

**County Council
Tuesday, 12 December 2023**

SPEECHES

- 6. Petitions and Public Address (Pages 1 - 40)**

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 6

Katie Nellist:

Hi, I'm Katie. I am 16 yrs old and I have autism, anxiety, PTSD and an eating disorder. I struggled a lot in primary school and I have had barely any secondary school education. My PTSD is around education, mostly from year 6 SATS and mainstream school. I turned to the SEND service to try and get an education that suited me but the system I have been dealing with for the past 4 years is fundamentally broken. First I tried to go to a special needs school but no places were available. After trying other schools and being misled by the SEND service multiple times I realised that I could not go to any school at all due to my trauma. I thought an Education Other Than At School package would be best for me but my perspective was repeatedly ignored by the SEND service. At the time my PTSD was not diagnosed but I did undeniably have trauma which the SEND panel repeatedly brushed off as "school based anxiety" leaving me with no choice but to get diagnosed. The system is underfunded but many of the issues can be fixed without money. It does not cost anything to have clear communication within the system, or to be transparent with families about what's happening, or for them to listen to the young person who's future they are deciding. I want to be seen as a person not a case file. The process is emotionally draining and I have spent a lot of time crying over irrational decisions made by the SEND panel. It needs to be fixed now regardless of politics. There is no middle ground, you fix the system or you enable it to ruin more lives, this is your responsibility which is why I was shocked when the previous full council meeting did not discuss the specific failings in Oxfordshire given that the meeting before was about the SEND failings. The priority action plan has been rejected by the Department for Education, why are you not discussing this. Listen to us, I am one person but there are many, many others and we want to be heard. Our families and ourselves know us best, we are how change starts. Take some responsibility and listen to us. No more battles between SEND and families just work with us. If you don't want to listen then I can keep reminding you so that we won't be forgotten again. The failings of the system are a standing issue in our lives so they should be a standing issue at all full council meetings until Real improvements are made. Thank you.

This page is intentionally left blank

Alison Chisholm address to Oxfordshire County Council 12/12/2023

Thank you for the opportunity to speak about participatory processes and deliberative democracy. I am a resident of Rose Hill and a researcher at Oxford University. I led the Street Voice citizens' jury on transport, climate and health in Headington last year, and we went on to organise a workshop about deliberative democracy for councillors and officers at Kellogg College in May, which some of you attended.

For those who weren't there, citizens' juries and assemblies bring together a diverse group of people reflective of the community to hear information from a range of perspectives, often on complex or contentious issues. This is followed by facilitated deliberation, to find common ground on ways forward.

These are respectful, constructive processes that deliver policy recommendations that are responsive to local needs. Time and again they have been shown to bring out the best in people, to engage and empower citizens, and enable them to work through differences, building trust where it has been damaged.

They *are* resource intensive but some councils have approached foundations for funding or collaborate with others to commission them jointly. We know there's a high price to pay for bringing in policies when communities feel they are not heard and become polarised. And the cost is not just for the event itself – it's an investment in trust and building bridges between citizens and decision-makers, which can seed further engagement processes, helping to build up resilient, cohesive communities.

There are precious few spaces where people who disagree with each other come together to really listen and understand other perspectives. Citizens' juries and assemblies are examples of where this can really happen. If you pay attention to how they interface with the existing democratic system, they are not a threat to it, but, the opposite – they can rejuvenate it, even resuscitate it. So I strongly encourage you to support them.

This page is intentionally left blank

Oxfordshire County Council statement December 2023

Item 13 Electoral Review: Local Government Boundary Commission for England Draft Recommendations

I represent the Wantage and Grove Campaign Group

Thank you for letting me address this meeting.

In the draft recommendations for the Local Government Boundary changes, your report states that in the Vale of White Horse – there are minor changes around the parishes outside of Grove.

But the changes proposed by the Commission take a significant area (Charlton and the associated Kingsgrove development) out of Wantage and place it in a geographically diverse division which would extend from within Wantage to a point beyond the eastern edge of Didcot. We believe therefore that the proposed changes fail the test of having strong, easily identifiable boundaries.

Wantage Town Council have submitted a detailed response to the commission which in summary includes:

- Placing Charlton, Kingsgrove and the villages of Lockinge, Ardington and the Hendreds in one division with the Wantage 3 Polling district and Chilton.
- Moving Upton and Blewbury into the same division as Harwell and Valley Park as all of these villages are more linked to Didcot than Wantage.
- Enlarging the remaining Wantage division by adding the villages of East and West Challow and Letcombe Regis and the Grove Brook Polling district.
- Moving East and West Hanney, Goosy and Denchworth into the Grove Division.
- Adding Milton Village to Drayton, Sutton Courtney and Steventon.

This proposal makes the six divisions in the southern part of the Vale of the White Horse more balanced and meet the statutory criteria set for the Boundary Commission better than the original proposal.

We therefore ask that you amend the recommendation on the agenda today to include these changes proposed for the Southern Vale.

Thank you for listening, Julie Maberley.

This page is intentionally left blank

Oxfordshire County Council statement December 2023
Item 13 Electoral Review: Local Government Boundary Commission for England Draft
Recommendations

Barry Gooch, local resident

Thank you for permitting me to address you on this matter.

I respectfully request that this Council makes a small amendment to its recommendation regarding Item 13 as it relates to the Southern Vale.

Please consider taking on board the views of Wantage Town Council (“WTC”) whose response to the Commission is neatly summarised by Julie Mabberley, who I believe is also speaking today. Adopting WTC’s proposal would reflect the views of locals and the actual geographical, historical, and social situation as it relates to our area.

The LGBCE report recommends that Grove representation reverts to being a single County Division as it was before 2008, which I completely agree with.

However, I, and many others, strongly disagree with the approach taken by the Commission towards Wantage and its surrounding area. The suggested new Division fails to meet the Commission’s own criteria of being coterminous as it cuts across several District, and Town boundaries.

Wantage is bounded on its southern limit by an AONB which prevents any development to the South. North of Wantage sits Grove and so the only possible future expansion of Wantage is to the East and West towards villages that rely upon the town for shopping and local services.

By disregarding any western expansion of Wantage, the Commission ignores the fact that these villages are currently lumped in with Shrivenham, some 11 miles distant and which has nothing in common with them, whereas they rely upon Wantage and historically formed part of Wantage Rural District Council.

Charlton is an integrated part of the town of Wantage, and is the location for Wantage Community Hospital, Wantage & Grove Cricket Club, and Wantage Community Support Centre. In these bodies the term ‘Wantage Community’ indicates the position that Charlton holds within the Town.

The suggested new Division would cross the A34 to extend as far away as Blewbury, Chilton, and Upton which are centred upon Didcot for all services and facilities. The Division would be unbalanced as the urban populations of Charlton and Kingsgrove would make up 56% of the constituents and inevitably drown out any issues from the small rural villages.

I respectfully ask that this Council takes these matters on board and recommends that the Commission revisits Item 13 as it relates to the Southern Vale.

This page is intentionally left blank

Address to Oxfordshire County Council on SESRO Motion

(Motion by Councillor Sally Povolotsky, item 17), 12 December 2023.

CPRE fully support this motion. The need for this reservoir is at best uncertain and at worst considerably exaggerated – the need is based on large, unrealistic population projections, a blanket reduction of groundwater extraction and an unlikely climate change scenario. There are considerable uncertainties in all these projections, and this suggests, strongly, that any strategic water resource project needs to be scalable and adaptable. We contend that the proposed reservoir can not be scalable or adaptable. This is in contrast other schemes, such as recycling water transfer and Severn – Thames Transfer, which can. These alternatives, also, will do considerably less environmental and social damage.

In addition, we are concerned that the plans for water in the region are fragmented and ignore the pressing need to invest to improve water quality across the rivers in the South-East. We call for a more holistic analysis of water across the region.

The RAPID project – which is supposed to produce a rational and transparent assessment of strategic water resource projects – is nothing of the sort. A typical example is the sudden increase in the size of the reservoir requirement from 100 to 150 million cubic metres – there are many other examples.

So CPRE fully supports the calls in this motion for a pause of the SESRO planning and the convening multi-stakeholder talks to fully explore the uncertainties, consequences and risks in this plan.

Thank you for your attention

Richard Harding, Chair CPRE Oxfordshire, 9 December 2023

This page is intentionally left blank

Kiera Bentley

"I make representation at today's meeting as an elected member of Grove North Ward for The Vale of White Horse District Council.

The SESRO project is massive and my ward is in the potential impact area, yet many of my constituents have had no meaningful engagement and most are totally unaware of the proposals.

The Letcombe Brook is a very special chalk stream that runs through Wantage and Grove. As rare as a rain forest and highly protected, yet the truth is, at 3am this morning for an hour and a half sewage was being discharged into Letcombe Brook. At this moment according to TW's own data sewage is being discharged at Shrivenham, Uffington, Kingston Bagpuise, Appleton, Drayton, Didcot and Abingdon and has been in most cases for the last 7 hours all within 10 miles of the reservoir site!

What faith can residents have in Thames Water about the alleged impact on the area regarding nature recovery? At 2 recent information events I attended, I was told conflicting outcomes regarding the dangers around bund failure and emergency planning. I would suggest that the truth is, the modelling has not been done and if it has, the results are too stark for the public to hear.

Maybe washing away of our smaller Parishes is considered acceptable collateral damage but surely the public has a right to know all the information and to be consulted using accurate figures? Meaningful discussion with the public has not taken place on the proposed current size and all the information is not available.

This project should go no further without a public enquiry and proper scrutiny.

The fact is if this project goes ahead, all the Councillors that did not object or call the water companies to proper account.... if you did not demand a public enquiry and insist due diligence was as comprehensive as you have the power to call then you must hold your head in shame when the next generations come and say "How was this allowed to happen?" Will you be putting your hand on your heart and know you did all you could today?

As Bethia Thomas, Leader of the Vale District Council, said, 'It's ridiculous to think that a giant Reservoir dominating our countryside, impacting our environment and involving significant financial and carbon costs could be considered the best solution".

We should be focusing on fast tracking less disruptive alternatives; fixing leaks, educating for reducing consumption and exploring the use of transfers etc.

I challenge members of this committee to make their vote count today and insist a public enquiry is held and support today's motion.

I suggest this project is not about capacity and need, this is about profit and greed.

Sort out your out-dated, leaking supply system. Stop trying to deceive the locals and start investing the money paid to your shareholders and fix the current failings."

GARD Address to OCC SESRO Motion 17 – 12th December 2023: Derek Stork

Good morning, I am chairman of GARD, and a Steventon resident.

The hugely disruptive Abingdon Reservoir, the size of Gatwick Airport, and taking 15 years to construct and fill, can only be justified if one assumes completely unrealistic population growth, and if Thames Water are not held to account on bringing their appalling leakage record down to industry average levels by 2050.

Thames Water must be held to account. We cannot go on building ever larger concrete structures and desecrating countryside just to satisfy unrealistic growth projections and prepare water for populations who will never exist.

Thames Water's proposal for a 100 Million cubic metre reservoir was defeated at Public Inquiry in 2010, and Thames returned to this proposal again in 2019 and 2023. There was overwhelming condemnation of the proposal from Oxfordshire stakeholders.

With utter contempt for Oxfordshire opinion, Thames Water has chosen to ignore all the valid criticisms of local Stakeholders about its plans for this hugely destructive Reservoir. Instead, it has 'doubled down' and, without any further consultation, now proposes an even larger reservoir of 150 Million tonnes of water, 50% bigger than rejected in 2010. This proposal will increase destruction of habitat and atmospheric pollution during construction, lengthen construction time and increase flooding and safety hazards once built. The cost has already inflated by one-third since the consultation (now £2.4 Billion). This is totally unacceptable. Not a drop of water will be delivered by this project until 2040 – a full six years behind the date by which we could have a cheaper and more drought resilient supply from the River Severn transfer.

We call on the government to suspend this proposal whilst Thames actually addresses the issues raised, especially those of flooding and safety post-construction. The Secretary of State should also remove SESRO from the Ofwat major infrastructure (so-called RAPID) process, which is clearly not fit for purpose in establishing the facts.

I urge you to support motion 17.

This page is intentionally left blank

Oxfordshire County Council statement December 2023
Item 17 Motion regarding SESRO (Abingdon Reservoir)

Barry Gooch, local resident

Thank you for permitting me to address you on this matter.

I wish to strongly support Councillor Sally Povolotsky's Motion which builds upon the expert work of GARD in countering Thames Water's highly self-interested project.

This issue has gone on for too long without resolution causing anxiety and uncertainty for local populations. The fact that the case for SESRO appears to be built on disputable data and debatable logic is bad enough. However, the current concerns about Thames Water's debt laden, highly geared, trajectory mean there now must be serious doubts about its ability to manage such a huge infrastructure project.

Thames Water has failed in its existing duties of fixing leaks and implementing measures to prevent raw sewage entering our rivers. The reasons given for developing SESRO and its proposed size has changed repeatedly over the past 20 or so years and they have dismissed out of hand any of the possible alternatives.

How on earth are we supposed to trust that an organisation topping the table of water companies for leaks and near the top for storm overflow discharges can deliver SESRO, and to a novel design?

Of course, the resolutions in this motion regarding a meeting with the Secretary of State and a request to OFWAT to pause SESRO in RAPID must be adopted at least until the questions have been answered and other schemes considered.

The final insult is that Thames Water expects the population of Oxfordshire to put up with:

- the construction of SESRO,
- the disruption to our rail and road services, and
- nuisance that will be caused

Alongside a 40% uplift in water bills so that London, East Anglia, Southern Water, or whomsoever they next choose as justification for SESRO, can enjoy the benefits.

Please carry this motion.

This page is intentionally left blank

Alison Semple

As a local resident, I have huge concerns about the RAPID Gated process, which hasn't yet allowed for any consideration of the main problem for people living in the area: the issue of risk.

Thames Water has been allowed to proceed through various stages of the process, and for its proposal to take on an unjustified degree of credibility, when it should never have got past the first hurdle, given the risks associated with what is being proposed.

It's also allowed Thames Water to get away with the most superficial of PR campaigns which completely fails to answer even the most basic questions around any actual advantages for the local area; or give any serious consideration to the Elephant in the Room: The actual size of this monster reservoir and the potential risks for the local population.

Residents I've spoken to have been largely unaware that this would be the biggest reservoir of its type in the UK. The process has allowed Thames Water to carry on planning, without any meaningful conversation around what would happen to the 10,000 residents of adjoining villages, and the 40,000+ inhabitants of Grove and Abingdon, in the event of a safety issue; around the flood wave that would hit East Hanney within 8 minutes of a catastrophic breach; or the estimated loss of 11 lives in the closest properties.

It doesn't matter if the risk of a failure is one in a trillion. Because of the gigantic nature of the reservoir, and the devastation and potential loss of life that would result from a failure, ANY risk is too great.

These issues cannot continue to be swept under the carpet. I believe the fact that Thames Water has been allowed to continue to develop plans for a frankly experimental scheme which would see us living in the shadow of 150 billion litres of water demonstrates a truly alarming level of disregard for our local communities. The transparent process and honest engagement that are urgently needed are orders of magnitude away from anything that Thames Water or the regulator have come close to delivering so far.

This page is intentionally left blank

Olly Glover

Speech in support of reservoir motion, item 17

**Oxfordshire County Council meeting, Tuesday 12th December
2023**

My name is Olly Glover. I live in Milton, and I am the Liberal Democrat parliamentary candidate for Didcot and Wantage constituency.

There is huge concern in the villages surrounding the site of the proposed reservoir about the scale of the proposal; the safety of its design; and the environmental, construction and water bills impact.

This concern was intensified when the size of the proposed reservoir was doubled over what was consulted about beforehand.

Residents feel that the case for the reservoir has not been made, particularly amidst huge losses of water from leaks; the very long construction time for the reservoir; unanswered questions about population growth assumptions used; and the financial sustainability of Thames Water.

Before any giant reservoir arrives in our area, we need answers as to why the Severn-Thames Transfer has been rejected as an alternative; to better regulate Thames Water, particularly on its water leaks performance; to examine how we can all use water resources more efficiently; and turn Thames Water in a public benefit company, with much tougher regulation that is clearly needed.

I urge the council to play its part in challenging the proposed giant reservoir, by voting for this motion.

This page is intentionally left blank

Claire Brenner

I am speaking on behalf of Oxfordshire SEND Parent Action.

First, I'd like to pay tribute to Katie who presented her petition today. We wholeheartedly support her request that SEND should be on the agenda at every full council meeting.

When I spoke here 2 months ago, us parents thought things were about to improve...

We know senior managers have been busy behind the scenes. And we thank Cllr Gregory for meeting with us, but...

3 months post-Ofsted there has not been ANY improvement. If anything...things are getting WORSE. No sense of urgency, no steps to increase transparency, no sign the adversarial culture is changing, no plans for genuine coproduction with parents...as Katie said many of the solutions don't cost money but require you to start treating our children as individuals not case files.

What does it say that two councillors with lived experience of SEND have felt the need to resign from their parties over this issue?

I was contacted by a desperate parent this week who told me OCC plans to stop funding the alternative provision for her two autistic children, against professional advice. This is the only education they have accessed in the past for 2 years. The mum says:

"I'm just still so shocked they can do what the F they want with no reason when it's clearly so damaging. I haven't told the kids yet because I keep thinking I can do something to reverse the decision, but if I don't say something soon they will get no closure at their provision. If I do say something I risk them not being able to go because they will be too upset".

So yes, Cllr Reeves you rightly highlight the huge projected overspend in Children's services. But I hope you agree that SEND funding must be a priority. You cannot fix the overspend by just cutting funding for existing provision. We need big, bold, unified action to fix Oxfordshire's SEND crisis.

What we're getting just feels like politics as usual...

This page is intentionally left blank

John Skinner

Labour's proposed amendment to the LTNs

I am planning to stand as an Independent Oxford alliance candidate in St Marys and I live in Marston St.

On the LTNs If you want to get the right treatment you need the right diagnosis. The labour diagnosis of LTNs is that the problems is congestion at the plain and private school traffic; their solution is to open Rectory Road and Marston St, talk nicely to the Magdalen College school and install traffic lights at the plain; miraculously this will make traffic evaporate, and enable public transport to work.

Years ago, there was an accident injuring a child at the end of my street. traffic calming was installed to stop cars crossing Cowley Rd from Rectory Rd to Marston St and preventing right turns. Rectory Rd traffic is routed to Cowley and Marston St traffic is directed to the Plain, the opposite of where people want to travel. Marston St and Rectory Rd are narrow with parking on both sides and not suitable for the purpose Labour propose.

The key measure to reduce congestion at the plain would be to open many of the side streets with major safety and traffic calming measures after talking to local residents.

Labour ignore the other problems of the LTNs including the constant jams on the ring road, the chaos arising from the Cowley LTN. Labour still support the lunatic busgates, the ANPRs on Divinity Rd, James St and Magdalen rd and banning blue badge holders access thru ANPR barriers.

The impact of the LTNs is not just failing buses, greater pollution and massive gridlock. The health impact is massive. The LTNs are strangling our health system; Emergency Services cannot get to patients; public transport to hospitals no longer functions at peak times; staff are leaving schools and hospitals for other towns where they can get to work easily. The daily chaos is delaying treatment and increasing the stress on sick patients worried about getting to hospital on time. No one here seems to care.

If Labour wanted to stop this they could pass a motion at the city council. They haven't. This motion is a cynical piece of political theatre designed to produce quotes for Red Rose election leaflets implying opposition to LTNs. The reality is Labour are scared because independents will be standing and they are frightened of losing.

This page is intentionally left blank

The most startling thing about this motion is what is missing from it.

Fifty years ago the last plans to bulldoze an inner ring-road across East Oxford were abandoned. This has left two different approaches to addressing steadily increasing congestion. The first is exemplified by the hugely successful 1999 Oxford Transport Strategy, which made High St into a bus priority route. The second approach has involved giving time and space to cars at the expense of people, by pushing motor traffic down side streets entirely unsuited for it and by junction designs that compromise pedestrian accessibility and cycling safety in the interests of traffic flows.

This motion doesn't even mention the planned traffic filters and Zero Emission Zone, and instead proposes various measures to take space away from walking and cycling and community -- it even includes a cut-down version of that inner ring road through East Oxford. In doing this it throws everything behind failed approaches to reducing congestion and turns its back on the bus priority measures that would actually work. ## Some of the measures it suggests are directly incompatible with the traffic filters ##

The motion calls for the county to "Investigate installing traffic lights on The Plain to improve traffic flow", without any mention of safety or accessibility. The implication of this is that traffic flow is all that matters, but in reality designs to make the Plain safer need to reduce its motor traffic throughput, not increase it.

The motion also says that "the Council has not effectively engaged Oxford's communities on transport". But it goes on to propose specific measures on specific streets, where no consultation whatsoever has been carried out. Neither the residents nor the councillors for the area were even informed about a proposal that would turn Marston St into an A road.

The only good bit of this motion is the support for School Streets schemes. Driven school-runs create four car trips a day, at the worst possible times for congestion and in the worst possible places for road danger, so inhibiting those would be hugely beneficial. We need School Streets schemes not just on Cowley Place but also on Barracks Lane and on Charlbury Rd, as those would remove road danger from key walking and cycling routes as well as reducing congestion.

Labour needs to come out with clear and explicit backing for the traffic filters and the ZEZ and Vision Zero, otherwise it is going to be very hard for anyone who cares about sustainable transport

to support them.

Robin Tucker

Address to Council re M O'Connor Motion on Road Capacity Being Exceeded 12 Dec 2023

Councillor O'Connor is right to point to road capacity being exceeded by traffic at least 10 years ago. But we are surprised that he makes no mention of the traffic filters.

Traffic problems will not be solved without reducing traffic. If you think they can be solved by adding roads to the network, then look at the 26 lane Katy Highway in Texas, which was congested almost as soon as it was widened. More capacity just encourages more traffic.

Because of this, the Strategic Traffic Filter plan was adopted in 2015. If it remained on schedule, they would already be in place. As things happened, it was approved for business case development by the Conservative Cabinet in January 2020 with four exemptions mentioned, and approved for implementation by the Fair Deal Alliance in November 2022 with 18 types of exemption.

We welcome suggestions to solve the decades old traffic problem. However, we'll make three points.

First, there is no need to waste the Council's time with this. Officers are already tasked with the job by the East Oxford LTN approval in September, and a Council Motion in November. We sent our suggestions by email last month.

Second. Don't promote schemes that reverse gains in traffic reduction or improvements in walking, wheeling, cycling and bus use. These will simply put more traffic back at some pinch point in the network.

Third. Don't endanger the health and safety of residents for the convenience of motorists. Evidence shows traffic in residential streets increases heart and lung diseases¹ and road casualties². Such proposals are simply unethical. You heard last month the moving testimony of Sarah Lockyer and Abby White whose mobility has been enabled by low traffic streets – listen to them.

We need to reduce traffic the city for active travel and buses, for health and for emergency services. Most of public knows this, and YouGov representative polling shows that Traffic Filters, ZEZ, Workplace Parking Levy and Low Traffic Neighbourhoods are all supported by a two-to-one majority. 12,000 people directly benefit from quieter, safer streets. They will be looking to you for support not a return to clogged, toxic rat runs.

¹ <https://www.kcl.ac.uk/news/living-near-a-busy-road-can-stunt-childrens-lung-growth>

² <https://cohsat.org.uk/road-casualties-halved-in-cowley-ltn/>



Robin Tucker, Co-Chair CoHSAT

Zuhura Plummer

Address to Council – 12 December 2023



I'm not going spend time running through the points of this motion, which could have been more constructive while achieving what Labour needed, but instead look at the meaning behind this it.

Fundamentally this is Labour sounding the alarm that people on the doorsteps are saying 'I don't understand why I can't drive like I used to'.

And I get that. Why these LTNs/traffic filters/ZEZ? It's all the same? Why make driving so difficult?

And the honest truth is known by everyone in this room – it's because 100k more houses in our County means 150k more cars, many of them trying to get in and out of Oxford every day.

Everyone in this room knows that you can't speed up buses without swapping out some car journeys. Everyone knows you can't gently persuade people out of their cars. Even the Tories which is why they introduced the LTNs and were going to introduce the filters before Covid.

But the public outside this room don't know this. But they're not stupid – they get it, if you explain it.

And this is the material point.

These policies need to turn information into knowledge and understanding.

You need stories that feel right in people's bones, values-led narratives which reframe core beliefs around freedom, flexibility, and convenience.

And it needs to start way, way before the policies are introduced.

And I don't mean a standard marcomms campaign, which at best fill an information deficit. It needs bravery, imagination and creativity which requires resources - and god knows the current comms officers are doing the best they can with what they have.

This is HARD. This is a new world. It would be amazing if any local authority emerged from a decade of austerity and came up with this.

But we do now we know we need it. And please do not say there are not the resources for it. There are resources for the legal and technical elements, but a stool cannot not stand up on only two legs alone, and building this social mandate has clearly not been considered to be essential – not by the current admin or when four Labour members sat on the cabinet. If it is not invested in, then all the policies will be swept away on a tide of disinformation and misunderstanding. And no data and monitoring plan, no matter how extensive, will make an adequate life raft.

This motion is not about traffic lights at the Plain. It is about people having a sense of where we're going, and why we're going there, and how we're going to get there together, and you've got to provide it.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Richard Parnham's presentation to Oxfordshire County Council
12 December 2023**

Today, you will vote on a motion that the motion's author, Michael O'Connor, says will improve bus services and reduce congestion in the city. However, while it is to be welcomed that Labour is finally proposing to open up various roads to facilitate traffic dispersion, the specific roads Mr O'Connor is suggesting are unlikely – by themselves – to do very little to facilitate this.

Sadly, the roads proposed for opening up seem to be been selected on the basis of trying to rescue Labour's vote across East Oxford, and head off divisions within his own party, rather than for than for the reasons stated. Please correct me if I'm wrong in that impression.

For example, the motion proposes to open up Crowell Road / Littlemore Road / Oxford Road in Church Cowley – a vital link road between Littlemore and the facilities around Templar's Square. That's all great – but let's not kid itself that the move is anything other than a panicked, defensive measure by Labour against the new Independent Oxford Alliance, which had its launch event in Littlemore.

If you were serious about reducing traffic and freeing up bus routes around Hollow Way, you'd consider opening up the Crescent Road filter – but that's not on the cards, presumably because Charlie Hicks will blow a gasket if you do. Be brave – add Crescent Road (and Bartholomew / Cornwallis Road) to the list. Maybe Charlie will leave the party, if you're a little bit more forthright about opening up additional roads around Cowley. Everyone in Cowley, apart from Charlie, wins if that happens. Go on, why not make everyone's Christmas?

Secondly, there's no plan to alleviate the massive traffic jams and wrecked bus services that are the bane of the lives of Morrell Avenue residents by opening up Divinity Road – presumably because you don't want Jemima Hunt, councillor for St Clements, "throwing toys out of [the] pram as expected", as one senior labour councillor said to me recently. It doesn't seem to have occurred to Ms Hunt that there's more to St Clements than Divinity Road.

If Labour thought this motion would allow them to see the back of what – for them – the dreadful Oxford Mail headline "Labour thwarts bid to scrap LTNs", I'm not entirely sure that's going to be successful, based on what's currently offered. "Labour in cynical LTN election ploy" might be a more realistic description of what's on the table today - because I'm afraid that's very much what this motion looks like.

This page is intentionally left blank

Thank you for this opportunity. I have lived in Littlemore for 32 years and am Chair of the Working Group developing a Neighbourhood Plan for Littlemore, though I am speaking in a personal capacity.

My comments relate especially to the clause in Motion 19 calling for an investigation of opening the Littlemore Road filter to motor traffic outside school travel hours and associated measures, though I also largely support the rest of the motion.

I have sympathy with the objectives of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods in reducing car traffic and pollution. However, I believe that the implementation of these, especially in Littlemore, has been both insensitive and unlikely to achieve these objectives.

Residents of Littlemore have for many years felt not listened to and 'done to.' But I have never known an issue raise such strong and divisive feelings as the LTNs. This is reflected in many consultations, most recently the Issues and Options survey for the Neighbourhood Plan, where much the most frequent response related to 'getting rid of LTNs'. Responses seemed to reflect which part of Littlemore respondents lived in and their age and background. As well as those living near Cowley Centre, residents in the most disadvantaged areas, especially blue badge holders, carers and businesses which need to carry tools, are very angry about what they see as unreasonable restrictions on their freedom, seeing the current set up as favouring those who are younger and able to walk or cycle. This is an issue of community cohesion and social justice, not simply traffic management.

The most important issue is how the Crowell Bollard stops cars and vans accessing Cowley Centre, which has always been the main place for shopping and other facilities. Linked to the lack of a frequent, reliable bus service, this results in longer journeys (and more pollution) and the accompanying frustration for those who need to use cars.

Pragmatic and workable solutions are needed. Opening up the Littlemore Road filter to vehicular traffic as much as possible, with the use of ANPR cameras, would go a long way towards reducing this sense of frustration and disaffection. I believe that the measures proposed to do so outside school travel hours should be actively and urgently investigated- and implemented as and when feasible. I emphasize especially the need to discourage traffic from travelling too fast on Littlemore Road. I urge you to support Motion 19, especially the elements highlighted.

Tony Eaude (Dr)

This page is intentionally left blank

Dear all,

Thank you for having me. My name is Gabriele Santi and I moved to the UK in 2017 and I've lived in Littlemore since. I am a councillor in the Littlemore Parish Council, but I'm speaking today in a personal capacity.

The Littlemore LTN has been a divisive topic lately, and I don't intend to waste your time by dragging you into the religious war that has been unfolding recently. I agree with you that the problem LTNs are trying to solve *has* to be solved, but I am doubtful that the current implementation of the Littlemore LTN is *actually* solving it. Yes, I am referring to the specificities of Littlemore, not LTNs in general.

And I'm not surprised. I am an engineer by profession and I know that "all-or-nothing" kinds of solutions are rarely optimal, if ever. The physical bollards are such an approach.

They push the problem to the boundaries instead of solving it, exacerbating the issues this city already has about traffic flows.

They create social inequalities, since the introduction of the LTN hasn't been followed by an improved public transport offer, or any other means that *make the car redundant*.

ANPR cameras offer a more balanced solution that comfortably stays somewhere between the "all" and the "nothing". It is dynamic, tweakable and effectively simplifies enforcement.

It is, in my opinion, the measure that, along with other concepts like the 15-minute city, will enable us to enjoy the real benefits of LTNs, as I imagined them implemented in a world-class city like Oxford.
I hence kindly invite you to support motion 19.

Thank you for your time.

This page is intentionally left blank

Robert Aitken Petition to OCC Meeting of 12 December 2023 Re: proposed withdrawal of Short Stay Hub Beds (SSHBs) from Henley

I'm Robert Aitken, resident of South Oxfordshire living in Bix & Assendon. I have had a long participation with the Townlands Steering Group, am a trustee of the League of Friends of Townlands, and was an Ambulance Service Community Responder.

I wish to protest against the proposed closure of the SSHBs in Henley and fully support Councillor Gawrysiack's motion to have this decision deferred to allow proper consultation.

This decision was taken without any communication, let alone consultation, with local interest groups, the community, or even GP surgeries. The existing Hub has been well used and is valued by local GPs.

The argument put forward against consultation is that it is not needed as the beds' contract is with OCC, so not NHS beds. This is pure sophistry. The beds were a direct replacement for NHS beds in the old Townlands under an NHS contract; if that was subsequently switched, that too was without communication or consultation; and the beds continue to function as step down NHS beds.

The sole justification appears to be to fulfil a national target, effectively that no more than 5% of hospital discharges be to bed hubs or equivalent. This is an arbitrary nationwide target, and may or may not be right as that, but for it to be a prescriptive local requirement irrespective of clinical need is inappropriate. The implication that a small minority **would** require a step-down bed is not being respected for this large area of South Oxfordshire as we would have **zero** beds. There is no guarantee of space in alternatives which are getting squeezed too. In any event they are not close enough for family participation in the recovery.

I understand that the "beefed up" Care in the Home Service to support this was not fully in place let alone trialled when this decision was taken. Since then, Government decisions to increase minimum wage, with further unfunded pressure on local authorities, and new limits on legal immigration of care workers' families, are likely to put further pressure on the labour-intensive home care system.

I ask you to imagine the situation of an elderly person, possibly themselves a carer, being discharged from hospital with a spouse unable to care for a rehabilitating partner, or with no-one at home. The idea of servicing this rehabilitating minority only via a drop-in care service does not bear thinking about.

Failure to get this right will be hugely detrimental to those patients affected and to the functioning of the main hospitals left potentially with bed blocking. There is little sign that it has been got right.

Thank you.

This page is intentionally left blank

Statement to Oxfordshire County Council – Tuesday 12 December

Daniel Leveson, Place Director for Oxfordshire (Integrated Care Board)

Firstly, I would like to acknowledge that we (as a health and care system) could have communicated new services and changes in our urgent and emergency care system better.

In recent weeks I am glad we have been able to meet with Henley Town Councillors and local GPs to discuss our plans. As we progress, we will put more into our engagement efforts.

Our plans for urgent and emergency care have been developed as a partnership between NHS and Local Authority. We followed our governance processes approving our plans at our Urgent and Emergency Care Board before bringing them to both Health and Wellbeing Board and Health Overview Scrutiny Committee (HOSC). I welcome further scrutiny when our plans and decisions regarding short stay hub beds are discussed at January's HOSC.

I am confident in the model of urgent care we are delivering in Oxfordshire. It is a model of care that prioritises supporting people, whenever possible, in their own homes.

If someone needs bed-based rehabilitation or ongoing complex medical oversight they will go to a community hospital bed. If they need reablement or longer-term social care assessment in a bed they will go to a short stay hub bed. As we increase support in people's homes, we will reduce the need for these types of beds.

In November last year we introduced a Transfer of Care Hub. This is a multidisciplinary team responsible for planning people's discharges as soon as they are admitted. Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) successfully engaged domiciliary care providers and as a result they have been able to increase the hours of home care delivered by 19% to over 30,000 hours per week.

We have a countywide hospital at home service, caring for acutely sick people in their homes avoiding unnecessary hospital admissions. We are also developing integrated neighbourhood teams that provide continuity of care for people with long-term conditions and older frail people, again avoiding unnecessary hospital admissions.

As a result of these initiatives and our commitment to working as a system we are bucking the national trend, reducing delays in discharges from hospitals meaning people spend more time at home – where they want to be.

This is good news for the people of Oxfordshire. This is a model of care to meet the needs of Oxfordshire's population now and in the future. As we enter 2024, I hope we can continue to build on the momentum we have created in 2023.

This page is intentionally left blank