alter the upper age limit of the College in order to enable it to offer post-16 education. The proposal is to implement the change from September 2014 and gradually increase the range of courses offered over a three-year period.

Councillor Gill Sanders, Shadow Cabinet member for Children, Education & Families, welcomed the proposal. The consultation showed it clearly had local support.

Councillor Neil Owen, local councillor for Burford & Carterton North, also welcomed the proposal.

Graham Speke, Business Manager at Carterton Community College, spoke in support of the proposal commenting that the timing was right, it would provide real choice for local families and there was no need for a capital build programme.

RESOLVED: to strongly support the proposal to alter the upper age limit of Carterton Community College in order to enable it to offer post-16 education.

30/14 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