



Notice of a Meeting

Performance Scrutiny Committee

Thursday, 9 March 2017 at 10.00 am

Council Chamber - County Hall, New Road, Oxford OX1 1ND

Membership

Chairman Councillor Liz Brighthouse OBE

Deputy Chairman - Councillor Janet Godden

<i>Councillors:</i>	Sam Coates	Patrick Greene	Sandy Lovatt
	Yvonne Constance OBE	Jenny Hannaby	Charles Mathew
	Mark Gray	Stewart Lilly	John Sanders

Notes: *Date of next meeting: 16 March 2017*

What does this Committee review or scrutinise?

- The performance of the Council and to provide a focused review of:
 - Corporate performance and directorate performance and financial reporting
 - Budget scrutiny
- the performance of the Council by means of effective key performance indicators, review of key action plans and obligations and through direct access to service managers, Cabinet Members and partners;
- through call-in, the reconsideration of decisions made but not yet implemented by or on behalf of the Cabinet;
- queries or issues of concern that may occur over decisions being taken in relation to adult social care;
- the Council's scrutiny responsibilities under the Crime and Justice Act 2006.

How can I have my say?

We welcome the views of the community on any issues in relation to the responsibilities of this Committee. Members of the public may ask to speak on any item on the agenda or may suggest matters which they would like the Committee to look at. **Requests to speak must be submitted to the Committee Officer below no later than 9 am on the working day before the date of the meeting.**

For more information about this Committee please contact:

Chairman	-	Councillor Liz Brighthouse E.Mail: liz.brighthouse@oxfordshire.gov.uk
Policy & Performance Officer	-	John Courouble, Research & Intelligence Manager Tel: (01865) 896163 Email: john.courouble@oxfordshire.gov.uk
Committee Officer	-	Colm Ó Caomhánaigh, Tel 07393 001096 colm.ocaomhanaigh@oxfordshire.gov.uk

Peter G. Clark
Chief Executive

February 2017

About the County Council

The Oxfordshire County Council is made up of 63 councillors who are democratically elected every four years. The Council provides a range of services to Oxfordshire's 678,000 residents. These include:

schools	social & health care	libraries and museums
the fire service	roads	trading standards
land use	transport planning	waste management

Each year the Council manages £0.9 billion of public money in providing these services. Most decisions are taken by a Cabinet of 9 Councillors, which makes decisions about service priorities and spending. Some decisions will now be delegated to individual members of the Cabinet.

About Scrutiny

Scrutiny is about:

- Providing a challenge to the Cabinet
- Examining how well the Cabinet and the Authority are performing
- Influencing the Cabinet on decisions that affect local people
- Helping the Cabinet to develop Council policies
- Representing the community in Council decision making
- Promoting joined up working across the authority's work and with partners

Scrutiny is NOT about:

- Making day to day service decisions
- Investigating individual complaints.

What does this Committee do?

The Committee meets up to 6 times a year or more. It develops a work programme, which lists the issues it plans to investigate. These investigations can include whole committee investigations undertaken during the meeting, or reviews by a panel of members doing research and talking to lots of people outside of the meeting. Once an investigation is completed the Committee provides its advice to the Cabinet, the full Council or other scrutiny committees. Meetings are open to the public and all reports are available to the public unless exempt or confidential, when the items would be considered in closed session.

If you have any special requirements (such as a large print version of these papers or special access facilities) please contact the officer named on the front page, giving as much notice as possible before the meeting

A hearing loop is available at County Hall.

AGENDA

1. **Apologies for Absence and Temporary Appointments**
2. **Declarations of Interest - Guidance note on back page of the agenda**
3. **Minutes (Pages 1 - 6)**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 5 January 2017 (**PSC3**) and to receive information arising from them.

4. **Petitions and Public Address**
5. **Proposals for the Future Organisation of Local Government in Oxfordshire (Pages 7 - 12)**

To consider feedback on One Oxfordshire and discuss any recommendations to Cabinet.

1. Presentation.
2. Public addresses.
3. Non-committee Councillors and responses from Officers.
4. Committee discussion (for the final 45 minutes).

In September 2016, Performance Scrutiny considered reports from Grant Thornton and PwC and made a recommendation to Cabinet on options for reorganisation of local government within Oxfordshire. Cabinet subsequently directed officers to engage with stakeholders and the public to prepare proposals for a new unitary council to cover the whole county.

A discussion document was published in January 2017 to inform an extensive stakeholder and public engagement process. This process has now been completed. Performance Scrutiny will receive a copy of the full bid document and a presentation on the feedback from the engagement process.

The Cabinet report, including the full proposal, will be available to Performance Scrutiny from Friday 3 March. This will be accompanied by a Service and Community Impact Assessment (SCIA).

The Committee is RECOMMENDED to consider the presentation giving feedback on the public and stakeholder engagement process and the revised bid document and make any such comments to Cabinet as they consider should be taken into account before determining whether or not to submit the bid to the Secretary of State.

Declarations of Interest

The duty to declare.....

Under the Localism Act 2011 it is a criminal offence to

- (a) fail to register a disclosable pecuniary interest within 28 days of election or co-option (or re-election or re-appointment), or
- (b) provide false or misleading information on registration, or
- (c) participate in discussion or voting in a meeting on a matter in which the member or co-opted member has a disclosable pecuniary interest.

Whose Interests must be included?

The Act provides that the interests which must be notified are those of a member or co-opted member of the authority, or

- those of a spouse or civil partner of the member or co-opted member;
- those of a person with whom the member or co-opted member is living as husband/wife
- those of a person with whom the member or co-opted member is living as if they were civil partners.

(in each case where the member or co-opted member is aware that the other person has the interest).

What if I remember that I have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest during the Meeting?

The Code requires that, at a meeting, where a member or co-opted member has a disclosable interest (of which they are aware) in any matter being considered, they disclose that interest to the meeting. The Council will continue to include an appropriate item on agendas for all meetings, to facilitate this.

Although not explicitly required by the legislation or by the code, it is recommended that in the interests of transparency and for the benefit of all in attendance at the meeting (including members of the public) the nature as well as the existence of the interest is disclosed.

A member or co-opted member who has disclosed a pecuniary interest at a meeting must not participate (or participate further) in any discussion of the matter; and must not participate in any vote or further vote taken; and must withdraw from the room.

Members are asked to continue to pay regard to the following provisions in the code that “*You must serve only the public interest and must never improperly confer an advantage or disadvantage on any person including yourself*” or “*You must not place yourself in situations where your honesty and integrity may be questioned.....*”.

Please seek advice from the Monitoring Officer prior to the meeting should you have any doubt about your approach.

List of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests:

Employment (includes “*any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain*”), **Sponsorship, Contracts, Land, Licences, Corporate Tenancies, Securities.**

For a full list of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and further Guidance on this matter please see the Guide to the New Code of Conduct and Register of Interests at Members’ conduct guidelines. <http://intranet.oxfordshire.gov.uk/wps/wcm/connect/occ/Insite/Elected+members/> or contact Glenn Watson on 07776 997946 or glenn.watson@oxfordshire.gov.uk for a hard copy of the document.

Agenda Item 3

PERFORMANCE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the meeting held on Thursday, 5 January 2017 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 1.20 pm.

Present:

Voting Members: Councillor Liz Brighthouse OBE – in the Chair

Councillor Janet Godden (Deputy Chairman)
Councillor Sam Coates
Councillor Yvonne Constance OBE
Councillor Mark Gray
Councillor Patrick Greene
Councillor Jenny Hannaby
Councillor Stewart Lilly
Councillor Sandy Lovatt
Councillor Charles Mathew
Councillor John Sanders

Officers:

Whole of meeting Steven Jones, Policy and Performance Officer
Colm Ó Caomhánaigh, Committee Secretary

Part of meeting

Agenda Item	Officer Attending
5	Lorna Baxter, Chief Finance Officer
6 & 7	Kate Terroni, Director for Adult Services
6	Benedict Leigh, Strategic Commissioner (Adults)
7	Ian Dyson, Assistant Chief Finance Officer (Assurance); Lucy Butler, Director for Children's Services; Hannah Farncombe, Deputy Director Children's Social Care
8	David Etheridge, Chief Fire Officer; Simon Furlong, Deputy Chief Fire Officer; Julian Green, Station Manager Strategic Risk & Assurance
9	Chris Kenneford, Planning Regulation Service Manager; Howard Cox, Infrastructure Funding Manager; Susan Halliwell, Acting Deputy Director Strategy & Infrastructure Planning

The Scrutiny 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 agreed as set out below. Copies of the agenda, reports and additional documents are attached to the signed Minutes.

1/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST - GUIDANCE NOTE ON BACK PAGE OF THE AGENDA

(Agenda No. 2)

In relation to Agenda Item 7, Councillor Stuart Lilly declared that he occasionally acts professionally, as a property advisor, for Home Farm Trust.

2/17 MINUTES

(Agenda No. 3)

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2016 were approved and signed as a correct record subject to the following corrections:

Minute 57/16: Second paragraph, delete: "look at the reviews" and replace with "review the responses".

Minute 59/16: Third paragraph, add "at this point" to the end of the second sentence.

3/17 SERVICE AND RESOURCE PLANNING 2017/18 - 2020/21 AND CAPITAL BUDGET 2017/18

(Agenda No. 5)

Ms Baxter introduced the report which set out the main points arising from the Local Government Finance Statement which was published on the 15 December.

Members discussed the following points:

- The New Homes Bonus will only be paid on housing growth above 0.4% of the local authority's housing stock as opposed to the consultation proposal which was 0.25%. This and other changes will yield £241m nationally to fund the Adult Social Care Support Grant in 2017/18.
- The Government's proposal abating the Bonus in circumstances where planning permission for a new development has only been granted on appeal was criticised by some Members. The Government will consult on this in 2018/19.
- The changes in the Adult Social Care Precept and Grant will not mean more on-going money for Adult Social Care. £5m demographic funding which was to come from corporate resources can now be funded by the precept and grant. However, this £5m from corporate resources must be transferred to other funds in order to balance the budget. Members expressed frustration that more money could not be allocated to Adult Social Care but supported the Chief Finance Officer's approach given the current financial circumstances.
- Ms Baxter stressed that the 3% increase in the Adult Social Care Precept was a one-off measure for the next 2 years and so the money could not be used for on-going spending but could be used for up-front funding.
- Members asked if the extended rights under Home to School Transport (HST) would increase pressure on the Council finances. Ms Baxter stated that the grant was not new and if reduced would not put pressure on HST funding.

- Members expressed concern at the spiralling costs of Adult and Children's Social Care and urged that the two be considered together.
- Members also called for a greater role for councillors in the Transformation process.

4/17 DAYTIME SUPPORT CONSULTATION

(Agenda No. 6)

The Chairman agreed to requests to speak on this item from Councillor Michael Waine and Mr Michael Hugh-Jones.

Mr Hugh-Jones, a member of the National Pensioners' Convention, called on the Director for Adult Services to reconsider the formula for eligibility for Council support and in particular the lack of an income limit.

Councillor Waine said that both options proposed in the consultation were historic and property-based not geographic. He believed that they didn't take into account growth in the east of the County.

Ms Terroni introduced the report and stated that the consultation period closed on 20 December so the information is still being analysed. She stressed that people are assessed according to national guidelines.

Points that have emerged from the consultation so far include:

- A preference for the Sustainability Fund over the Innovation Fund.
- More money is needed to aid transition.
- More help is needed for people deciding how to use direct payments.
- A preference for Option A over Option B.

Mr Leigh summarised the advantages and disadvantages of both options. Option A is cheaper, uses existing buildings and provides better opportunities for people to mix. However, people have to travel further and there would be less choice. Option B would mean shorter travel, more choice and more staff time per person. However, it costs more, groups are smaller and those with higher needs will need to travel further.

Members raised a number of points including the following:

- Members in rural areas said that the Comet bus service doesn't work in their areas because the cost of the travel time is too great.
- Will staff have to be able to drive? Will cars need to be provided to some staff? Mr Leigh agreed that case workers will have to be able to drive. Cars may have to be provided. An advantage is that trained staff will provide the transportation.
- Concerns have been expressed about the multi-functional spaces. Ms Terroni said that staff were confident they could make them work well.
- Members expressed concerns that voluntary groups will lose funding. Officers explained that they will be able to bid for funding. Overall, the funding available will drop from £900,000 to £250,000. There will be a fair and transparent process to decide.

Officers noted questions asked during the discussion and committed to circulating further information and clarification to Members of the Committee after the meeting.

The Chairman summarised the outcome of the discussion:

- The model must be financially sustainable in all its parts.
- A transition package must be in place.
- It must ensure the sustainability of organisations that are currently meeting needs.
- Transport is of particular concern – especially the cost of booking the Comet in rural areas.
- The possibility of combining aspects of Options A & B should be considered.

5/17 Q2 CORPORATE PERFORMANCE

(Agenda No. 7)

The Chairman invited Members to identify issues from the report that may require closer study. Several points were taken away to be scheduled for further consideration.

Members expressed concern about the increasing number of children being placed in homes out-of-county. This has been compounded by a delay in providing new centres. It was agreed that Members who would like to pursue this further can attend a meeting of the Corporate Parenting Panel. Councillors Hannaby, Greene, Gray and Mathew indicated that they were interested in attending.

Members discussed with Officers the problems in recruiting enough staff for reablement. Ms Terroni reported that the new contract had delivered more reablement in its first month – even with less staff than any of the previous 12 months, but there were still not enough staff available despite efforts by agencies to recruit. The workforce must have the right skills.

6/17 OXFORDSHIRE FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE ANNUAL REPORT 2015-16

(Agenda No. 8)

Chief Fire Officer Dave Etheridge introduced the report and thanked the Committee for their support over his tenure which is due to end in April this year. He appreciated the way in which the Council had invested in him as a member of staff and given him great development opportunities.

Mr Etheridge stated that Oxfordshire is one of the safest counties in the UK. He drew attention to the introduction of a fire inspectorate in April 2018. Mr Etheridge thanked Deputy Chief Fire Officer Simon Furlong, the incoming Chief Fire Officer, for his support.

Mr Furlong drew attention to a number of points:

- There were no accidents involving OFRS staff during the last year.
- They achieved their targets in the 10 year vision.

- They have implemented co-responding with the ambulance service.
- Although there had been an increase in significant fires the overall trend was still down.
- He provided the additional briefing document to provide more detail on integration.

Asked why only 24 stations are involved in co-responding with the ambulance service, Mr Furlong responded that any scaling up would be at the request of the ambulance service.

In response to questions relating to the legislation going through Parliament to enable Police and Crime Commissioners to make a business case to take on responsibility for the fire service Mr Etheridge made the following points:

- This seems to be the current direction of travel.
- It's important that nobody thinks it would be a straight-forward move.
- There is room for increased efficiencies through collaboration.
- It's important that we don't complicate collaboration through governance issues.

Mr Etheridge responded to other points as follows:

- Training for users of mobility scooters is something they could look at.
- The service's new vision commits more cadet spaces for Looked After Children and this would include work experience.
- He would like to roll out the work done with Police Community Support Officers across the county. They can play roles in safety advocacy, safeguarding and Prevent.

Members thanked Mr Etheridge for his commendable service and wished him well in the future.

7/17 S.106 AGREEMENTS & THE COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) (Agenda No. 9)

Mr Kenneford introduced the report which had been prompted by a set of questions from Members of the Committee arising from meetings with Officers last year.

He reported that the Single Response system had been well received. The system coordinates the County Council's responses to City and District Council planning applications. Mr Cox explained that City and District Councils have to negotiate S106 agreements with developers but the County Council is responsible for the key services for which financial contributions are required – especially education and transport. He described how the Single Response system is used to manage that situation.

Officers responded to questions from Members on the following points:

- They were aware of pressures on General Practitioners' services in the Vale of White Horse area. This is primarily the responsibility of the District Council through its local plan.

- The release of monies has been relatively slow in the last year. Sometimes it's necessary to renegotiate the use of monies and this can take time.
- Officers have met with District Councils and have received assurances that there will be no more bipartite agreements with developers.
- Members asked about enhancing the role of local councillors. Mr Kenneford said that officers are available to meet with councillors.
- The Government's announcement of proposed Garden Villages and Towns was raised and the infrastructural problems that would be created by those proposed in Oxfordshire. Mr Cox responded that he would expect such developments to include S106 agreements.
- It was agreed that it would be useful for the locality meetings to get the papers for this Agenda Item, updated with matters that have arisen in this discussion.
- Mr Cox said that the tools used to calculate population increases as a result of developments take local variations into account.

The Chairman asked Members if this way of scrutinising an aspect of the Council's work had been beneficial. Members agreed that it was useful for some Members to have meetings with Officers in advance of a report coming to the full Committee in order to determine the questions that need to be addressed.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing 2017

Division(s): N/A

PERFORMANCE SCRUTINY – 9 March 2017

Proposals for the Future Organisation of Local Government in Oxfordshire

Report by Assistant Chief Executive

Introduction

1. At its meeting on 13 September 2016, Performance Scrutiny considered independent reports into the future of local government in Oxfordshire prepared by Grant Thornton (commissioned by the County Council) and PwC (commissioned by Oxford City Council on behalf of all Oxfordshire Districts).
2. Performance Scrutiny welcomed the reports and recommended to Cabinet that officers should be directed to investigate thoroughly proposals for a single county-wide unitary, including proposals for maximising delegation of powers to local areas.
3. Following this recommendation, Cabinet resolved on 20 September 2016 to "ask officers to work with stakeholders, including the public, to develop proposals for a single Oxfordshire unitary council". Cabinet also recognised the need to develop a model for local devolution.
4. Between October and December, officers worked in consultation with key partners to develop draft proposals. A discussion document was published on 19 January 2017 to inform an extensive public and stakeholder engagement exercise.
5. A full presentation on the outcomes of the engagement process, including key areas where the revised proposals differ from the draft, will be made at Performance Scrutiny and a detailed report will be published prior to consideration by Cabinet on 14 March, and available to Performance Scrutiny.
6. In early February 2017, South Oxfordshire District Council (SODC) and Vale of White Horse District Council (VoWHDC) agreed in principle to join the County Council in submitting a joint bid to government.
7. Subsequently officers representing all three councils have worked together to consider and incorporate feedback from the public and stakeholders in order to improve the draft proposal. This work was overseen by a 'Leaders' Working Group' to which all council leaders in Oxfordshire were invited.
8. The Cabinet report, including the full proposal, will be available to Performance Scrutiny from Friday 3 March. This will be accompanied by a Service and Community Impact Assessment (SCIA).

9. Cabinet is then due to consider the revised proposal on 14 March where a decision will be sought on the submission of these proposals to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

Developing the Evidence Base and Agreeing the Preferred Option

10. In May 2016 Oxfordshire County Council commissioned Grant Thornton to undertake a review of future options for local government in Oxfordshire – including maintaining the status quo. The County Council developed criteria for the review in consultation with local and national stakeholders and with regard to guidance issued in previous rounds of local government reorganisation, taking into account the changed political and economic agenda. The criteria were as follows:
 - Service Delivery and Outcomes: reforms should improve local service delivery and outcomes, particularly for the most vulnerable;
 - Cost Savings and Value For Money: reforms should deliver significant cost savings and drive value for money and long-term financial sustainability;
 - Stronger Leadership: reforms should provide stronger and more accountable strategic and local leadership;
 - Economic Growth and Infrastructure: reforms should drive economic growth and meet the infrastructure challenge, and;
 - Local Engagement and Empowerment: new structures should engage with communities and empower local areas
11. Grant Thornton undertook this work between May and August. Their process including engagement with a range of key local stakeholders, and a public call for evidence. The terms of reference were agreed by an independent advisory group chaired by the Right Reverend Colin Fletcher, Bishop of Dorchester, and made up of stakeholders drawn from public, private and voluntary sectors who advised Grant Thornton on the review.
12. Grant Thornton's study was published in August 2016 and identified that a single unitary council covering the whole of Oxfordshire was most able to meet these criteria. It is available at <http://news.oxfordshire.gov.uk/review-of-future-options-for-local-government-in-oxfordshire>
13. During the same period, Oxfordshire's five district and city councils commissioned PwC to undertake a similar study, which is also available online at https://www.oxford.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/2820/pwc_review_of_proposed_unitary_authority_options_with_a_combined_authority.pdf
14. On 20 September 2016, Cabinet received both of these reports along with a recommendation from the Performance Scrutiny Committee. Cabinet agreed to take forward work on the preferred option of a single unitary council,

determining that officers should work with stakeholders including the public to develop proposals for the new council. In particular Cabinet directed officers to further explore models to ensure that local areas within the new unitary council could make decisions for their own area, within an overall budget and policy framework set at the strategic level.

15. Subsequently the Leader of the Council committed to publishing a discussion document outlining draft proposals in order to facilitate to the fullest possible extent public and stakeholder engagement in their development.

Developing the Discussion Document

16. In order to ensure that as wide as possible an audience was able to participate in the development of proposals, it was determined that a discussion paper should be published at the earliest possible point on a “white paper” basis, with the draft proposal set out to promote and frame a public and stakeholder conversation.
17. After setting out the case for change and the blueprint for the new council, officers structured a document using the criteria established for the Grant Thornton study seeking to address how the proposed new model would meet the five criteria. A summary of relevant information about Oxfordshire and a summary of the options appraisal process were also included for context.
18. Throughout the development of the discussion document, the County Council continued to engage with members of the Stakeholder Advisory Group and other key partners in regular individual and group discussions.
19. The discussion document was published on 19 January and can be downloaded from <http://www.oneoxfordshire.org/our-vision>

Public Engagement

20. The engagement was designed to help improve and refine proposals ahead of a decision on submission to the Secretary of State. It included:
 - Commissioning a 500 interview representative door-step survey and an open online survey;
 - Holding well-publicised engagement visits to 42 libraries around Oxfordshire, and throughout the entire engagement period the libraries have had posters and response boxes with comment forms;
 - Continuing to work through the Stakeholder Advisory Group of key local organisations and holding a further formal meeting of this group as well as multiple individual meetings, telephone calls and presentations to groups and boards;
 - Writing to stakeholder organisations when the draft proposals were launched, and since. Our website and social media accounts direct visitors to a dedicated website;
 - Running digital and print media advertisements to raise awareness of the proposals;

- Engaging with town and parish councils on the detail of the proposal, including four formal events and attendance at individual meetings when requested, and offering articles to community newsletters and small local publications;
- Featuring on the proposals in council circulars such as [Your Oxfordshire](#) and the [Libraries newsletter](#);
- E-mailing over 30,000 Oxfordshire residents; and
- Holding deliberative workshops (one per city/district council area) to understand in detail residents' interests and concerns.

Working with District Councils

21. On 9 February a joint statement was issued by the leaders of Oxfordshire County Council, South Oxfordshire District Council and Vale of White Horse District Council.
22. In this statement they set out that *“Having looked at all the evidence, we are convinced that a single unitary council for Oxfordshire provides the best prospect for maintaining high quality services and securing badly needed investment in infrastructure”*.
23. As a result of this, joint work has been undertaken around a number of themes in the bid, in particular the localism model, to set out a proposal which commands support across both tiers of local government.
24. Unfortunately the City Council, West Oxfordshire DC, and Cherwell DC, have not been prepared to engage in developing a shared proposal, and have continued an active PR campaign, both jointly and individually, against proposals to reform local government in Oxfordshire.

The Revised Proposals

25. A range of outcomes from the engagement exercise are currently being used to finalise the revised proposals, which will be available to Scrutiny from 3 March. A presentation outlining the outcomes from this exercise will be made to Performance Scrutiny and a full report will be published prior to consideration by Cabinet. Engagement with the public and stakeholders will continue as proposals move from submission to implementation.

Legal Implications

26. The procedure for the creation of a unitary authority is set out in Sections 1-7 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007. Under this procedure, the Secretary of State can ‘invite’ a proposal. In making any such proposal, the proposing authority or authorities must have regard to any guidance from the Secretary of State as to what a proposal should seek to achieve and the matters that should be taken into account in formulating a proposal (Section 3(4)).

27. The most recent guidance formally issued by the Secretary of State was *Invitation to councils in England to make proposals for future unitary structures* published in 2006. The Department of Communities and Local Government has also actively engaged in conversations and correspondence much more recently with various local authorities about potential submissions under the Section 1-7 procedure, including this Council and Dorset and Buckinghamshire County Councils.
28. For this Council, it is for Cabinet to determine and submit a proposal to the Secretary of State. This is a function of the Cabinet under Section 9D(2) of the Local Government Act 2000. Once a submission is received by the Secretary of State, the procedures under the 2007 Act say that the Secretary of State *may* seek the advice of the Local Government Boundary Commission on any matter relating to the proposal. The procedures also *require* that the Secretary of State may not make an order implementing a proposal unless he/she has consulted every local authority and such other persons as he considers appropriate. It is for the Secretary of State to determine whether it is applicable or not, in the present case, that Section 15 of the Cities and Local Government Act 2016 allows him/her to 'fast track' any of the processes under Section 1-7 of the 2007 Act.
29. For this Council, the normal procedural requirements are that any bid has had regard to guidance from the Secretary of State (which has been the case) and that Cabinet makes the bid to the Secretary of State. Other considerations, after the submission of the bid, are for the Secretary of State to determine as of course is the final decision on whether to implement a proposal.

RECOMMENDATION

30. **The Committee is RECOMMENDED to consider the presentation giving feedback on the public and stakeholder engagement process and the revised bid document and make any such comments to Cabinet as they consider should be taken into account before determining whether or not to submit the bid to the Secretary of State.**

MAGGIE SCOTT
Assistant Chief Executive

Contact Officer: Robin Rogers, Strategy Manager, robin.rogers@oxfordshire.gov.uk
March 2017

This page is intentionally left blank