

County Council

13 December 2016

Schedule of Business

This page is intentionally left blank

OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL – 13 DECEMBER 2016

SCHEDULE OF BUSINESS

Members are asked to note that there will be an all member briefing on the rise of Council to give an overview of the new accountability measures in primary and secondary schools, highlighting up-to-date education performance data for the county, from Early Years through to A-levels.

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
1.	1	20 mins	10.00 am	<p>Minutes</p> <p>Minutes of the Meeting held on 26 November 2016 (CC1).</p> <p>Members are asked to note the following correction to the Minutes:</p> <p>Minute 71/16 – correct ‘Maggie’ to read ‘Maggie’s’.</p> <p>Minute 75/16 – add in “members requested a report on the activities of the Oxfordshire Skills Board”.</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
2.	2			Apologies for Absence	
3.	2			Declarations of Interest	
4.	2			Official Communications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Queenie Hamilton • Alan Bryden • Chairman's Dinner • Letter from High Sheriff 	
5.	2			Appointments	- See Agenda Smith Brighthouse

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
6.	2			Petitions and Public Address	<p><u>Petition</u></p> <p>Mrs Anne Morgan-Smith, in relation to the cumulative impact of Industrial and residential development on Sutton Courtenay.</p> <p><u>Public Address</u></p> <p>Mr Larry Sanders, in relation to Motion 15 From Glynis Phillips;</p> <p>Mr Ken Williamson, Chair of Keep Our NHS Public in support of Motion 15 From Glynis Phillips.</p>
7.	2			Questions with Notice from Members of the Public	None.

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
8.	2	30 mins	10.30 am	Questions with Notice from Members of the Council (1) Coates to Hudspeth (2) Williams to Hudspeth (3) Williams to Nimmo Smith (4) Coates to Rose (5) Coates to Heathcoat (6) Williams to Harrod (7) Dhesi to Heathcoat (8) Dhesi to Heathcoat (9) Dhesi to Heathcoat (10) Gill Sanders to Lindsay- Gale (11) Tanner to Nimmo Smith (12) Tanner to Nimmo Smith (13) Tanner to Hudspeth (14) Johnston to Rose (15) Gill Sanders to Nimmo Smith (16) Hards to Hudspeth (17) Hards to Stratford	

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
9.	2	35 mins	11.00 am	Brunel Pension Grouping	(M) Lilly (SEC) Greene S Fatemian S Carter S Mathew S Fooks S Johnston S Harris S Hards S Tanner
10.	3	5 mins	11.35 am	National Scheme for Auditor Appointments	(M) Lovatt (SEC) Wilmshurst
11.	4	20 mins	11.40 am	Senior Management Review	(M) Hudspeth (SEC) Brighthouse S Fatemian S Harris S Christie

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
12.	3	15 mins	12.00	Treasury Management Mid Term Review (2016/17)	(M) Stratford (SEC) Hudspeth S Fatemian S Smith S Hards
13.	5	20 mins	12.15 pm	Report of the Cabinet Leader (Hudspeth) Deputy Leader (Rodney Rose) Children & Family Services (Melinda Tilley) Environment (Nimmo Smith) Finance (Lawrie Stratford)	Q. Webber (1) Q. Godden (3) Q. Handley, Constance, Howson (4) Smith, Howson, Godden (5) Q. Handley, Mallon, Fooks, Johnston (6) Smith (7)

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
14.	5	25 mins	12.35 pm	Motion From Councillor Arash Fatemian	(M) Fatemian (SEC) Mallon (AM) Fatemian (SEC) Mallon (AM) Smith (SEC) Rooke S Constance S Smith S Cherry S Pressel

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
15.	4	60 mins	2.00 pm	Motion From Councillor Glynis Phillips	(M) Phillips (SEC) Heathcoat (AM) Williams (SEC) Coates S Constance S Bulmer S Fatemian S Mallon S Handley S Godden S Rooke S Howson S Harris S Brighthouse S Price S Hards
16.	6	30 mins	3.00 pm	Motion From Councillor Bob Johnston	(M) Johnston (SEC) Howson S Rose S Nimmo Smith S Webber S Harris S Curran S Hards

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
17.	6	25 mins	3.30 pm	Motion From Councillor Mark Cherry	(M) Cherry (SEC) Curran S Mallon S Fatemian S Reynolds S Nimmo Smith S Johnston S Harris S Tanner
18.	6	15 mins		Motion From Councillor Sam Coates	(M) Coates (SEC) Bartholomew (AM) Bartholomew S Nimmo Smith S Mathew S Webber S Brighthouse S Curran

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
19.	7	15 mins		Motion From Councillor Sam Coates	(M) Coates (SEC) Williams (AM) Rooke (SEC) Webber S Rose S Smith S Brighthouse
20.	7	15 mins		Motion From Councillor John Howson	(M) Howson (SEC) Webber S Johnston S Smith S G Sanders

AMENDMENTS TO MOTIONS ON NOTICE

Agenda Item 14 – Motion From Councillor Arash Fatemian - Amendment to be moved by Councillor Arash Fatemian

“Council notes the recent media coverage and casework of Councillor’s concerning the pressures on parking at the John Radcliffe Hospital in Oxford.

Council finds the present situation unsatisfactory and is dismayed at the knock-on effect this is having on those who need to visit the John Radcliffe. Council further notes that these pressures have already been, and will be further exacerbated by the centralisation of services from local hospitals, such as maternity services from the Horton Hospital in Banbury to the John Radcliffe. As the transport authority, it is the wish of Oxfordshire County Council that no further services are centralised from any local hospitals across the county ~~until such time as suitable measures have been put in place to mitigate the distressing parking circumstances.~~

Council further calls on the Health Overview Scrutiny Committee and the Clinical Commissioning Group to take this into account in their deliberations and outcomes.”

Agenda Item 14 – Motion From Councillor Arash Fatemian - Amendment to be moved by Councillor Roz Smith

“Council notes the recent media coverage and casework of Councillor’s concerning the pressures on parking at the ~~John Radcliffe~~ **Principal** Hospitals in Oxford.

Council finds the present situation unsatisfactory and is dismayed at the knock-on effect this is having on those who need to visit the ~~John Radcliffe~~ **principal hospitals**. Council further notes that these pressures have already been, and will be further exacerbated by the centralisation of services from local hospitals, such as maternity services from the Horton Hospital in Banbury to the John Radcliffe. As the transport authority, it is the wish of Oxfordshire County Council that no further services are centralised from any local hospitals across the county until such time as suitable measures have been put in place to mitigate the distressing parking circumstances.

Council further calls on the Health Overview Scrutiny Committee and the Clinical Commissioning Group to take this into account in their deliberations and outcomes.”

Agenda Item 15 – Motion From Councillor Glynis Phillips – Amendment to be moved by Councillor David Williams

“Oxfordshire County Council is deeply concerned about the Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West (BOB) Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP) **a draft of which is now in circulation**. In particular we are concerned about the implications for Adult Social Care in the County, and for our infrastructure as Hospitals close, ~~and~~ services are centralised **and more cuts imposed**. The Consultation with Oxfordshire has been derisory with the full plan not having been made public during the numerous meetings which have been held. This Council therefore asks the Leader to write to the Secretary of State for Health asking him:

- A. How the BOB area was decided? ~~BOB covers 14 Local Authorities with 5 having responsibility for Adult Social Care?~~
- B. What consideration has been given to the implications of putting increased pressure on the fragile coalitions across this area?
- C. What evidence is there that this approach to delivering savings of the magnitude required will work? ~~Particularly in relation to reduced activity and the need during transformation to run 2 systems. What will happen if it doesn't?~~
- D. Why the NHS workforce, the public and politicians have not been involved in shaping the plan?
- E. Given that local government, in relation to Adult Social Care has unrivalled insight into how services can be transformed. Why is the process so NHS centric? when it directly effects local government Adult Social Care.

F. Why does the Plan (as envisaged in the published draft) include massive reductions in funding further privatisation and closures when these have proved so disastrous in past years.

Council calls upon the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee to object to the draft proposals.”

Agenda Item 18 – Motion From Councillor Coates - Amendment to be moved by Councillor Bartholomew

“Oxfordshire County Council recognises that new housing developments suggested by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment will lead to the generation of substantial increases in traffic throughout Oxfordshire. This has been further compounded by obvious additions such as the new Oxford Westgate development.

In consequence, the County Council calls on the Cabinet to collaborate with Oxfordshire's District Councils, the City of Oxford, the Local Economic Partnership, landowners such as Oxford University and developers in commissioning a transport impact assessment for the current range of housing proposals for the whole of Oxfordshire covering the period up to 2031. The study to focus on Oxford City, **market towns, villages and other areas where new housing developments will have the greatest impact**. ~~and the likely congestion in the various market Towns resulting from new housing developments.~~

The County Council's case for more resources for cycling, walking, bus and rail investments may be considerably enhanced by such an Assessment, given the scale of possible traffic impacts likely to result from planned new housing.”

Agenda Item 19 – Motion From Councillor Coates - Amendment to be moved by Councillor Rooke

“Given that an increasing number of services are becoming ever more reliant on voluntary efforts and partnerships with charities the County Council should undertake a 'capacity survey' of charities and volunteers which may be engaged in the support of a wide variety of County services in the future.

The intention of the ~~review~~ **survey** would be to determine which services may be sustained via voluntary efforts, and where costs and the need for specialist workers make services unsustainable with third sector partners.”

This page is intentionally left blank

QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

ANNEX 2

Questions are listed in the order in which they were received. The time allowed for this agenda item will not exceed 30 minutes. Should any questioner not have received an answer in that time, a written answer will be provided.

	Answers
<p>1. COUNCILLOR SAM COATES</p> <p>On the assumption that the UK Government are intending to push ahead with Brexit, will the Leader write on behalf of the Council to the relevant ministers reminding them of the County’s views on continued EU membership and asking them to seek to negotiate a revised Treaty relationship with the EU which would preserve the undoubted benefits that Oxford and our local economy have gained from the single market, a common customs union, free movement of labour within Europe and from the common standards attaching to product certification and common environmental standards?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR IAN HUDSPETH, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>There are no assumptions to be made; the Government are simply following the democratic wish of the electorate of the United Kingdom with over 17 million voters exercising their democratic right to vote to Leave the EU. I am confident that the Prime Minister and her government will negotiate a good deal not just for Oxfordshire but the whole of the United Kingdom.</p>
<p>2. COUNCILLOR DAVID WILLIAMS</p> <p>Would the Leader of the Council like to make a statement as to what progress has been made in terms of consultations with other local authorities in Oxford to establish an agreed structure for future devolution? Does he envisage the present stand-off with an</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR IAN HUDSPETH, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>Before discussing reforms to governance, it is important to be clear why they are on the table. There are two main issues. Our vital local public services are not financially sustainable in the long-term if we continue to spend money unnecessarily sustaining six wholly separate local government organisations in the county. In addition, Oxfordshire benefits from one of the most dynamic economies in the country, and one of the most innovative research sectors in the world.</p>

agreement to disagree sustaining for any length of time with Central Government determined to introduce unitary authorities to save money and elected mayors to take power from local governments.

However our infrastructure, and our housing delivery, have failed to keep pace with this growth - there is a gap of at least £1.5bn of the £6.5bn of infrastructure that we know is needed, and we need a model of governance that will enable us to address this gap and provide the infrastructure that our residents and businesses repeatedly tell us that they need. Specifically we need a) better democratically accountable decision-making that aligns decisions about housing, jobs and transport infrastructure in the whole county's interests, without the ability to pass the buck between organisations or block progress as we see currently between the district councils in Oxfordshire; and b) a local government structure which gives confidence to central government that investment in Oxfordshire will be well stewarded, and will pay dividends.

This debate has been something of the theme of 2016 locally. Initially we were working with joint proposals with the districts and other local partners on devolution proposals, then in February the Districts launched their own proposals for small unitary authorities without informing or involving us. We seized the opportunity given by this recognition that unitary government is the way forward to research and consult on alternative proposals, and strong backing has been given by Councillors from both Cabinet and Scrutiny to the idea of a single new council for Oxfordshire, with strong local empowerment and decision-making. I am therefore actively engaged in discussions with local government colleagues across the county on two strands of work.

The first is endeavouring to find a governance model within the current two-tier arrangements which will give Government the confidence to fund Oxfordshire's infrastructure needs. The second is that we continue to work on the proposals identified above, for a new unitary authority for Oxfordshire, releasing over £100m over four years to protect services and meet our own infrastructure needs, and joining up planning for homes with planning for jobs, and planning for the transport and schools needed alongside these. I have endeavoured to involve district colleagues in the design of the new authority, and in particular the localism model, though with limited success thus far.

<p>3. COUNCILLOR DAVID WILLIAMS</p> <p>Presumably from all that has been said to date the Portfolio Holder will welcome the fact that a possible CPZ for Iffley fields has been included in the programme of development work by Finance for 2017 - 2018. I am also sure he would welcome the fact that Wadham College as a part of their £500,000 contribution to the Community Infrastructure Levy have earmarked £66,000 in support of a CPZ in the area around the old VW Garage on Iffley Road that they are about to develop as student accommodation. Given that these commitments are there could he give an indication when the officers under his direction will commence design consultation with local residents and a target date for the scheme to come to fruition?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR NIMMO SMITH, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>I always welcome any funding opportunity which will help to relieve transport problems in local areas across Oxfordshire. In the case of the development in question, whilst payments under CIL are the responsibility of the City Council to collect and allocate as they see fit, our officers are working with the College to enter into a Section 278 Agreement with the County Council in order to secure a contribution of £66,500. This is in addition to the CIL contribution and will go towards Controlled Parking Zones in the vicinity of the site, including Iffley Fields area. When this money has been committed we will be able to commence work on the scheme.</p>
<p>4. COUNCILLOR SAM COATES</p> <p>The Chancellor has announced in the Autumn Statement the funding to underpin the so called Varsity rail link between Oxford and Cambridge. Given that the money is now available could the Portfolio holder outline what steps are to be made immediately to implement this obvious and</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR RODNEY ROSE, DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>The detail on the £100M in the Autumn Statement shows this NOT to be new money, but money brought back into the Railway's Control Period 5 from CP6, so that it can be spent BEFORE 2019, with the aim of completing all EWR works in the Calvert area. The reason for this urgency is to ensure that EWR is completed in Buckinghamshire well before HS2 construction starts in the area. The EastWestRail [EWR] Consortium very much welcomes the interest of Secretary Chris Grayling MP and the appointment of Rob</p>

<p>much overdue development? Would he agree that given there has been over 15 years of speculation and pre-planning by rail authorities and local government on this proposal moving the project forward should now be relatively easy?</p>	<p>Brighouse, and is very happy to work very closely with Rob. However, it would be unwise to underestimate the problems on the Oxford – Bedford section of 102 level crossings/rights of way issues, or planning issues with new stations etc, being mindful of all the problems just linking Oxford to Bicester in Phase One of EastWestRail!</p>
<p>5. COUNCILLOR SAM COATES</p> <p>Would the Portfolio holder agree with me that no matter which way it is dressed up closing centres – Some of the 8 Health and Wellbeing Centres and 14 Learning disability support services for the elderly and cutting £3.5m out of the budget will mean a dramatic decline in the level of care for the elderly in Oxfordshire? Is it not disingenuous to launch a consultation on how many centres will close when the budget of £9.3 million is clearly identified for the £3.5 million cut in the approved Council budget?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDITH HEATHCOAT, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE</p> <p>The Council's agreed budget for 2016/17 as set out in the published budget book includes a saving of £1.0m for day services for older people.</p> <p>The original proposed reduction of £3.0m related to spend of £4.0m on grants to voluntary sector tier 2 older persons services and health and wellbeing centres. This was changed by full Council in February 2016 as a result of OCC being allocated £4.0m Transitional Grant just before council met. This change resulted in the £1.0m saving set out in the published budget book.</p> <p>As a result of this change in plans officers worked with people who use services and their carers to carry out a full review of all of Oxfordshire County Council daytime support. This is a broader scope and includes services for people with physical disabilities and learning disabilities, alongside some community based services for older people not in the original proposals. These are the services that currently cost £9.3m, as identified in the question. There are a number of options in the proposals and the range of potential cost for a new service range from £5.9m to £6.9m. This will deliver savings of between £3.4 and £2.4m. All of the potential options include continued grants for voluntary sector tier 2 older persons, and the continued delivery of support to older people by a county council staffed and run service. You will have noted from the consultation detail that the proposal that delivers the greatest saving is also the one with the most buildings.</p> <p>The proposals, currently out for consultation focus on improving the whole</p>

	<p>service for vulnerable adults, including older people. As a council we need to have high ambitions for vulnerable people, including the delivery of support in a range of community settings. All of the proposals, as set out in the consultation, continue to deliver our statutory responsibilities, improve the county wide consistency of support, and increase the range of opportunities available for people who need daytime support.</p>
<p>6. COUNCILLOR DAVID WILLIAMS</p> <p>Would the New Portfolio holder like to comment on the recently published NUT report that Oxfordshire Education funding will face a £17.5 million black hole in its funding by 2020 given the present funding arrangements? Given that will mean a cut of £217 per pupil per year and hit schools in poorer areas hardest does the new Cabinet Member agree that the £200million set aside by the Chancellor for the introduction of Grammar Schools could have been better spend in mainstream funding?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR STEVE HARROD, CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION</p> <p>I agree that Oxfordshire's schools stand to suffer a real terms loss of £17.5 million, equivalent to £217 per pupil, if the IFS's inflation assumption is correct and the national funding formula doesn't result in substantial additional funding for Oxfordshire. Of course this is <i>revenue</i>, funding whereas the £200 million announced by the Chancellor for grammar schools is <i>capital</i>, so the two sums aren't simply interchangeable. Therefore, even if the Chancellor hadn't set this sum of money aside for grammar schools, Oxfordshire's schools would still be facing pressures on their budgets. The current funding arrangements aren't fair and Oxfordshire's children deserve a much better deal.</p>
<p>7. COUNCILLOR SURINDER DHESI</p> <p>More elderly patients are being identified as suffering from malnutrition when admitted to hospital due to cuts to services providing meals on wheels. What precautions are there in place to make sure it is not happening in Oxfordshire?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDITH HEATHCOAT, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE</p> <p>Thank you for your question regarding Meals on Wheels. I am not aware that there is any link between people being admitted to hospital and the funding of Meals on Wheels services. This council has not funded Meals on Wheels services for about 15 years. Instead this council has funded a frozen meals service that operated through to March 2015. In April 2015 the council ceased its funding and the Community Meals Service continued under a purely private arrangement; I understand it continues to do so. There are a range of</p>

	<p>services that provides meals in various settings across the county and this Council's website does include information about the ongoing Frozen Meals Service under 'Buying Your Own Care Services'; so we continue to provide information to signpost individual to the options available to them and we aim to make sure that people have the information available so that they can make informed choices.</p> <p>Our expectation of domiciliary care services who support people in the community is that should they notice a change in a person's health and well-being for whatever reason, including a change to their eating habits or if their weight declines, then they would escalate this through the appropriate channels, whether it be health or social care. In this way, should there be an identified need for advice, information and support it can be given by the appropriate professional so that an individual can remain in the community.</p>
<p>8. COUNCILLOR SURINDER DHESI</p> <p>There are Care Providers who offer Personal Care to residents living in the community and are restricted from helping residents who may need help with personal hygiene but sometimes don't realise they have a problem. Do you think that the rules should change that the welfare and wellbeing should always take president?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDITH HEATHCOAT, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE</p> <p>Thank you for your question. Can I first say that the work that Adult Social Care carries out promotes an individual's health, welfare and well-being throughout. The Care Act has as one of its key aims that the focus of the care and support an individual receives should promote their wellbeing in order to reduce dependency, rather than only intervening at crisis point.</p> <p>Our operational policies require a person's wellbeing to be considered throughout the assessment and review processes. In this context 'Wellbeing' includes amongst other things, their personal dignity, physical and mental health and emotional well-being; protection from abuse and neglect; and control by the person over their day-to-day life (including over how their care and support should be provided and the way it is provided). The council's guiding principle is that people themselves, regardless of age or ability, are best placed to determine what help they need and this why we ensure that service users have the information they need to make informed choices. However where it is evident that self-neglect is taking place additional</p>

	<p>support, advice and options are offered to the service user, but ultimately it is their choice as to whether to accept the support on offer.</p> <p>As part of our new Domiciliary Care contract we are encouraging providers to work with service users to determine how best their care and support needs can be met, so we promoting a more flexible approach to how their care should be delivered, not restricting choice. Alongside this we use Customer Standards that have been developed by service users and providers in our monitoring work so we are measuring what is important to service users and this includes their dignity and wellbeing.</p> <p>So to summarise, I do believe that this council strongly promotes an individual's welfare and well-being, and the existing arrangements we have put in place support these principles right through to the point of care delivery as well.</p>
<p>9. COUNCILLOR SURINDER DHESI</p> <p>The Consultation survey about the Provision of Day Services and Wellbeing Centres is very long winded and uses language which is complicated and not easy to understand. Many elderly and vulnerable people want to express their views, but when they look at the forms they give up. There were meetings held during the day when careers are busy and were unable to attend. What are you doing to make sure all residents that are affected by the changes are not disconnected?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDITH HEATHCOAT, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE</p> <p>Whilst acknowledging that the proposals for Daytime Support are complex, it is important that people are given enough information about the proposals to be able to provide an informed response.</p> <p>To help with this, the Information and Questionnaire document was created. This provides sufficient information within the body of the questionnaire to respond without the necessity of referring to the main review document of 40 pages, although the main document provides more detail about the proposals should people wish to see it. An Easy Read version of the Questionnaire was also created which has been distributed widely and is particularly helpful for those with learning difficulties or who might otherwise have difficulty understanding the proposals.</p> <p>The questionnaire document was one of a range of different methods that</p>

	<p>people were able to use to contribute their views to the consultation. All internal services have conducted focus groups with people who use services, carers' and families. Contracted providers and other key stakeholders' organisations were also invited to run focus groups, and several have.</p> <p>The three November workshops were planned during the day at times that were based on feedback received directly from carers about when would suit them, and were promoted widely prior to the start of the consultation to provide adequate notice for people who wanted to attend. However, further feedback requested that an evening meeting would work for some people, so an additional workshop meeting was held on the evening of 6 December.</p> <p>The consultation has been promoted widely, including in libraries, in internal and external services, via other organisations that support people who use services and their families and organisations such as OCVA who have cascaded the information to a wide range of community and voluntary organisations. All feedback received, whether by letter, e-mail, phone call, questionnaire (hard copy or online), focus group or workshop is counted as a contribution to the consultation.</p> <p>We believe that the wide range of responses received so far reflects that people have been able to contribute to the consultation. We have heard from almost 700 people so far, at least 150 of whom are carers (based on previous experience others who are carers may not have identified themselves as such).</p>
<p>10. COUNCILLOR GILL SANDERS</p> <p>Given the delays experienced during the building of the four new children's homes that are part of Oxfordshire County Councils' placement strategy (one of which was completed 6 months later than planned</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LINDSAY-GALE, CABINET MEMBER FOR PROPERTY, CULTURAL & COMMUNITY SERVICES</p> <p>For some time Carillon's recent performance has been recognised as an area that needs improving. High level discussions have taken place between Carillon's Managing Director and the Cabinet Member for Property and the Acting Director of E & E to introduce a range of measures to drive improvements in service delivery including a different approach to how</p>

<p>largely as a result of the failures of Carillion); What guarantees can you give us that work on the children’s and family centres will be completed in time for the new integrated children’s social care services to begin operating on 1 March 2017 – given that they too are dependent on Carillion completing the necessary work required on time?</p>	<p>construction projects are delivered. Going forward this will represent a more robust approach, which coupled with the development of a new set of performance measures and the taking back in-house of a number of key services will improve OCC’s ability to more effectively manage Carillion and should secure significant improvements. Unfortunately there are a number of legacy projects still in the system of which the Children's homes formed a part and whilst it is recognised these present a challenge every effort is being made to bring these back on track. I am, however, glad to advise that all four of the homes have been completed with two now open at Witney and Didcot, one at Thame, which has been opened but unfortunately had to be temporarily closed to allow some minor repairs following some damage by one of the residents, is anticipated to be reopened in the next week or two. The final one at Eynsham has successfully completed an Ofsted inspection this week and subject to minor works to satisfy the inspector it is anticipated to be open at the beginning of the new year.</p> <p>Regarding the Children's and Family centres, Carillion are working closely with CEF and Property to programme the works including making contingency arrangements and have given assurances that all works necessary to allow the new integrated service model to operate will be completed by 1st March. The one exception will be the centre at Abingdon where completion of the office section will be achieved for the 1st March with the remainder to be completed shortly after. This is due to the extent of the works required although this will not delay the implementation of the new service.</p>
<p>11. COUNCILLOR JOHN TANNER</p> <p>There are two pedestrian and cycle bridges over the Thames in my Isis division; the ‘gasworks bridge’ from Grandpont Park to Dale Close and the ‘pipe bridge’ from Marlborough Road to Friars Wharf. Can the cabinet member confirm that these are the responsibility of the County Council and say</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR NIMMO SMITH, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>Oxford City Council have approached OCC to clarify responsibilities for both these bridges and we are due to meet with them shortly once we have compiled all relevant available records, considered OCC Legal’s opinion and jointly concluded what we believe should be OCC’s position. The situation is not totally straight forward.</p> <p>Relevant facts regarding these bridges are:</p>

<p>when they are likely to be inspected and repaired?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Both bridges are owned by Oxford City Council. 2. Neither bridge is recorded on the Definitive Map and Statement as carrying a public right of way. 3. Highway Records, which it is understood were inherited from the City Council in about November 2001, show the “Pipe Bridge” as carrying a route designated as highway maintainable at public expense. Full history of this is not entirely clear/straightforward 4. Neither bridge has been adopted by OCC. <p>Please note that Point 3 above may only refer to the highway surfacing rather than the bridge structure itself (such as is the situation with all Network Rail and Highways Agency owned bridges supporting OCC maintained public highway).</p> <p>The facts above would appear to point to the Highway Authority/OCC not being responsible for “Gasworks Bridge”. With respect to the “Pipe Bridge” the situation is a little less clear cut and investigations are ongoing.</p> <p>Until this matter is resolved we cannot confirm that both bridges are definitely not OCC’s responsibility. We will make further progress during early December and then subsequently meet with Oxford City Council once we have clarified our own views. It may assist if Cllr Tanner was able to help resolve issues with his City Officers.</p>
<p>12. COUNCILLOR JOHN TANNER</p> <p>There is growing public demand for residents’ parking schemes to be considered in my own Isis division, south of Hinksey Park as far as Redbridge, and in the neighbouring division of Iffley Fields & St Mary’s, from Magdalen Road to the Boundary Brook estate. Could the cabinet member say if and when the Council might consult on such residents’ parking</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR NIMMO SMITH, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>Whilst I recognise there are growing concerns from these areas regarding parking pressures, I am afraid that until there is a source of funding there is no way for us to implement new CPZs. We have been able to do this in areas where funds arise from new developments but I’m not aware there is currently that opportunity in Cllr Tanner’s Division.</p>

<p>schemes?</p>	
<p>13. COUNCILLOR JOHN TANNER</p> <p>Would the Leader of the Council congratulate the British Government on ratifying the Paris Climate Change Agreement (aiming to restrict global warming to below 1.5 degrees centigrade), will he commit the County Council to continuing reductions in energy costs and global warming gases (notably carbon dioxide) and will the Council continue to work with others to reduce Oxfordshire’s overall carbon footprint?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR IAN HUDSPETH, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>I am delighted that Cllr Tanner is congratulating the Conservative government on ratifying the Paris Climate Change Agreement. I’m sure that Cllr Tanner would like to join me in congratulating the Conservative government on other achievements:</p> <p>The Conservative government allowed the electorate of the United Kingdom to decide if they wanted to remain in the European Union</p> <p>The Conservative government is ensuring that the democratic wish of the electorate of the United Kingdom is followed.</p> <p>The Conservative government has made real progress on reducing our deficit – it is down by two-thirds. This safeguards our economy for the long-term and keeps mortgage rates low.</p> <p>The Conservative government will, from April 2017, have cut income tax for 31 million people. It means a typical basic rate taxpayer will be paying over £1,000 less income tax than when it came into government five years ago. And it means another 1.3 million of the lowest paid taken out of tax altogether.</p> <p>The Conservative government has introduced the new National Living Wage – giving people over 25 on low wages a pay rise – and lifting 4 million people, and rising, out of income tax altogether.</p> <p>The Conservative government has creating more jobs. Employment is up by over 2.8 million since the 2010 General Election. That’s over two and a half million more people with the security of bringing home a regular pay packet.</p>

	<p>The Conservative government has backed small business and enterprise with better infrastructure and lower taxes there are 900,000 more businesses, helping drive growth and create jobs.</p> <p>The Conservative government has capped welfare. So that no out-of-work household can claim more than the average working family earns, ensuring our economy delivers for people who want to work hard and play by the rules.</p> <p>The Conservative government are delivering the best schools for young people. Nearly 1.8 million more pupils are being educated in good or outstanding schools since 2010.</p> <p>The Conservative government are delivering the best skills training. There have been 2.9 million new apprenticeships since 2010 giving people the chance to learn the skills they need to get on in life.</p> <p>The Conservative government are meeting the NATO two per cent target for defence spending. That means our Armed Forces will always have what they need to keep us safe.</p> <p>The Conservative government has tackled crime that is down by more than a quarter, to its lowest level since records began, meaning people are safer on the streets and in their home.</p> <p>Will Cllr Tanner join me in writing to the Prime Minister congratulating her government on all these achievements? Of course I will work with all partners to reduce energy use and costs.</p>
<p>14. COUNCILLOR BOB JOHNSTON</p> <p>Can you tell me what discussions have taken place, and with whom about the future of</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR RODNEY ROSE, DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>We have had an initial discussion with the Department for Transport about Oxford station, but until we are clearer about the details of the revised</p>

<p>Oxford City Rail station in the light of the revised timetable for the East-West railway project in the Autumn Statement?</p>	<p>timetable for East West Rail - which we won't know until early next year - we cannot be more conclusive.</p>
<p>15. COUNCILLOR GILL SANDERS</p> <p>Local residents are concerned, as I am, about the dangerous junction of Littlemore Road and Bartholomew Road in Oxford, which is much used by children attending the Church Cowley St James Primary School. Could the Cabinet member investigate and see what might be done to improve safety and reduce speeding around this junction?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR NIMMO SMITH, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>The concerns of residents over safety are noted, especially given the number of children crossing here on their journeys to and from school. Measures such as traffic calming or the provision of a pedestrian crossing would very likely be feasible subject to funding and consultation but currently there is no specific budget available; this matter will though be kept under review should the funding position change. For information, one injury accident (resulting thankfully in only minor injury) has been recorded at the junction in the past 5-years.</p>
<p>16. COUNCILLOR NICK HARDS</p> <p>At the September Council meeting you gave details of funding which had been sought through the planning process towards the infrastructure which Didcot Garden Town will need to support the additional 15,000 homes which are planned and proposed. You also said that “In addition to seeking the £24million from these developments (for transport schemes) the County Council has also submitted the following bids to the LEP for the Local Growth Fund Round 3 (LGF3) for match funding of the schemes – the outcome of these funding bids is expected to be announced after the autumn statement”. Out of the match funding bid of £36,223,000,</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR IAN HUDSPETH, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>At the deadline for replying to questions there has been no formal announcement regarding LGF3. I will give a verbal update at council should we have received the formal announcement.</p>

how much LGF3 money has been awarded?	
<p>17. COUNCILLOR NICK HARD'S</p> <p>The Treasury Management Report to Cabinet on 22 November said at para 45 "The economic outlook for the UK has immeasurably altered following the vote to leave the EU". On 23 November the Chancellor Philip Hammond confirmed that the government was going to miss its borrowing targets. Is Oxfordshire still on course to deliver its capital programme particularly in the south of the county and if so how has this been achieved in the teeth of such adversity?</p>	<p>COUNCIILOR LAWRIE STRATFORD, CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE</p> <p>The economic outlook has no bearing on the delivery of the existing capital programme. All government funding in the programme, which is predominantly through LGF, is secured.</p>