



**Cabinet  
Tuesday, 21 July 2015**

**ADDENDA**

**3. Minutes (Pages 1 - 12)**

Attached.

**4. Questions from County Councillors (Pages 13 - 18)**

Attached.

**5. Petitions and Public Address (Pages 19 - 20)**

Attached.

**7. 2015/16 Financial Monitoring & Business Strategy Delivery Report - May 2015**

Reference to Annex 7c in recommendation (e) to be amended to read 8c

**8. Connecting Oxfordshire: Local Transport Plan 2015-2031**

Cabinet is advised of an amendment to the report with the deletion of paragraph 10 v.

**12. Public Health Annual Report (Pages 21 - 22)**

Comments of the Oxfordshire Joint Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee are attached.

**15. Forward Plan and Future Business (Pages 23 - 24)**

Attached.

**17. Longford Park New Primary School, Banbury**

The reference in the agenda to the relevant Cabinet Member is incorrect.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 3

## CABINET

**MINUTES** of the meeting held on Tuesday, 23 June 2015 commencing at 2.00 pm and finishing at 3.15 pm

### Present:

**Voting Members:** Councillor Ian Hudspeth – in the Chair  
Councillor Rodney Rose  
Councillor Mrs Judith Heathcoat  
Councillor Melinda Tilley  
Councillor Lorraine Lindsay-Gale  
Councillor David Nimmo Smith  
Councillor Lawrie Stratford

**Other Members in Attendance:** Councillor Brighthouse (Agenda Item 6)  
Councillor Fooks, (Agenda Item 6)  
Councillor Godden (Agenda Item 6)  
Councillor Gray (Agenda Item 6)  
Councillor Hards (Agenda Item 7)  
Councillor Gill Sanders (Agenda Item 6)  
Councillor Webber (Agenda Item 6)

### Officers:

Whole of meeting Peter Clark, County Solicitor & Monitoring Officer; Sue Whitehead (Chief Executive's Office)

Part of meeting Item	Name
6	Jim Leivers, Director for Children's Services
7	Lorna Baxter, Chief Finance Officer
8	Jonathan McWilliam, Director of Public Health

*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.*

## 50/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

(Agenda Item. 1)

Apologies were received from Councillor Carter and Councillor Hibbert Biles

## **51/15 MINUTES**

(Agenda Item. 3)

The Minutes of the meeting held on 26 May were approved and signed as a correct record.

## **52/15 QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS**

(Agenda Item. 4)

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

"What are the consequences for Oxfordshire of the letter from Lord Nash, the PUS at the DfE taking away the responsibility of the local authority to help choose sponsors for new schools from 1st July 2015?"

Councillor Tilley replied:

"Up until now decisions about sponsors for underperforming schools have, ultimately, been taken by the Secretary of State acting on the advice of 'brokers' who have worked with Council officers to identify the most appropriate sponsor to tackle the underlying issues and to support long term sustained improvements. Delegating the decision making to the Regional Schools Commissioner who will, over time, develop an understanding of the 'education landscape' of Oxfordshire, strikes me as much more sensible than a remote Secretary of State, or PUS, making the decision. Officers will be meeting with the Regional Schools Commissioner next week and Lord Nash's letter will be on the agenda. I hope that we can build upon our already positive working relationship with him and I am confident that he will wish to call upon officers' local knowledge and expertise in order to make the best possible decisions about which organisations are best placed to sponsor Oxfordshire schools in need of support."

Supplementary: Councillor Tilley responding to a further question from Councillor Howson replied that no, she was unable to give an assurance that the Regional Schools Commissioner will take decisions based on the suggestions of council officers.

Councillor Godden had given notice of the following question to Councillor Carter:

"The message below was received from Botley School on 1 June. My question is not what has happened since then, but how did this happen in the first place, and what measures are we taking to improve performance and communication?"

"The building work has been delayed unfortunately, as it should have been finished by now. The initial delay was due to the steel structure (to support the new reception classroom) being built to incorrect measurements which caused a 12 week delay. There was supposed

to be a meeting with Carillion staff to complete a snagging list on 20th May, but this was cancelled as the build wasn't sufficiently advanced for that meeting to happen. I have not had a response from Carillion with an update, since my last meeting with them on 20th April."

Councillor Carter replied:

"The last progress meeting with Botley School was held by the Project Manager on the 18<sup>th</sup> of June, as part of regular formal monthly progress meetings, in addition to weekly site meetings which are held between the construction lead and the School site representative, during this meeting the practical completion date was communicated to the school as being the 15<sup>th</sup> of July, the team also agreed that a snagging session would be completed on the 25<sup>th</sup> of June, with the school invited, with a view to have all outstanding snagging items cleared by the practical completion date.

The delays during construction have been approximately 6 months, attributable to the following reasons.

- 6-8 weeks for an unidentified Gas Main which required re-routing before commencement of work. This was not present on any existing service drawings was not picked up during ground surveys
- 12 week delay due to inaccuracies in the steel frame when delivered, which required the Frame to be reworked. This was a subcontracted package of works, the reworking of which did not financially cost Oxfordshire, however there is recognition of the disruption to the school by being on site longer than anticipated.
- There have been another 4 weeks or so of minor delays which have contributed to this delay.

All of the delays have been communicated with the school and have been verified by Oxfordshire's Employers Agent and have been managed to their conclusion in the context of the contracts that were agreed at the outset of the project. These delays have materially not affected the cost of the project to Oxfordshire, however final accounts are still to be established.

In order to mitigate these types of delay's in the future the Properties & Facilities Department and Carillion are currently redefining the requirements, outputs and processes needed during the design phase of projects as the length of time it has taken for some jobs to progress through this process has been longer than originally scheduled and has put subsequent pressure on the construction periods. In addition to this all School Projects will be targeted for completion 8 weeks prior to when the Asset is required for use, which will allow some time for unforeseen events to be addressed should they occur, prior to their required need."

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

"Both the primary schools in my division of Wolvercote and Summertown have suffered from delays to building work being carried out at the schools. Will the Cabinet member tell me how he will ensure that such delays do not happen in future, as it is immensely disruptive to the education of the children in the school?"

Councillor Carter replied:

"There has already been a major overhaul of personnel who are working on the professional services and construction teams within the Property and Facilities contract, some of the current issues we face are as a result of work that had been progressed prior to this overhaul, given that most building projects are several years from inception to delivery the time lag is a critical factor that has to be taken into account.

Coupled with the changes to the professional services and construction teams, the Properties & Facilities Department and Carillion are currently redefining the requirements, outputs and processes needed during the design phase of projects as the length of time it has taken for some projects to progress through this early part of the process has been longer than originally scheduled and has put subsequent pressure on the construction periods. As part of the review of our processes all School projects will be targeted for completion 8 weeks prior to when the Asset is required for use, which will allow some time for unforeseen events to be addressed should they occur, prior to their required need. To further improve efficiency, Carillion are introducing Standardised Design processes and alternative construction routes (such as Modular Buildings) to reduce overall project durations.

In addition to this the OCC Corporate Landlord Function (Contract Performance Management) will be ensuring that a robust Project closure process is in place to capture lessons learned and ensure that these are incorporated into future projects.

Specifically regarding the project at Wolvercote, the time taken in design meant that there was little or no time to absorb delays due to unforeseen events, in this case an ancient well was discovered during the excavation of the foundations for the new building, upon this discovery works were halted for Archaeological investigation to take place in order to establish whether anything of significance was found. As part of this work a Roman Brooch was found and is currently with the Archaeological team in OCC.

With regards to Cutteslowe the other school in this area which has had works completed recently, these were practically completed in time for September 2014, however the snagging at this site took an unacceptably long time to complete. The process for this has been addressed and is now part of pre completion works, prior to handover, there have also been several other works which have continued into this Academic year, these were either not in the original scope or were late variations to the design as a result of the

school not being happy with the agreed final design once it was observed when finished. There have also been some on-going work with the school to close out issues affecting previous phases of work from the past.”

Supplementary: Councillor Fooks requested that local members be kept informed.

### **53/15 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS**

(Agenda Item. 5)

Item 6 – Councillor Fooks, local councillor

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Brighthouse and Webber together with Councillors Godden, Gray, and Gill Sanders, as members of the Early Intervention Cabinet Advisory Group were invited to the table during discussion of this item.

Item 7 – Councillor Hards, Shadow Cabinet Member for Finance

### **54/15 RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EARLY INTERVENTION CABINET ADVISORY GROUP (CAG)**

(Agenda Item. 6)

Cabinet considered the report of the Early Intervention CAG which provided some background into the work of the CAG and made recommendations to Cabinet for changes to the children’s early intervention service in order to realise the necessary savings.

Councillor Fooks referred to the huge concerns within communities and commented that the report would not allay those fears. Within her Division there were areas that were very deprived with high numbers of single parents, children on free school meals and families on income support or job seekers allowance. She believed that the proposals on early intervention centres needed re-consideration and that it would be a mistake to close them. There was a need to provide at lower cost but the Centres themselves should be asked for their suggestions to achieve this. In response to concern that the consultation was over the summer period when schools were closed the Leader explained that there would be a full consultation on proposals to come back to Cabinet following initial conversations with stakeholders over the summer period.

Councillor Gray, as Vice Chairman of the CAG highlighted the seriousness with which they approached their task and outlined how their work had been carried out. He was pleased to see the move to a 0-19 service and he did feel that going forward the Council would need to focus on the statutory services and work with the most vulnerable families.

Councillor Brighthouse, Leader of the Opposition, stated that there was more information that she would have liked to have seen, for instance around the finances of the individual centres. As someone heavily involved in her own local centre she was aware of the value of the stay and play services, which

encouraged people into the centres. The question was how to work in the local areas to ensure children were safeguarded and that the most vulnerable were not disadvantaged by the new service. The Council was facing very difficult decisions in a time of financial constraint and increasing need.

Councillor Godden, speaking as a recently resigned member of the CAG commented that she had a minority view, feeling that further information was needed before being able to say that the proposals in the report were the best way forward.. She felt uncomfortable and embarrassed not to be in a position to understand the funding of individual centres and at the lack of information on the changing policies and the impact on health partners. She would have liked to see more being done to explore what was possible with the current model before suggesting a new model. She had formally written with her views but received no acknowledgement.

Councillor Gill Sanders, Shadow Cabinet Member for Children, Education & Families and member of the CAG, recognised the need for cuts. The CAG had recognised that it was vital that children & young people received the support they needed and the question was how to best provide that in the face of such cuts and to assure the public that needs will be met. She urged that the consultation be thorough and wide ranging. She welcomed the move to a 0-19 service. Going forward the experience of trained staff was vital as was partnership working. She commented that the job losses were worrying and that currently staff must be very unsure of their future employment. She hoped that the eventual proposals would meet needs and that the Council will not need to make further cuts. She urged Cabinet to continue to lobby the Prime Minister .

Councillor Webber, Liberal Democrat Group Leader, thanked Councillor Godden for all her work on the CAG and understood her reasons for stepping down. He had concerns about the process so far but would be replacing Councillor Godden. Having spoken to Councillor Godden he supported the 0-19 service. He felt that the approach was wrong and that schools and parish councils should be approached first to see what they could do to then look at what remained to be done by the Council.

Councillor Tilley responded to the speakers commenting that there was an in depth understanding of need; that children's centres had already been asked to find savings and she recognised the need to work with them; that the major consultation would not begin until September when schools were back; that the NHS were central to this matter and it was vital they were involved and that safeguarding was central to the proposals. Councillor Tilley responding to Councillor Godden stated that she had not known how to reply to her letter. The CAG had had a lot of information on matters such as footfall, delivery and duplication. She recognised the need to work with

Jim Leivers, Director for Children's Services, introduced the contents of the report, highlighted that the report was the start of the process and explained the context and background to the recommendations. His staff had tried to



provide relevant information and no-one sought to hide or prevent information going to the CAG. He detailed the consultation process to be followed and briefly explained the proposals.

During discussion Cabinet thanked the CAG for the work they had undertaken and recognised that although it would be difficult there was the need to make progress on a sustainable delivery model.

Councillor Brighthouse suggested that locality meeting during September may be a useful tool in terms of tapping into councillors local knowledge. It was essential that this massive piece of work was done properly involving the whole range of individuals concerned including teachers. Councillor Hudspeth welcomed the use of locality meetings.

Councillor Tilley in moving the recommendations thanked all the CAG members and paid tribute to former Councillor Val Smith who had been a very valued member during her time on the CAG.

**RESOLVED:-** to agree that Cabinet consults with potential partners on the proposals set out below:

- a. The current service needs to be streamlined and refocused to respond to (i) financial pressures to achieve savings of £6m by 2017/18; (ii) increases in demand for statutory services.
- b. A robust and sustainable service should be developed that delivers an integrated response to families' needs and focus on the prevention of the escalation of need.
- c. One coherent 0-19 years' service be created rather than continuing with an early intervention service divided by age groups. This allows for better joined up working and use of limited resources.
- d. Location of services and funding should be determined based on need as defined by Index of Multiple Deprivation, Children on Protection Plans, Children in Need and percentage under 5 (2015-20). See Annex 1 for draft summary of the needs analysis providing detailed information on the data.
- e. In addition to centres being located on the basis of need considerations of access and geographical spread of centres is critical given the rural nature of the county. The existing locality model should be used as a basis for future service design.
- f. Children & Family Resource Centres be developed in line with County Council localities. Locality based centres targeted to those areas of greatest need will be developed and combined with outreach services so as to allow for a good geographical spread of resources. Locality modelling which is based on natural communities means limited resources can be allocated on a needs basis at a local level. Locality

modelling is a robust model which can be flexible to meet changes in need and population. It also allows for local communities/groups and parishes to play a part in service delivery.

- g. Early intervention services must not be duplicated. Close working is required with partners, especially schools and Public Health to ensure an effective service.
- h. Outreach of early intervention work from main service centres should be a means to ensure service provision in both urban and rural areas.
- i. Early intervention services need to focus on providing evidence based prevention work in particular to prevent children's needs escalating and requiring statutory interventions as well as providing targeted family support. This means that some other services perhaps traditionally associated with children's centres and early intervention cannot continue under county council funding streams for example stay and play sessions.
- j. Maintaining services through the current network of centres is not sustainable and alternative options for these buildings should be sought. Discussions are required with communities about the future of buildings and services in their area.
- k. The voluntary and community sector provision of early intervention services in Oxfordshire is thriving. Communities should be supported by the council, including being given the opportunity to access funding to develop alternative models of service delivery. As a strong signal of commitment to alternative models community funding should be made available for communities to bid for.
- l. Detailed proposals for the future delivery of early intervention services be drawn up for public consultation and communication undertaken at the earliest stage to involve stakeholders, including schools, district councils, town and parish councils, public health and the voluntary and community sector.
- m. Given the current indications from Government, that there is likely to be extensive reductions in available resource, we recognise that reductions in the service, beyond the £6m, will be needed.

## **55/15 PROVISIONAL 2014/15 REVENUE AND CAPITAL OUTTURN**

(Agenda Item. 7)

Cabinet considered a report that set out the provisional revenue and capital outturn position for 2014/15 and showed how actual expenditure and income for the year compared to the budgeted position. Figures shown in the report reflect the Council's draft Statement of Accounts for 2014/15.

Councillor Hards, Shadow Cabinet Member for Finance by reference to Annex 2 and the overspend on Social & Community Services highlighted as a general point that the end position was impressive but that the use of reserves, in this case the pooled budget reserve was not sustainable. He made detailed comments on the position across Directorates and asked a number of questions related to actions being taken.

Councillor Stratford, Cabinet Member for Finance, agreed that the outturn was extremely close and detailed the actions taken to achieve such a good outcome. It had been a difficult year and finance officers and heads of service had worked hard for the final result. He accepted that the coming year would be as hard or harder.

The Leader thanked Councillor Stratford, Lorna Baxter and the Finance Team for their work.

Cabinet Members responded to the individual questions but noted that it would be helpful to have notice of them in order to respond fully.

**RESOLVED:**

- (a) in respect of the 2014/15 outturn to:
  - i. note the provisional revenue and capital outturn for 2014/15 along with the year end position on balances and reserves as set out in the report;
  - ii. approve the carry-forwards and virements as set out in Annex 2a;
  - iii. recommend Council to approve the virements greater than £1.0m for Children, Education & Families, Social & Community Services, Chief Executive's Office, and Environment & Economy Directorates as set out in Annex 2a;
  - iv. agree that the surplus on the On-Street Parking Account at the end of the 2014/15 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 2015/16 financial year;
  - v. Agree the use of £0.825m one off funding from Children, Education & Families reserves to offset the overspend within Children's Social Care;
- (b) in respect of the 2015/16 revenue budget and Capital Programme to:
  - i. approve the virements for 2015/16 as set out in Annex 7;

- ii. recommend Council to approve supplementary estimates of £2.0m to the Efficiency Reserve and £2.7m to the Budget Reserve as set out in paragraph 90.
- iii. Approve the entry into the capital programme of the Riverside routes to Oxford city centre cycling scheme with a total budget of £3.667m and release of £0.336m project development budget to proceed with feasibility and preliminary design works.
- iv. Approve the increase in budget of the Cutteslowe roundabout scheme by £1.077m to £5.177m and the increase in budget of the Wolvercote roundabout scheme by £0.538m to £5.632m and to contractually commit to construction of both schemes;
- v. Approve the increase in the Universal Infant Free School Meals Programme by £2.053m to £4.046m.

#### **56/15 NOVATION OF HEALTH VISITOR CONTRACT**

(Agenda Item. 8)

A ministerial announcement on 29 January 2014 confirmed that the responsibility for the commissioning of some elements of the 0-5 Healthy Child Programme (HCP) (including health visiting), are transferring out of NHS England to Local Authorities on 01 October 2015.

Cabinet considered a report seeking ratification of the approach being taken to novate the Health Visiting contract in line with the transfer of commissioning responsibility for 0-5 public health services to local authorities from the 1st October 2015.

**RESOLVED:** to ratify the approach being taken to novate the Health Visiting contract in line with the transfer of commissioning responsibility for 0-5 public health services to local authorities from the 1st October 2015.

#### **57/15 APPOINTMENTS 2015/16**

(Agenda Item. 9)

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

**RESOLVED:** to agree the appointments set out in the annex to the report with the following additional appointments to existing vacancies:

Adoption & Permanency Panel – Councillor Mills

Oxfordshire Association of Local Councils – Councillor Nimmo Smith

**58/15 FORWARD PLAN AND FUTURE BUSINESS**

(Agenda Item. 10)

The Cabinet considered a list of items (CA) 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 ..... 2015

This page is intentionally left blank

## CABINET – 21 JULY 2015

### ITEM 4 – QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS

Question received from the following Members:

#### 1. From Councillor Howson to Councillor Tilley

" Using the last three sets of data available could she list the academies, community school and voluntary schools that would have been regarded as coasting primary or secondary schools? "

#### Answer

The first set of coasting schools will be defined in 2016. Based on the DfE's definition of coasting schools, the maximum number of Oxfordshire schools that could meet the definition in 2016 includes:

- a) secondary schools - 7
  - of these - 6 academies, 1 community school
  
- a) primary schools - 32 (excluding small schools)
  - of these - 13 academies
  - 10 community school
  - 7 voluntary controlled schools
  - 2 voluntary aided schools

This list of schools is currently based only on 2014 data and will be refined following the release of 2015 and 2016 data. Hence the number of schools on this list can fall but not increase.

Definition of Coasting schools by DfE:

1. For secondary schools, a school will be 'coasting' if in 2014 and 2015 fewer than 60% of children achieve 5 A\* to C including English and mathematics and they are below the median level of expected progress and in 2016 they fall below a level set against the new progress 8 measure. This level will be set after 2016 results are available to ensure it is set at a suitable level. A school will have to be below those levels in all 3 years to be defined as 'coasting'. By 2018 the definition of 'coasting' will be based entirely on Progress 8 and will not have an attainment element.

2. At primary level the definition will apply to those schools who for the first 2 years have seen fewer than 85% of children achieving level 4, the secondary-ready standard, in reading, writing and maths, and which have also seen below-average proportions of pupils making expected progress between age 7 and age 11, followed by a year below a 'coasting' level set against the new accountability regime which will see children being expected to achieve a new higher expected standard and schools being measured against a new measure of progress.

3. The 'coasting' definition will capture performance in 2014, 2015 and 2016. Therefore we will not know until 2016 how many schools will be captured within the definition. However, based on current performance we expect the definition to apply to hundreds of schools across the country.

## **2. From Councillor Pressel to Councillor Nimmo Smith**

" In the consultation, the City Council expressed a very strong view that we should include "sustainable transport corridors" in the City, to provide better space for buses, cycling and walking.

In fact, there was very little in LTP4 about encouraging walking, which I found most disappointing.

They also said that we need a much more ambitious package of measures to encourage cycling, drawn from European best practice, if we are to achieve the necessary "modal shift".

Surely it's obvious that we won't come close to increasing cycling from 3% to 10% of all trips without a much more radical approach?

This need not cost a lot of money, if we start to build good cycle measures into every road scheme. Excellent opportunities for doing this have recently been squandered, for instance in Iffley Road in Headington and in St Aldate's, in spite of advice from local cycling organisations.

Please can we be assured that this will change from now on? Can we look forward to a much bolder approach?"

### **Answer**

"Local Transport Plan 4 has many ambitions including improvements for walking and cycling – indeed the Oxford Transport Strategy element of LTP4 sets out a high level of ambition for walking and cycling as one of its three central themes. We are already demonstrating our commitment to see this through, with the ambitious Access to Headington proposals tackling some long-standing problems such as car parking and investing substantial sums in cycling infrastructure. There is a completely false view that the county could have made major improvements to cycling infrastructure at little or no additional cost as part of its maintenance programme. In reality, the schemes mentioned would have required a substantial financial contribution from outside the maintenance programme to deliver the aspirations some have. Clearly it makes sense to combine multi-modal road improvements with maintenance, but to pretend that this has no cost implication is misleading. Lack of funding is key barrier – but the OTS sets out proposals for raising additional funding for transport improvements (including cycling) in the city, which go beyond anything put forward previously. We are doing a lot for walking as well as part of OTS and through existing schemes – for example at Frideswide Square and again through the Access to Headington programme.



We do not feel that we need to have a separate Walking Strategy to see real delivery on the ground.”

### **3. From Councillor Fooks to Councillor Nimmo Smith**

“As Highway Authority, the County Council issues licenses for a fee to anyone wanting to appropriate parts of the highway, both road and pavement, for a specified length of time. Having tried to get action taken against an overstaying builder, I find that enforcement of the time limit is virtually impossible except by negotiation – without any realistic likelihood of a fine for overstaying. Could the Cabinet member confirm that it is indeed impossible to insist that either the obstructions are removed or a new fee is charged, and that enforcement is essentially impossible?

If this is indeed the case, would he agree to lobby the Government for a change in the regulations in this area?”

#### **Answer**

‘As Highway Authority, the County Council issues licenses for a fee to anyone wanting to appropriate parts of the highway, both road and pavement, for a specified length of time. Having tried to get action taken against an overstaying builder, I find that enforcement of the time limit is virtually impossible except by negotiation – without any realistic likelihood of a fine for overstaying. Could the Cabinet member confirm that it is indeed impossible to insist that either the obstructions are removed or a new fee is charged, and that enforcement is essentially impossible?’

If this is indeed the case, would he agree to lobby the Government for a change in the regulations in this area?’

We always hope that developers recognise the impact that their materials have on the local community and would be prepared to take a responsible approach to this. If a developer overruns the end date of the licence then our current approach to resolving this issue is as follows:

1. Discuss the overrun with the developer on site to ascertain the reason for the extension and agree where possible a date when the materials etc will be removed. This will always depend on the location and impact on the Network etc. and the appropriate fees would be applied
2. Refuse extension to licence due to location etc.
3. If developer/builder refuses to remove materials then Oxfordshire County Council can arrange for the materials to be removed from site which under the law the developer would be responsible for. We would then need to recover the costs for that removal, which may well result in court action.

Under the Highways Act 1980 there is no process to enable the authority to fine the applicant apart from court action and so the decision on whether to take further action is based on a judgement of the likely outcome of taking the developer to Court. Whilst this is not ideal it does provide us with a route for the most persistent of offenders. I agree with Cllr Fooks that this is not the most robust of deterrents and so I will ask Officers to draft a letter on this matter that I will send to Ministers.

#### 4. From Councillor Fooks to Councillor Nimmo Smith

“The major project on the A40 to improve traffic flow and reduce congestion by remodelling the Wolvercote and Cutteslowe roundabouts is causing considerable concern in my division – and elsewhere. Welcome as the new Oxford Parkway station will be, it will attract more traffic to the area while the road works are still in progress. It was unfortunate that the proposed road closures were not communicated to residents with the general project information, so that many only found out about them at the exhibitions if they were able to attend, or even later from others who had been able to attend.

Would you agree that it is a great pity that the promised strategic link road between the A40 and the Loop Farm roundabout was not in place before these major works on the A40 were done?”

#### Answer

It has never been the intention of the county council for the A40/A44 strategic link road to be delivered in advance of the Wolvercote and Cutteslowe roundabout improvements. This is because the link road is a more complex project in that it isn't within the current highway boundary so negotiations with landowners will need to take place; it will require planning permission and greater detailed design work.

However, the county council is progressing with the scheme as fast as possible and the current programme (as reported to Cabinet and at the Northern Gateway AAP Examination in Public earlier this year) for the project is:

Environmental and planning appraisal	March 2015	October 2015
Feasibility & Preliminary Design	October 2014	February 2016
Detailed Design	February 2016	August 2016
Consultation	tbc	Tbc

Planning Application	February 2016	July 2016
Enabling Works	tbc	Tbc
Procurement	September 2016	January 2017
Construction	May 2017	June 2018
Post Completion	June 2018	June 2019

As a planning application has yet to be submitted for the Northern Gateway development, it isn't clear on the timing for the build out of that site.

Every effort is being made to inform the residents of road closures. Communication beyond what is formally required as part of the temporary traffic regulation order process is being had, and further improvements to this process will be made if possible or necessary. The county council has a dedicated communications officer for all Major Projects and the Wolvercote and Cutteslowe scheme will also have a dedicated communications officer as part of the construction team.

This page is intentionally left blank

## CABINET – 21 JULY 2015

### ITEM 5 – PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

#### Petition

By Councillor Howson from parents at St Aloysius School requesting an extension of the cycle path to the school along the Woodstock Road

#### Public Address

The Leader of the Council has agreed the following requests to address the meeting:-

Item	Speaker
Item 6 - Treasury Management 2014/15 Outturn	Councillor Nick Hards Shadow Cabinet Member For Finance (5 mins) Councillor Roz Smith, Liberal Democrat Group spokesman (5 mins)
Item 7 - Financial Monitoring & Business Strategy Delivery Report	<b>Councillor Nick Hards Shadow Cabinet Member For Finance (5 mins)</b>  Councillor Roz Smith, Liberal Democrat Group spokesman (5 mins)
Item 8 – Connecting Oxfordshire: Local Transport Plan 2015-2031	<b>Councillor Steve Curran Shadow Cabinet Member for Environment, (5 mins)</b> Councillor Bob Johnston, (3 mins) <b>Councillor John Howson, Local councillor (3 mins)</b> Councillor Roz Smith, (local councillor 3 mins) <b>Councillor Richard Webber</b> , Liberal Democrat Group leader (5 mins) Councillor Jean Fooks, local councillor (3 mins) <b>Councillor Liz Brighthouse, local councillor (3 mins)</b> Councillor Laura Price, local councillor (3 mins) <b>Councillor Nick Hards, local councillor (3 mins)</b> Councillor John Christie, local

	<p>councillor (3 mins)</p> <p><b>Simon Pratt, Regional Director, Sustrans South East (3 mins)</b></p> <p>Bob Warne, SPADE (Sunningwell Parishioners Against Damage to the Environment (3 mins)</p> <p><b>Joanne Blower-- Sunningwell Parish councillor (3 mins)</b></p> <p>Ticia Lever, North Abingdon Local Plan group (3 mins)</p> <p><b>Helen Marshall, Director, CPRE (3 mins)</b></p>
Item 9 - A40 – Science Transit Public Transport Scheme and Long-Term Strategy	<p>Councillor Jean Fooks local councillor (3 min)</p> <p><b>Councillor Laura Price, local councillor (3 mins)</b></p>
Item 10 - Household Recycling Centre Strategy	<p>Councillor Steve Curran, Shadow Cabinet Member for Environment (5 mins)</p>
Item 12 - Public Health Annual Report	<p><b>Councillor Glynis Phillips, Shadow Cabinet Member for Public Health &amp; the Voluntary Sector (5 mins)</b></p>
Item 13 – Compulsory Purchase Powers for acquisition of land required for the delivery of schemes – Harwell Oxford Entrance	<p>Councillor Nick Hards, local councillor (3 mins)</p>
Item 14 - Cabinet Business Monitoring Report for Quarter 4	<p><b>Councillor Liz Brighthouse, Chairman of Performance Scrutiny Committee (5 mins)</b></p>

## **CABINET – 21 JULY 2015**

### **Director of Public Health's Annual Report 2014/15**

#### **Comments from the Oxfordshire Joint Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee**

The following are the comments which the Committee would be sending to Cabinet and would like to share with the Health & Wellbeing Board.

The Committee felt that the report was very comprehensive, very readable and explained how services were to be delivered in each section thus enabling scrutiny to be conducted effectively. The Committee expressed the hope that future reports would continue to be approached and written in a similar way. It was satisfied that major areas such as Mental Health and Child Poverty continued to be given a high prominence. The Committee, in particular, endorsed the following factors:

##### Chapter 1 – The Demographic Challenge

The Committee was keen to flag up that more detailed information was required on the plans to commission a countywide dementia support service (page 10 of the report) to help patients and families throughout the disease and to help plan and navigate a path through services to make care less disjointed.

The Committee strongly endorsed recommendation 4 (page 13 of the report):

'OCCG, OCC, OUHT, OH and NHS England should develop, as a priority, their joint work to collaborate in transforming the local health system. This is in order to provide new models of care closer to home, care focused on prevention and early detection of disease, improved care for carers, prevention of hospital admission and speedy hospital discharge through improved community services, the modernisation of primary care and the funding of primary prevention services by the NHS.'

The transformation programme is of major interest to the Committee and the subject of scrutiny at its September meeting.

##### Chapter 2 – Health, Houses and Roads

The Committee also endorsed strongly recommendation 2 (page 21 of the report).

'The NHS should become a consultee for local planning decisions and the CCG should be offered membership on key planning groups. Planning and health infrastructure should be considered when developer contributions are considered.'

HOSC has already highlighted a disconnection between local authority planning and Health when planning large housing developments. Scrutiny of this issue forms part of the Committee's Forward Plan and it is hoped that there would be a full response to these issues from NHS England at the Committee's September meeting.

In addition it endorsed recommendation 4 (page 22 of the report):

‘Cycling should be seriously encouraged in new road developments which are likely to attract high usage. Alternative cycle-only commuter routes using features such as rivers and canals should be considered.’

The Committee recognised the Government’s increased input into the provision of cycle paths and provision being made in the forthcoming Local Plan 4. It was their view however that local authorities should also be consulting with CCGs with regard to the provision of cycling routes for the purpose of improving the health of the local community, and advocated a policy to be put in place to ensure input into S. 106 contributions.



## CABINET – 21 JULY 2015

### ITEM 15 – FORWARD PLAN AND FUTURE BUSINESS

Members are asked to note the following changes to the Forward Plan:

#### Amendments to items in the present Plan

Portfolio	Topic (Ref)/Decision	Present Timing	Change
<i>Environment</i> Cabinet Members	<b>Proposed Parking Restrictions – Radley</b> (Ref: 2014/033) To seek approval to the proposals.	3 September 2015	Item withdrawn – no objections
<i>Adult Social Care</i> Cabinet	<b>Learning Disability Health Provision</b> (Ref: 2015/051) To seek a decision in respect of the current contract for learning disability health services.	21 July 2015	Deferred to 15 September 2015
<i>Environment</i> Cabinet Member	<b>Proposed Speed Limit Changes, Turning Ban &amp; Traffic Calming - Hagbourne Hill &amp; Chilton Road, SVUK Area</b> (Ref: 2015/047) To seek approval of the proposals.	23 July 2015	Deferred to 3 September 2015
<i>Environment</i> Cabinet Member	<b>Proposed Amendments to Residents Parking Scheme – Abingdon</b> (Ref: 2013/017) To seek approval to proceed.	3 September 2015	Deferred to 12 November 2015
<i>Environment</i> Cabinet Member	<b>Proposed Puffin Crossing - Cumnor Hill</b> (Ref: 2014/115) To seek approval of the proposals.	3 September 2015	Deferred to 12 November 2015
<i>Environment</i> Cabinet Member	<b>Proposed Puffin Crossing (Revised Location) - A417 Stanford in the Vale</b> (Ref: 2014/186) To seek approval of the proposals.	3 September 2015	Deferred to 8 October 2015
<i>Environment</i> Cabinet Member	<b>Proposed 20mph Speed Limit - High Street, Shrivenham</b> (Ref: 2015/008) To seek approval of the proposals.	3 September 2015	Deferred to 12 November 2015

This page is intentionally left blank