

To: **Members of the Cabinet**

## ***Notice of a Meeting of the Cabinet***

**Tuesday, 18 April 2023 at 2.00 pm**

**Rooms 1&2 - County Hall, New Road, Oxford OX1 1ND**

If you wish to view proceedings online, please click on the link shown on the website.



Martin Reeves  
Chief Executive

April 2023

*Committee Officer: Chris Reynolds*  
*Tel: 07393 001096;*  
*E-Mail: [chris.reynolds@oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:chris.reynolds@oxfordshire.gov.uk)*

### **Membership**

#### *Councillors*

Liz Leffman	Leader of the Council
Liz Brighthouse OBE	Deputy Leader of the Council
Glynis Phillips	Cabinet Member for Corporate Services
Dr Pete Sudbury	Cabinet Member for Climate Change Delivery & Environment
Tim Bearder	Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care
Duncan Enright	Cabinet Member for Travel & Development Strategy
Calum Miller	Cabinet Member for Finance
Jenny Hannaby	Cabinet Member for Community Services and Safety
Mark Lygo	Cabinet Member for Public Health & Equality
Andrew Gant	Cabinet Member for Highway Management

*The Agenda is attached. Decisions taken at the meeting will become effective at the end of the working day on 26<sup>th</sup> April 2023 unless called in by that date for review by the appropriate Scrutiny Committee. Copies of this Notice, Agenda and supporting papers are circulated to all Members of the County Council.*

*Date of next meeting: 23 May 2023*

## AGENDA

### 1. Apologies for Absence

### 2. Declarations of Interest

- guidance note below

### 3. Minutes (Pages 1 - 16)

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 21 March 2023 (CA3) and to receive information arising from them.

### 4. Questions from County Councillors

Any county councillor may, by giving notice to the Proper Officer by 9 am two working days before the meeting, ask a question on any matter in respect of the Cabinet's delegated powers.

The number of questions which may be asked by any councillor at any one meeting is limited to two (or one question with notice and a supplementary question at the meeting) and the time for questions will be limited to 30 minutes in total. As with questions at Council, any questions which remain unanswered at the end of this item will receive a written response.

Questions submitted prior to the agenda being despatched are shown below and will be the subject of a response from the appropriate Cabinet Member or such other councillor or officer as is determined by the Cabinet Member, and shall not be the subject of further debate at this meeting. Questions received after the despatch of the agenda, but before the deadline, will be shown on the Schedule of Addenda circulated at the meeting, together with any written response which is available at that time.

### 5. Petitions and Public Address

*Members of the public who wish to speak at this meeting can attend the meeting in person or 'virtually' through an online connection.*

*To facilitate 'hybrid' meetings we are asking that requests to speak or present a petition are submitted by no later than 9am four working days before the meeting i.e., 9am on Wednesday 12 April 2023. Requests to speak should be sent to [chris.reynolds@oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:chris.reynolds@oxfordshire.gov.uk)*

*If you are speaking 'virtually', you may submit a written statement of your presentation to ensure that your views are taken into account. A written copy of your statement can be*

*provided no later than 9am 2 working days before the meeting. Written submissions should be no longer than 1 A4 sheet.*

## **6. Reports from Scrutiny Committees (Pages 17 - 56)**

Cabinet will receive four scrutiny reports:-

- From the Performance and Corporate Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the Cost of Living
- From the People Overview and Scrutiny Committee on Transitions to Adult Social Care
- From the People Overview and Scrutiny Committee on Children and Adults' Social Care Workforce
- From the People Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the Home to School Transport Policy Working Group

## **7. Proposal From Oxford United Football Club to Oxfordshire County Council As Landowner: Update (Pages 57 - 66)**

*Cabinet Member:* Finance

*Forward Plan Ref:* 2023/080

*Contact:* Claire Taylor, Corporate Director Customers, Organisational Development & Resources, [claire.taylor@oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:claire.taylor@oxfordshire.gov.uk)

Report by Corporate Director Customers, Organisational Development & Resources (**CA 7**).

RECOMMENDATION

**The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to**

- (a) Note the progress set out in the report below.
- (b) Note the that the 'Likely Case' timetable set out in appendix 1 remains the probable timeframe for decision making.

## **8. ERP Outline Business Case - A Programme for Transforming the Council's Enterprise Business Systems and Processes (Pages 67 - 98)**

*Cabinet Members:* Finance and Corporate Services

*Forward Plan Ref:* 2023/029

*Contact:* Tim Spiers, Director of IT, Innovation, Digital and Transformation, [tim.spiers@oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:tim.spiers@oxfordshire.gov.uk)

Report by Corporate Director Customers, Organisational Development & Resources (**CA 8**).

**Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to**

- a. Approve the development of detailed requirements and a full business case to review delivery options for corporate support services and underpinning technology including human resources, finance, payroll and procurement in order to deliver services more efficiently, modernise business processes and upgrade current IT systems.
- b. Approve funding of £1.57m for programme resources to prepare requirements for a transformation and potential procurement process. This funding will be drawn from the council's transformation reserve.
- c. Note that a further Cabinet decision to commit capital funding and progress to the next stage will be required in due course, which will be based on a full business case.

**9. Delegated Powers Report for January to March 2023 (Pages 99 - 100)**

*Cabinet Member:* Leader

*Forward Plan Ref:* 2022/188

*Contact:* Colm Ó Caomhánaigh, Committee Officer, 07393 001096

Report by Director of Law & Governance (**CA 9**).

To report on a quarterly basis any executive decisions taken under the specific powers and functions delegated under the terms of Part 7.1 (Scheme of Delegation to Officers) of the Council's Constitution – Paragraph 6.3(c)(i). It is not for Scrutiny call-in.

**10. Forward Plan and Future Business (Pages 101 - 106)**

*Cabinet Member:* All

*Contact Officer:* Colm Ó Caomhánaigh, Committee Officer Tel: 07393 001096

The Cabinet Procedure Rules provide that the business of each meeting at the Cabinet is to include "updating of the Forward Plan and proposals for business to be conducted at the following meeting". Items from the Forward Plan for the immediately forthcoming meetings of the Cabinet appear in the Schedule at **CA**. This includes any updated information relating to the business for those meetings that has already been identified for inclusion in the next Forward Plan update.

The Schedule is for noting, but Cabinet Members may also wish to take this opportunity to identify any further changes they would wish to be incorporated in the next Forward Plan update.

***The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to note the items currently identified for forthcoming meetings.***

## **Councillors declaring interests**

### **General duty**

You must declare any disclosable pecuniary interests when the meeting reaches the item on the agenda headed 'Declarations of Interest' or as soon as it becomes apparent to you.

### **What is a disclosable pecuniary interest?**

Disclosable pecuniary interests relate to your employment; sponsorship (i.e. payment for expenses incurred by you in carrying out your duties as a councillor or towards your election expenses); contracts; land in the Council's area; licenses for land in the Council's area; corporate tenancies; and securities. These declarations must be recorded in each councillor's Register of Interests which is publicly available on the Council's website.

Disclosable pecuniary interests that must be declared are not only those of the member her or himself but also those member's spouse, civil partner or person they are living with as husband or wife or as if they were civil partners.

### **Declaring an interest**

Where any matter disclosed in your Register of Interests is being considered at a meeting, you must declare that you have an interest. You should also disclose the nature as well as the existence of the interest. If you have a disclosable pecuniary interest, after having declared it at the meeting you must not participate in discussion or voting on the item and must withdraw from the meeting whilst the matter is discussed.

### **Members' Code of Conduct and public perception**

Even if you do not have a disclosable pecuniary interest in a matter, the Members' Code of Conduct says that a member 'must serve only the public interest and must never improperly confer an advantage or disadvantage on any person including yourself' and that 'you must not place yourself in situations where your honesty and integrity may be questioned'.

### **Members Code – Other registrable interests**

Where a matter arises at a meeting which directly relates to the financial interest or wellbeing of one of your other registerable interests then you must declare an interest. You must not participate in discussion or voting on the item and you must withdraw from the meeting whilst the matter is discussed.

Wellbeing can be described as a condition of contentedness, healthiness and happiness; anything that could be said to affect a person's quality of life, either positively or negatively, is likely to affect their wellbeing.

Other registrable interests include:

- a) Any unpaid directorships

- b) Any body of which you are a member or are in a position of general control or management and to which you are nominated or appointed by your authority.
- c) Any body (i) exercising functions of a public nature (ii) directed to charitable purposes or (iii) one of whose principal purposes includes the influence of public opinion or policy (including any political party or trade union) of which you are a member or in a position of general control or management.

### **Members Code – Non-registrable interests**

Where a matter arises at a meeting which directly relates to your financial interest or wellbeing (and does not fall under disclosable pecuniary interests), or the financial interest or wellbeing of a relative or close associate, you must declare the interest.

Where a matter arises at a meeting which affects your own financial interest or wellbeing, a financial interest or wellbeing of a relative or close associate or a financial interest or wellbeing of a body included under other registrable interests, then you must declare the interest.

In order to determine whether you can remain in the meeting after disclosing your interest the following test should be applied:

Where a matter affects the financial interest or well-being:

- a) to a greater extent than it affects the financial interests of the majority of inhabitants of the ward affected by the decision and;
- b) a reasonable member of the public knowing all the facts would believe that it would affect your view of the wider public interest.

You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting. Otherwise you must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation.

This page is intentionally left blank



# Agenda Item 3

## CABINET

**MINUTES** of the meeting held on Tuesday, 21 March 2023 commencing at 2.00 pm and finishing at 3.15 pm

**Present:**

**Voting Members:** Councillor Liz Leffman – in the Chair  
Councillor Liz Brighthouse OBE (Deputy Chair)  
Councillor Glynis Phillips  
Councillor Dr Pete Sudbury  
Councillor Tim Bearder  
Councillor Duncan Enright  
Councillor Calum Miller  
Councillor Jenny Hannaby  
Councillor Mark Lygo  
Councillor Andrew Gant

**Other Members in**

**Attendance:** Councillors Donna Ford, Kieron Mallon, Ian Middleton, Nigel Simpson

**Officers:**

Whole of meeting Martin Reeves, Chief Executive; Lorna Baxter, Director of Finance, Anita Bradley, Director of Law & Governance and Monitoring Officer; Colm Ó Caomhánaigh, Committee Officer.

*Cabinet considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting, together with a schedule of addenda tabled at the meeting, and decided as set out below. Except insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda, reports and schedule, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.*

**30/23 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

(Agenda Item. 1)

There were no apologies for absence. There were no apologies for absence. The Leader welcomed Martin Reeves to his first Cabinet meeting as Chief Executive.

**31/23 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

(Agenda Item. 2)

There were no declarations of interest.

**32/23 MINUTES**

(Agenda Item. 3)

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 February 2023 were approved and signed.

**33/23 QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS**

(Agenda Item. 4)

See Annex.

**34/23 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS**

(Agenda Item. 5)

7 Proposal from OUFC to OCC as landowner

Suzanne McIvor

Cllr Ian Middleton

**35/23 REPORTS FROM SCRUTINY COMMITTEES**

(Agenda Item. 6)

Councillor Kieron Mallon, Chair of the Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee, introduced the report "Water Resources and the South East Regional Plan" which summarised the Committee's consideration of the Council's consultation response to the draft Water Resources South East regional plan at its meeting on 25 January 2023.

The Committee heard from Thames Water, the Group Against Reservoir Development (GARD), the Cabinet Member for Climate Change Delivery & Environment as well as officers of the Council and presented three recommendations which Councillor Mallon outlined.

Councillor Pete Sudbury, Cabinet Member for Climate Change Delivery & Environment, thanked the Committee for the report. He noted that Recommendation 2 had been taken on board in the final version of the Council's response to the plan. Cabinet will formally respond to the scrutiny committee in due course.

**36/23 PROPOSAL FROM OUFC TO OCC AS LANDOWNER: ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY, TIMEFRAME AND MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING**

(Agenda Item. 7)

Cabinet was asked to consider an engagement and communications strategy in relation to the proposal from Oxford United Football Club (OUFC) to use a parcel of Council land known as 'Land to East of Frieze Way / South of Kidlington Roundabout or the triangle' for the development of a new stadium.

Before discussing the report, the Chair had agreed to the following requests to speak.

Suzanne McIvor, representing Friends of Stratfield Brake, stated that the Council's online engagement exercise had been dominated by supporters of Oxford United and asked that the Council hold a secure public consultation for local residents within something like one and a half miles radius of the Triangle to determine if the local community supports the fundamental principle of a stadium on the Triangle Green Belt site before any further negotiation for the site's disposal.

Councillor Ian Middleton, Kidlington South, stated that the majority of local residents that he had spoken to were dissatisfied with the Council's handling of this issue. There needed to be proper local engagement and he welcomed the suggestion that there will be a way to verify the location of respondents in the proposed further engagement. He expressed his view that some Cabinet Members had shown predetermination on this issue.

Anita Bradley, Director of Law & Governance and Monitoring Officer, stated that she was not aware of any predetermination in relation to this issue and that any councillor who believed that they had evidence of predetermination should bring it to her attention.

Councillor Andrew Gant proposed an amendment to Annex 1: on Agenda Page 26, under the heading "Audiences", second bullet point, replace "and local MPs" with "local MPs and Neighbourhood Forums". This amendment was agreed.

Councillor Glynis Phillips, Cabinet Member for Corporate Services, summarised the engagement and communication strategy aspects of the report which will be undertaken in two phases, both meeting with stakeholder groups and inviting wider feedback. This will take place over a six week period following receipt of the club's proposals.

Councillor Calum Miller, Cabinet Member for Finance, emphasised that Cabinet had made no decisions on the proposal from Oxford United. In the first engagement process, the Council clearly identified the concerns of those in local postcodes and it was a result of this that Cabinet decided not to take a decision but start a process to gather more information before making a decision. Local Parish Councils, Neighbourhood Forums and other representative bodies would be very welcome to take part in the engagement process.

Councillor Gant gave an assurance that Officers and Councillors will take great care to differentiate between the views of those living locally and those further away.

The recommendations as amended were proposed by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Gant and agreed.

**RESOLVED to:**

- a) **Agree the engagement and communications strategy set out at annex 1 as amended.**
- b) **Agree the memorandum of understanding (MoU) as set out at annex 2 and delegate authority to the Corporate Director, Customers and Organisational Development to sign on behalf of the Council. Whilst not anticipated, any non-material changes to be agreed in consultation with the portfolio holder for Finance and Property.**
- c) **Note the timetable set out at annex 3.**

### **37/23 BUSINESS MANAGEMENT & MONITORING REPORT - DECEMBER 22 / JANUARY 23**

(Agenda Item. 8)

Cabinet received a report presenting the January 2023 performance, risk, and finance position for the council.

Councillor Calum Miller, Cabinet Member for Finance, summarised the report. He highlighted the deteriorations of £3.8m in Adult Services, which was related to pooled budgets with the NHS, and £1.8m in Children's Services.

These overspends were the result of an unexpected spike in inflation due to the invasion of Ukraine. The Council was fortunate to be able to manage these through the reserves and contingency provided for in the 2022/23 budget. However, challenges remained going forward and the Government had flagged that funding of local government will decrease from 2025 onwards.

Other Cabinet Members commented:

- The Government SEND (Special Educational Needs and Disabilities) Review had nothing about the finance needs to provide better services. Officers were working with local parents to get the offer right and additional resources had been allocated to alleviate the difficulties around Education, Health and Care Plans.
- There was a saving due to deferred recruitment of posts in the area of climate change action but the recent International Panel on Climate Change Synthesis Report showed that this was not a good position to be in.
- The increase in borrowing from libraries and increase in visitors to the County Museum were welcomed and officers congratulated.
- The Council had been recognised with a gold award for its work in supporting LGBTQ+ staff.

The recommendations were proposed by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Hannaby and agreed.

**RESOLVED to:**

- a) **note the report and annexes.**
- b) **note the virements in Annex B-2b and approve the virements in Annex B-2a.**
- c) **approve the write - off of seven unrecoverable social care debts with a combined total of £0.135m as set out in Annex B paragraph 119.**

**38/23 CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING REPORT - JANUARY 2023**

(Agenda Item. 9)

Cabinet had before it a report setting out the monitoring position based on activity to the end of January 2023 - the fourth update for 2022/23. It also included an update to the Capital Programme approved by Council in February 2023 taking into account additional funding and new and/or changes to schemes.

Councillor Calum Miller, Cabinet Member for Finance, introduced the report. He highlighted reduced forecast expenditure of £14.9m on the capital programme for 2022/23 due to projects starting later than expected. He stated that it was hoped to have a new format for these reports going forward to make it easier for Members to track progress and see that allocations advance the Council's priorities.

Councillor Miller proposed the recommendations, Councillor Enright seconded and they were agreed.

**RESOLVED to:**

**OCC Capital Programme**

- a) Approve the latest capital monitoring position for 2022/23 (Annex 1) and the associated updated capital programme at Annex 2, incorporating the changes set out in this report
- b) To note the approval of the Leader of the Council, in accordance with the Council's Financial Regulations for the revised budget provision of £5.4m for the Ploughley Road/A41 Junction Improvement scheme in Bicester (paragraph 21)

**Re-profiling**

- c) Agree the in-year re-profiling as identified in the report and (Annex 1 and 2)

**39/23 TREASURY MANAGEMENT 3RD QUARTERLY REPORT**

(Agenda Item. 10)

Cabinet considered a report covering the treasury management activity for the third quarter of 2022/23 in compliance with the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management 2021. It provided an update on the anticipated position and prudential indicators set out in the Treasury Management

Strategy Statement & Annual Investment Strategy for 2022/23 agreed as part of the Council's budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy in February 2022.

Councillor Calum Miller, Cabinet Member for Finance, introduced the report. Higher interest rates had resulted in higher than expected interest receivable on the surplus cash held. Some investments have been more challenged but none have materially damaged the overall Treasury position.

Councillor Miller had also consulted with officers and was assured that no investments or funds were held with financial institutions that were currently under threat.

The recommendations were proposed by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Enright and agreed.

**RESOLVED:**

**to note the report, and to RECOMMEND Council to note the Council's treasury management activity in the third quarter of 2022/23.**

**40/23 WORKFORCE REPORT AND STAFFING DATA – QUARTER 3 - OCTOBER TO DECEMBER 2022**

(Agenda Item. 11)

Cabinet had before it a report providing an update on the key strategic workforce priority areas for Quarter 3 and a refreshed workforce profile.

Councillor Glynis Phillips, Cabinet Member for Corporate Services, summarised the report. A new workforce strategy and action plan was being developed across the organisation. The results of the staff wellbeing survey will be reflected in this work.

Councillor Phillips stated that emotional support was the main reason for staff seeking employee assistance and for referrals to the occupational health service. It was clear that more needed to be done to support staff, especially in Children's Services and schools.

Although spending on agency staff had risen in this quarter there was positive news from Children's Social Services where the proportion of agency staff had been reduced from a 46% high in December 2021 to 23% in January 2023.

The recommendation was proposed by Councillor Phillips, seconded by Councillor Lygo and agreed.

**RESOLVED to note the report.**

**41/23 OXFORDSHIRE HOUSING AND GROWTH DEAL UPDATE**

(Agenda Item. 12)

Cabinet considered a report updating the existing financial governance arrangements following the receipt of updated requirements for the release of the remaining £30m grant funding.

Councillor Duncan Enright, Cabinet Member for Travel & Development Strategy, summarised the report as a procedural exercise to deal with the decision by the Future Oxfordshire Partnership to end the Oxfordshire Plan 2050. The Department proposed additional criteria relating primarily to strengthened reporting requirements and also a proposed change in payment methodology. There have been a number of meetings to clarify the points and Councillor Enright was happy to propose the recommendation from the report.

Councillor Hannaby seconded the recommendations and they were agreed.

**RESOLVED:**

- a) **Subject to the decision of the Future Oxfordshire Partnership on 20 March 2023, request the Chief Executive of the Council to write to Department for Levelling Up Housing and Communities (DLUHC) to formally accept the terms of the letter from DLUHC to Oxfordshire Leaders and Oxfordshire County Council's Chief Executive dated 5 December 2022 (Annex 1).**
- b) **Agree that in accepting the terms of the letter at Annex 1, the Council will, as accountable body and in consultation with the relevant District or City Council regarding the impact on accelerated housing numbers, take responsibility for decisions necessary to manage the programme in accordance with the updated conditions set out by DLUHC.**
- c) **Note that it will be necessary to agree revised Terms of Reference and Memorandum of Understanding for the Future Oxfordshire Partnership to reflect the change in responsibility as set out in recommendation 2.**

**42/23 COST OF LIVING SUPPORT MEASURES**

(Agenda Item. 13)

Cabinet had before it a report providing an update on delivery of cost of living support in 2022/23 and making recommendations for the disbursement of cost of living resources in 2023/24.

Councillor Mark Lygo, Cabinet Member for Public Health & Equality, summarised the report. There was a real danger that rises in the cost of living will increase the inequalities on our community that we have resolved to tackle – especially when the national energy support grants end. The proposals were targeted at those most vulnerable and those who fall through the gaps between the national schemes.

Councillor Calum Miller, Cabinet Member for Finance, added that there were proposals to ensure that the increases in Council Tax would not fall on those in the lowest income households. Also, support for discretionary housing payments was being doubled.

Other Cabinet Members commented:

- Thanks to the District and City Councils for the joint working on the proposals, building on the cooperation that worked so well during the Covid pandemic.
- The opposition had criticised the maximum rise in Council Tax but this had been necessary in these very difficult times. However, the Council was being progressive in protecting the most vulnerable.

The recommendations were proposed by Councillor Lygo, seconded by Councillor Sudbury and agreed.

**RESOLVED to:**

- a) Note the cost of living support measures delivered during 2022/23, as summarised in Table 1;**
- b) Agree to vary the match funding requirements for Council Tax support agreed in September 2022, as set out in paragraph 30;**
- c) Agree to the support package for 2023/24, as summarised in Table 3, noting the flexibility outlined in paragraph 31.**

#### **43/23 OXFORDSHIRE INCLUSIVE ECONOMY PARTNERSHIP AND CHARTER**

(Agenda Item. 14)

Cabinet had before it a report providing an overview of the Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Partnership (OIEP) including the development and launch of the Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Charter on 24 January 2023. The report recommended the Council becomes a signatory to the charter and makes four pledges to demonstrate the Council's commitment to an inclusive economy.

Councillor Liz Leffman, Leader of the Council, summarised the report. The vision of the Partnership was very much in line with that of the County Council but in this case the Council signs up to pledges from a list of options provided. The report recommended the pledges listed in paragraph 18 with an additional stretch pledge in paragraph 19. The Partnership included commercial organisations, the universities and local councils.

Councillor Leffman proposed the following addition to the recommendations:

- e) Agree that the OIEP Steering Group is considered to be a Strategic Body and that the Council's representative will be the Leader of the**



Council. The portfolio holder for Public Health & Equality will be the official substitute.

Councillor Leffman proposed the recommendations as amended, Councillor Phillips seconded and they were agreed.

**RESOLVED to:**

- a) **Note that the Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Partnership has been established.**
- b) **Note that the Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Charter was launched on 24 January 2023.**
- c) **Agree to become a signatory to the Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Charter.**
- d) **Agree to make four pledges to build on our commitment to an inclusive economy.**
- e) **Agree that the OIEP Steering Group is considered to be a Strategic Body and that the Council's representative will be the Leader of the Council. The portfolio holder for Public Health & Equality will be the official substitute.**

**44/23 ADULT SOCIAL CARE MARKET SUSTAINABILITY PLAN**

(Agenda Item. 15)

Councils are required to publish a Market Sustainability Plan detailing how they intend to meet market needs in the next 3 years. Cabinet was recommended to approve the draft plan in Annex 1 of the report.

Councillor Tim Bearder, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, introduced the report. The proposed plan included an increased offer to providers. It was a difficult time for them with all of their costs going up. The short term increase in funding from the Government was welcome but providers need radical reform for the long term. However, the Council has been able to use extra funding to bring legacy providers up to consistent standards.

Councillor Calum Miller, Cabinet Member for Finance, added that Oxfordshire had a high provision of care as well as high costs of care. He noted that decisions on adult social care appeared to come from the Treasury rather than the Department for Health and Social Care. Promised solutions have not been delivered. He thanked officers and the social care sector for its input into the Plan.

The recommendations were proposed by Councillor Bearder, seconded by Councillor Miller and agreed.

**RESOLVED to:**

approve, following the extensive work with partners described in the paper, the draft in Annex 1 for publication and submission to Department for Health & Social Care (DHSC).

**45/23 HIGHWAYS CONTRACT PROCUREMENT - PREFERRED MODEL FOR APPROVAL**

(Agenda Item. 16)

Cabinet considered the outcome of work by highway maintenance contract specialists, DMSqd, to determine the most appropriate procurement model for Oxfordshire.

Councillor Andrew Gant, Cabinet Member for Highway Management, introduced the report. He thanked the Audit & Governance Committee for their work on the governance arrangements. The models considered were listed in paragraph 9 of the report. The recommended model was described in recommendation a) and there was a helpful visual representation on page 280.

Councillor Gant moved the recommendations. They were seconded by Councillor Enright and agreed.

**RESOLVED to:**

- a) **Approve the preferred model (single provider with greater level of in-house responsibilities and use of frameworks for some activities) for the future highway maintenance contract for Oxfordshire.**
- b) **Support progression to the next stage of developing and drafting the specification, contract, and other tender documents required for procurement.**

**46/23 FORWARD PLAN AND FUTURE BUSINESS**

(Agenda Item. 17)

The Cabinet considered a list of items (CA17) for the immediately forthcoming meetings of the Cabinet together with changes and additions set out in the schedule of addenda.

**RESOLVED:** to note the items currently identified for forthcoming meetings.

.....in the Chair

Date of signing .....

## ITEM 4 – QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS

Questions	Cabinet Member
<p><b>1. COUNCILLOR MARK CHERRY</b></p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member look into expediting Warwick Road onto the resurfacing highway schedule from Orchard Way to the traffic lights at Southam Road where its condition continues to decline? From interaction with highway officers it could be till late 2024/2025 until funding is available to resurface the road. This poses a health and safety concern to cyclists and general traffic using the road.</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>Investigation work on this scheme is due to take place shortly, with design work planned during the course of 23/24, making it difficult to bring this scheme forward. This preparation work will look at making sure the right treatment is selected and that the whole life cost from a financial and carbon perspective is understood. The current proposal is for this scheme to be delivered in 24/25, however, we will continue to keep the road safe in the interim by repairing any safety defects in line with our road safety inspection policy through regular monitoring.</p>
<p><b>2. COUNCILLOR JOHN HOWSON</b></p> <p>Last November at Cabinet I asked about whether attendance records for councillors could be made public. Will it be possible to introduce such a scheme from the start of the new municipal year this May?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR LIZ LEFFMAN, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</b></p> <p>Member attendance data are available on the software used to manage the Council's public meetings and we are in discussions with the software providers with regard to how to present the data on the public website. We will start to do that from May.</p>
<p><b>3. COUNCILLOR CHARLIE HICKS</b></p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT</b></p>

Questions	Cabinet Member
<p>Active Travel England have recently published the active travel capability ratings for Local Authorities across England and Oxfordshire County Council is rated as 2 out of 4, with the next rating happening in Summer 2023. This rating affects how much funding Local Authorities receive from Active Travel England, who have stated as a headline message that "working with ambitious councils is at the heart of everything we do". Councils with higher ratings are in line to receive more funds.</p> <p>To become a Level 3 Local Authority on Active Travel Capability, we need to meet the criteria of: "Very strong local leadership, comprehensive plans, and a significant network in place with a growing number of people choosing to walk, wheel and cycle"</p> <p>Does he agree with me that we should be doing everything we can to achieve a Level 3 rating from Active Travel England in the next rating round in summer 2023 (especially as we are hosting a key national active travel conference this year)? And if he does agree with me on this, please can he outline what steps are being taken to maximise our chances of a Level 3 rating, including whether the opportunity is being taken in the current E&amp;P department restructure to help get Oxfordshire County Council to the Level 3 definition this summer?</p>	<p>These ratings were agreed last year – following self-assessment [we assessed ourselves as a level 3 at that time] this was then moderated down to a level 2 by Active Travel England.</p> <p>We are very clear that we would consider ourselves pushing for a level 3 and have the opportunity to do so when these ratings are reassessed in the summer. Most ‘3’ rated authorities – there are only 5 in the country – are larger metropolitan combined authorities, with Nottingham and Leicester the other two. So in addition to setting out how we have developed and improved over the last year (including our Active Travel network investment programme and supporting Behaviour Change activity) we are looking at what they have been doing to achieve this rating.</p> <p>As far as restructure goes, we are very clear that the need and opportunity to Transform Environment &amp; Place is firmly linked to achieving the Council’s priorities including Active Travel.</p>

Questions	Cabinet Member
<p><b>4. COUNCILLOR MARK CHERRY</b></p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member urgently, investigate safety measures such as a lower speed limit for the stretch of road around house numbers in the 170s Warwick Road, Banbury where there have been recent road collisions with parked cars causing concern to local residents?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>In view of the number of incidents reported I have asked officers to review the possibility of introducing traffic calming measures and/or adjustments to the parking arrangements. If deemed to be feasible, funding would need to be identified to enable such proposals to be designed and taken to consultation. Alongside this a reduction in speed limit to 20mph could be considered as part of the Banbury speed limit review.</p>
<p><b>5. COUNCILLOR IAN MIDDLETON</b></p> <p>The Oxfordshire County Council and Oxford United Football Club land negotiations: engagement and communications strategy appears not to include a focused local consultation with residents in my division in Kidlington or those in Cllr Gant's division of Wolvercote &amp; Summertown who will be directly affected by the siting of a football stadium on green belt land owned by the County Council at the Triangle site in Kidlington.</p> <p>The only reference to such an exercise appears to be "an</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR CALUM MILLER, CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE</b></p> <p>Thank you for your question, which reflects your close engagement with this scheme, and follows from the previous questions you have raised. The engagement and communications strategy is set out in the Cabinet paper. It includes a clear commitment to direct and independently facilitated engagement with stakeholder groups, including local community groups. We are planning to hold these sessions in April.</p> <p>We have also set aside six weeks for independently conducted public engagement which will take place when OUFC</p>

Questions	Cabinet Member
<p>open engagement where anyone can share feedback using an online response form; email and letters will also be accepted". This seems similar to the process that was carried out last year which captured responses from the entire country and beyond with no reliable mechanism to ascertain if the respondents lived in the local area or even in Oxfordshire.</p> <p>Given that residents in my and Cllr Gant's divisions could be living with any development for many decades to come, will Cllr Miller please confirm that the engagement and communications strategy will incorporate a separate and geographically verifiable consultation exercise with the residents of Kidlington, Gosford, Wolvercote and Cutteslowe as soon as possible, which will include the opportunity for respondents to say if they support the principle of the leasing or sale of the Triangle site to OUFC?</p>	<p>have provided information to OCC regarding how the strategic priorities identified by Cabinet will be addressed by their proposals. Likely timeframes for this have been published within the 21 March Cabinet report. This exercise will enable responses to be analysed on a geographic basis. Our previous engagement also enabled geographic differentiation and was supported by a programme of targeted communications to encourage participation by those local to the proposed site. We have reflected this in our work to date, noting in our January Cabinet report the difference between local views and wider views regarding the broader Stratfield Brake proposals. Indeed, this is one of the factors that has shaped our engagement with OUFC on the smaller, Triangle site.</p> <p>The Cabinet has also set out our willingness to receive feedback in any form, including feedback in the form of letters, emails and commentary in online forms. Respondents are welcome to express any and all views, supportive or otherwise.</p> <p>In my discussions with parish councils prior to the Cabinet report considered in January 2023, I made clear that we would value greatly their informed responses to OUFC's proposals when these are published. It is not for me to say how the parish councils should represent the views of local residents. However, were the parish councils to consider undertaking their own local engagement, I would welcome this. Also, reflecting feedback from the parish councils, we have ensured that a six-week window (avoiding the peak period of summer holiday) has been factored in to</p>

Questions	Cabinet Member
	accommodate this activity. The Cabinet will consider any feedback provided by the parishes as part of the decision-making process.
<p><b>6. COUNCILLOR IAN MIDDLETON</b></p> <p>The fundamental reason for the council entering into negotiations with OUFC is their assertion that they have no choice but to leave their existing home as their licence to occupy the Kassam stadium will end in 2026 and they have no legal right to renew.</p> <p>Cllr Miller confirmed in the January meeting of the cabinet that the licence end date had been verified. However, there is an option for the club to challenge the status of their licence in the courts and make a claim that their long term occupation of the Kassam stadium gives them the same legal protections as a lease under the Landlord and Tenant Act, including security of tenure and the automatic right to renew. There is already ample legal precedent for this which I have provided details of to Cllr Miller and officers.</p> <p>Given that it's now well over a year since the club first approached the council saying that they had exhausted all legal avenues to remain at the Kassam, and that it's now a further 2 months on since I requested clarification on this point, can Cllr Miller please confirm that the club has been asked for and has provided evidence that they have sought</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR CALUM MILLER, CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE</b></p> <p>Thank you for your question. As I explained when you asked at Cabinet in January, officers have received information from OUFC setting out the position with regards to the club's occupancy of Kassam Stadium: a description of this position was set out in the Cabinet report in January 2023. Further to this, officers understand that avenues have been previously explored with the City Council to resolve this issue.</p> <p>At the request of Cabinet, council officers are presently in the process of undertaking further due diligence with regards to all finance and legal matters, and this will be presented to Cabinet in a timely fashion in order to inform decision making. I have shared your points with officers and asked that they be raised with OUFC as part of this process.</p> <p>The County Council is planning to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with OUFC, any misrepresentation of the position regarding the Kassam would be a breach of the commitments set out in the MOU and would call into question progress with any negotiations.</p>

Questions	Cabinet Member
<p>to protect their own interests by making such a legal challenge on the status of their existing licence, and if not, why not?</p>	
<p><b>7. COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS</b></p> <p>In relation to item 16, can I be assured that serious consideration is given to the options of framework and multiple contracts?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>The option of frameworks has been considered and, as can be seen from the recommendation in the report to Cabinet, the use of frameworks is part of that recommendation.</p>



## **REPORT OF THE PERFORMANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: COST OF LIVING PERFORMANCE**

Cllr Eddie Reeves

Chair of the Performance and Corporate Services Overview & Scrutiny Committee

April 2023

### **RECOMMENDATION**

1. The Cabinet is **RECOMMENDED** to:
  - a) Agree to respond to the recommendation within the report and Annex 1, and
  - b) Agree that relevant officers will continue to update Scrutiny for 12 months on progress made against actions committed to in response to the recommendations, or until they are completed (if earlier).

### **REQUIREMENT TO RESPOND**

2. In accordance with section 9FE of the Local Government Act 2000, the Performance & Corporate Services Overview & Scrutiny Committee hereby requires that the Cabinet consider this report and its recommendation and, within two months of receipt, publish a response to the report and its recommendation indicating what, if any, action the Cabinet proposes to take. There is no requirement to respond to any observations made by the Committee, though the Cabinet may choose to do so if it wishes.

### **INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW**

3. At its meeting on 19 January 2023, the Performance and Corporate Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered the interventions in place and in development to support those facing challenges with the cost of living and comparing them with LGA advice on the role of councils should play in this area.
4. The Committee would like to thank Cllr Lygo for attending the meeting to present the report and respond to questions, and to Robin Rogers, Programme Director (Partnerships & Delivery), and Jamie Slagel, National Management Trainee also for attending and for drafting an exemplary report.

## SUMMARY

5. Councillor Mark Lygo, Cabinet Member for Health and Equalities, introduced the report, which provided an update on OCC's response to the cost of living crisis and the measures the Council had implemented to help residents, lessons learned and planned and proposed work.
6. The rising cost of living was a significant issue nationally, and the Council had taken on addressing a number of key issues. As ever, the Council did not seek to work in isolation but in partnership - particularly with those in the voluntary community sector and district and city councils. The Council's primary focus were those in greatest financial need, and to reach them by working with the most appropriate organisations. Immediate tactical responses were combined with longer-term strategic responses. Highlights of the interventions provided included free school meals being provided during school holidays, £85 vouchers distributed to 11,000 low-income pension households, £200k to the voluntary and community sector to support cost of living and energy costs, and providing welcome and warmth to all residents across the Council's libraries. Further projects were being developed to provide children with help for costs relating to everyday needs, to support those who did not qualify for national cost of living support, targeted support for vulnerable groups including those leaving hospital, carers, foster children, and those on low incomes. The Council had also taken steps to support its own staff. Notwithstanding the interventions, there was clearly greater demand than the Council could address and support from national government was sought, particularly in helping with some of the cliff-edges experienced by those in receipt of welfare and providing long-term funding to reflect the long-term nature of the challenge. It was recognised that this area work was new for the Council, and it was in the process of procuring the required infrastructure to process the associated funding with the Council's interventions.
7. In response, the committee welcomed the interventions delivered and planned, recognising how absolutely crucial they were to those in receipt of them. The Committee made a number of observations, concerning the focus of activity in the longer-term, the needs of hard to reach communities, and financial probity. It also makes one formal recommendation concerning how this work should be communicated to and engaged with by members hereon.

## OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### **i) Strategic Direction**

8. The Committee recognises that the war in Ukraine and the post-Covid re-opening of the world economy have been drivers for the marked rise in inflation, and that the rise in inflation has been particularly acute around energy costs and food. These are items which poorer individuals and households spend a greater proportion of their income on, meaning that the inflation-impact has been felt more acutely by those at the bottom end of the

income scale. This situation has been the cause of both a significant and rapid deterioration of the ability of poorer households to afford necessities, hence popular reference to the 'cost of living crisis'. The committee recognises that the crisis requires immediate remedial action to tackle the crisis, hence the distribution of money to particularly at-risk groups, and it notes that the Council's response does include some poverty-prevention activity. However, in the long run immediate, tactical responses are neither sustainable nor the best outcome for those at risk of poverty, and that prevention upstream is both more cost-effective and better for individuals. It may prove difficult to deprioritise immediate crisis support with its very clear costs, but the Committee wishes to state its support for a future transition away from crisis-management and towards poverty prevention as the Council's primary focus in this work.

**Observation 1: That the Council should seek to plan to transition its work towards greater emphasis on poverty-prevention than crisis management.**

**ii) Financial Probity**

9. As noted above, crisis response requires, by its nature, swift action. As recognised by the Cabinet member and officers, a lot of the Council's interventions did not occur on the back of existing activity, but rather a new infrastructure is presently in the process of being organised to manage it. This is fully right and proper and the Committee makes no criticism, but it does draw attention to a consequence of these specific circumstances.
10. In the period in which the Council is overseeing the delivery of interventions without a fully-developed infrastructure to support it there is a higher risk of money not going to where it is meant to; the systems of oversight are not currently fully in place. With the acute challenges faced by residents relating to the cost of living members of the committee are particularly keen that the resources that the Council has made available are indeed making their way to those who most need it. The Committee recognises the resource intensiveness of undertaking a financial review or audit, which is why it does not make a formal recommendation that the Council should undertake one. However, owing to importance of funds getting to the front line and the increased risk profile it does want to flag this as a possibility for consideration.

**Observation 2: That crisis-response requires swift action, and that the Council is developing its infrastructure to manage this work. Consequently, at present, risk management processes are less robust and the Council should give consideration to whether it is appropriate to undertake a review to ensure moneys have reached their intended targets.**

**iii) Hard to Reach Communities**

11. An ongoing challenge of Scrutiny to the Council is the need for the Council to continue evolving and extending its reach into communities; if the same

approaches are taken and delivery partners used the same types of people will receive Council support. This leaves certain groups unsupported and through no fault of their own. The Committee raises this challenge with respect of this work, and in particular highlights the fact that digital access, particularly during a cost of living crisis where internet access is more expendable than food or heat, is likely to be depressed amongst many of these harder to reach communities. As such, the Council should be giving significant thought in the design and delivery of its interventions as to how to ensure sufficient access for those who are digitally excluded. It was felt that this issue specifically had not been given sufficient focus.

**Observation 3: That the Council must continue to make efforts to bridge the gap to hard to reach groups. Key in this is the choice of partners, but also how support is accessed and promoted, particularly in light of the expected increase in digital exclusion amongst those in poverty.**

**iv) Councillor Communication and Oversight**

12. Committee members value the interventions being made to address the cost of living across the Council. When deciding on the best way of providing oversight, however, a local perspective is best. Strategic issues can rightly be discussed, for example at a Scrutiny committee, but the vulnerability and need of the individuals involved means a more localised and ground-level approach may be best. This is especially the case given that the level of demand and spread, type and delivery partners of interventions will not necessarily be uniform across the county. Committee members would prefer that they are kept up to date on what is going on in their area – what the needs are, how they are being met and who is responsible for delivering that help - over and above a generalised view across the county. As such, it is suggested that the setting where this might be most effectively provided to members is the Locality fora.

**Recommendation 1: That the Council report regularly to the Locality meetings on the spending and activity relating to the cost of living within that locality.**

## **NEXT STEPS**

13. As per the recommendation, it is expected that ongoing engagement with this topic will be undertaken first and foremost through the Council's Locality fora. However, the Committee has indicated it would like to consider whether the Council voluntarily adopting the Equality Act 2010 socio-economic duty could further equality, diversity and inclusion, and whether a specific policy is necessary in July 2023.

Contact Officer: Tom Hudson, Principal Scrutiny Officer  
[tom.hudson@oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:tom.hudson@oxfordshire.gov.uk)

Annex 1: Pro-forma Template - Response to Recommendations

## Overview & Scrutiny Recommendation Response Pro forma

*Under section 9FE of the Local Government Act 2000, Overview and Scrutiny Committees must require the Cabinet or local authority to respond to a report or recommendations made thereto by an Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Such a response must be provided within two months from the date on which it is requested<sup>1</sup> and, if the report or recommendations in questions were published, the response also must be so.*

*This template provides a structure which respondents are encouraged to use. However, respondents are welcome to depart from the suggested structure provided the same information is included in a response. The usual way to publish a response is to include it in the agenda of a meeting of the body to which the report or recommendations were addressed.*

### Issue: Cost of Living

**Lead Cabinet Member(s):** Cllr Mark Lygo, Cabinet Member for Public Health and Equality

**Date response requested:** 18 April 2023

**Response to report:**

**Response to recommendations:**

Recommendation	Accepted, rejected or partially accepted	Proposed action (if different to that recommended) and indicative timescale (unless rejected)
That the Council report regularly to the Locality meetings on the spending and activity relating to the cost of living within that locality.		

<sup>1</sup> Date of the meeting at which report/recommendations were received

This page is intentionally left blank

# **REPORT OF THE PEOPLE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: TRANSITIONS TO ADULT SOCIAL CARE**

Cllr Nigel Simpson  
Chair of the People Overview & Scrutiny Committee  
April 2023

## **RECOMMENDATION**

1. The Cabinet is **RECOMMENDED** to —
  - a) Agree to respond to the recommendations contained in the body of this report, and
  - b) Agree that relevant officers will continue to update Scrutiny for 12 months on progress made against actions committed to in response to the recommendations, or until they are completed (if earlier).

## **REQUIREMENT TO RESPOND**

2. In accordance with section 9FE of the Local Government Act 2000, the People Overview & Scrutiny Committee hereby requires that, within two months of the consideration of this report, the Cabinet publish a response to this report and its recommendations.

## **INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW**

3. At its meeting on 10 November 2022, the People Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered a briefing on Oxfordshire's approach to supporting young people through their transition into adult services and the development and implementation of the Moving into Adulthood team in June 2021. The Committee sought to understand current progress in implementation and any associated improvement in the outcomes for young adults and to review plans for the future.
4. The Committee received the input of Cabinet member Councillor Brighthouse, the Corporate Director for Children's Services, Kevin Gordon, the Interim Corporate Director of Adult Social Care, Karen Fuller, the Interim Deputy Director Adult Social Care, Victoria Baran. The Committee also heard from Kathy Liddell, a family carer with a 26 year old daughter with learning disabilities. The Committee would like to thank everyone for their contribution to this item, particularly Ms Liddell.

## SUMMARY

5. The Committee heard from Kathy Liddell, a family carer with a 26 year old daughter with learning disabilities. The family had first experienced Oxfordshire's social care services when Ms Liddell's daughter was 15. Ms Liddell spoke about joining a co-production group which included officers delivering services and young people who used the services. A key aspect which came out of the group meetings was having a named individual who could take families through the process from teenage years through to the age of 25. This did not just relate to educational needs but also included where the young person was going to live and how he/she was going to work and earn money. The group also looked at best practice at other county councils.
6. The Moving into Adulthood (MiA) Service was developed in response to recommendations made by the co-production group. The Service worked with young people from 18 to 25 years of age, with an in-reach into Children's Services from the age of 16. Having a named link worker from the age of 16 enabled the young person and their family to build a relationship with the Service from an early point and provided them with consistency through their journey into adulthood.
7. There was an emphasis on improving co-ordination between teams and partners, including operating a Multi-Agency Placement and Commissioning forum with a single route for all young people needing funding from more than one team. Children's and Adults' Social Care teams were also undertaking joint training in areas such as Mental Capacity, the role of social care in SEND and, the Working with Families training delivered by the Oxfordshire Family Support Network.
8. The Service was currently actively supporting 385 young people to plan for their journey into adulthood. Since the service launched in June 2021 it had worked with a total of 560 young people. 85% of young people open to the Service had had an assessment by their 18th birthday and there was confidence this would increase in the future. 27 young people had been supported to move out of residential education establishments back into the family home or into supported accommodation in a planned fashion.
9. Future plans included expanding the "Chair my own review" initiative, giving the young person choice and control and ensuring they were able to voice their aspirations for the future and aligning MiA planning with the SEND Planning Lives Process which takes place at age 14. This would further improve early planning and would enable young people to develop a single future plan that would take into account their education, health, and care support requirements.
10. Since the implementation of the team the number of children in relatively high-cost residential placements that move into residential placements as an adult was reducing. It was recognised that the old model of residential care and education provision outside the county was not tenable in the longer term. It was noted that steps were being taken to address this, including an additional 50 supported living placements being delivered in-county in 2022/23.



11. Overall, the Committee considered that there was progress and a vision in place as a result of the establishment of the Moving into Adulthood Service.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

12. The Committee noted that longer term strategic activity, working in partnership with Housing and Planning and District Council colleagues, included the development of a joined-up Housing Needs Assessment (5-10 years) to help determine housing needs based on a strong evidence base. This would help ensure that the County Council is better linked to district plans and Section 106 funding, particularly in the context of delivering more supported living placements in county and moving away from the old model of residential care and education provision outside the county, something which is not financially tenable in the longer term.
13. Members of the Committee sought clarification that there was an appropriate strategy in place for the spending of S106 money and Community Infrastructure Levy receipts.
14. The Committee considered that there was a need for senior officers to have a more co-ordinated approach in order to identify opportunities for Section 106 funding in terms of housing needs. There was also an opportunity for more joined up working with the District Councils on how best to use the S106 funding to ensure the right mixture of housing for vulnerable residents, developing provision that better meets the needs of residents while reducing overall cost pressures in the long term.

**Recommendation One: That senior officers work in a holistic and co-ordinated fashion in order to identify the potential opportunities for Section 106 capital funding in terms of housing needs.**

## NEXT STEPS

15. The People Overview & Scrutiny Committee will review the published Cabinet response to this report and its recommendations at the meeting of the Committee after Cabinet's response in accordance with part 6.2, 13(f), of the Constitution of the Council.
16. The Committee does not intend to examine transitions to adult social care again in this municipal year.

Contact Officer: Marco Dias, Interim Scrutiny Officer  
[marco.dias@oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:marco.dias@oxfordshire.gov.uk)

Annex: Pro-forma template – response to recommendations

This page is intentionally left blank

## Annex - Overview & Scrutiny Recommendation Response Pro forma

*Under section 9FE of the Local Government Act 2000, Overview and Scrutiny Committees must require the Cabinet or local authority to respond to a report or recommendations made thereto by an Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Such a response must be provided within two months from the date on which it is requested<sup>1</sup> and, if the report or recommendations in questions were published, the response also must be so.*

*This template provides a structure which respondents are encouraged to use. However, respondents are welcome to depart from the suggested structure provided the same information is included in a response. The usual way to publish a response is to include it in the agenda of a meeting of the body to which the report or recommendations were addressed.*

### Issue: Transitions to Adult Social Care

**Lead Cabinet Member(s):** Cllr Liz Brighthouse, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Children, Education and Young People's Services. Cllr Tim Bearder, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care

**Date response requested:**<sup>2</sup> 18 April 2023

### Response to report:

*Enter text here.*

### Response to recommendations:

Recommendation	Accepted, rejected or partially accepted	Proposed action (if different to that recommended) and indicative timescale (unless rejected)
That senior officers work in a holistic and co-ordinated fashion in order to identify the potential opportunities for Section 106 capital funding in terms of housing needs.		

<sup>1</sup> Date of the meeting at which report/recommendations were received

<sup>2</sup> Date of the meeting at which report/recommendations were received<sup>9</sup>

## Annex - Overview & Scrutiny Recommendation Response Pro forma

--	--	--

# **REPORT OF THE PEOPLE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: CHILDREN AND ADULT'S SOCIAL CARE WORKFORCE**

Cllr Nigel Simpson  
Chair of the People Overview & Scrutiny Committee  
April 2023

## **RECOMMENDATION**

1. The Cabinet is **RECOMMENDED** to —
  - a) Agree to respond to the recommendations contained in the body of this report, and
  - b) Agree that relevant officers will continue to update Scrutiny for 12 months on progress made against actions committed to in response to the recommendations, or until they are completed (if earlier).

## **REQUIREMENT TO RESPOND**

2. In accordance with section 9FE of the Local Government Act 2000, the People Overview & Scrutiny Committee hereby requires that, within two months of the consideration of this report, the Cabinet publish a response to this report and its recommendations.

## **INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW**

3. At its meeting on 10 November 2022, the People Overview and Scrutiny Committee received a briefing providing an overview of the children and adults' social care workforce (both internal and external), recruitment and retention challenges and opportunities. It considered the factors influencing current and anticipated demand, funding, and related service sustainability.
4. The Committee received the input of Cabinet member Councillor Brighthouse, the Corporate Director for Children's Services, Kevin Gordon, the Interim Corporate Director of Adult Social Care, Karen Fuller. The Committee would like to thank everyone for their contribution to this item.

## **SUMMARY**

5. The report was introduced by Kevin Gordon, Corporate Director for Children's Services. The social care workforce in Oxfordshire is made up of a combination of people who are directly employed by the Council ("internal workforce"), and those who are employed by care providers ("external workforce").

6. The Council currently employs 811 FTE staff in Adult Social Care and 1,021 FTE staff in Children's Social Care. In terms of those who are employed by the Council's care providers, 14,500 people are working in residential care homes, homecare and day centres. The social care workforce also consists of 1,300 Personal Assistants work in the county supporting people at home. Many unpaid carers also contribute significantly.
7. The challenges for recruiting and retaining staff included the underlying economic factors such as Oxfordshire being an expensive place to live and strong competition from other sectors in a buoyant local labour market in the South East. Social care roles were sometimes perceived to be unskilled jobs with little career progression and relatively low wages were paid for what can be a very demanding job.
8. Covid had an impact generally on people leaving the workforce in the UK and that the increase in vacancy levels in the internal and external social care workforce at Oxfordshire was a widespread phenomenon. A deep dive review of the issues impacting the recruitment and retention of children's social workers had been undertaken this year. In relation to the findings, work was progressing to reduce the demand flow into statutory Children's Services and caseloads were stabilising. There was for now a continued reliance upon agency workers until such time as work demand could be managed.
9. The Council has a plan in place to 'grow your own' social work staffing, with an established Social Work Academy that supports the learning and development for students who wish to enter the social work profession and those who are newly qualified, to experienced practitioners and those aiming to become managers. The Council was able to be quite selective in introducing people into the programmes, including local people and it was hoped there would be longer term retention.
10. An alternative source of experienced social workers was the recent employment of six International Social Workers. It was expected that an additional six would be recruited in 2022/23.
11. Options being looked at in terms of retention of staff included market supplements for hard to recruit to posts, lump sum long-service payments and career break opportunities such as sabbaticals for staff who may otherwise be considering leaving due to stress or burnout. The Council would explore the potential to offer sabbatical leave after 3 years of service for staff in hard to recruit teams.
12. The presentation drew the Committee's attention to the Adult Social Care legislation, 'Build Back Better: Our Plan for Health and Social Care' and 'People at the Heart of Care'. As one of six 'Trailblazer' local authorities, OCC was working with the Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC) to trial key aspects of the reforms. It was stated that the work that had been done on the Oxfordshire Way made the Council more resilient than others in terms of responding to the reforms and new ways of working.

13. The Council had in place a programme of activity to support employers in the care market. This included Funding the Care Workers' Charity to enable provision of hardship grants for Oxfordshire care workers and 'New Starter' grants to help people joining the Oxfordshire Care workforce with the cost of starting a new job.
14. The Council was exploring its offer in relation to key worker housing, taking into account the expensive nature of housing being a barrier to recruitment and retention. A group of officers within the Council were reviewing this matter.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

15. The Committee noted that there were specific steps being taken to improve the retention of staff in the internal workforce and to develop a package that could make OCC an employment Council of choice. However significant issues continue to impact recruitment and retention, including: workload (impact of high caseloads on social workers), pay and rewards (competition from other sectors in a buoyant local labour market), and the very high cost of living in Oxfordshire.
16. These factors impact recruitment across the Council and there are many similarities with the Council's difficulty in recruiting employees in other service areas, including for example highways engineers. It was recommended that a Council wide retention strategy was developed to address common issues and improve recruitment and retention across the board.

**Recommendation One: To develop and introduce a Council wide staff retention strategy.**

17. The issue of key worker housing was also discussed. The cost of purchased and rented accommodation remains high locally, making Oxfordshire an expensive place for key workers to settle. The Committee queried whether there was scope for interim housing as had been provided for key workers in the 1960s, noting that key worker housing is effective in reducing housing and commuting costs for key workers.
18. It was noted that there were provisions in respect of Section 106 funding for key worker housing and there was the potential for this to be explored. It was recognised that currently there was a lack of emphasis on partnership working between the County Council and the District Councils regarding key worker housing, and more could be done to develop an Oxfordshire approach to address this issue.

**Recommendation Two: To have a partnership approach to key worker housing with the District Councils, including exploring the potential for Section 106 funding.**

## **NEXT STEPS**

19. The People Overview & Scrutiny Committee will review the published Cabinet response to this report and its recommendations at the meeting of the Committee after Cabinet's response in accordance with part 6.2, 13(f), of the Constitution of the Council.

20. The Committee does not intend to examine children and adults' social care workforce again in this municipal year.

Contact Officer: Marco Dias, Interim Scrutiny Officer  
[marco.dias@oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:marco.dias@oxfordshire.gov.uk)

Annex: Pro-forma template – response to recommendations



## Annex - Overview & Scrutiny Recommendation Response Pro forma

*Under section 9FE of the Local Government Act 2000, Overview and Scrutiny Committees must require the Cabinet or local authority to respond to a report or recommendations made thereto by an Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Such a response must be provided within two months from the date on which it is requested<sup>1</sup> and, if the report or recommendations in questions were published, the response also must be so.*

*This template provides a structure which respondents are encouraged to use. However, respondents are welcome to depart from the suggested structure provided the same information is included in a response. The usual way to publish a response is to include it in the agenda of a meeting of the body to which the report or recommendations were addressed.*

### Issue: Children and Adult's Social Care Workforce

**Lead Cabinet Member(s):** Cllr Liz Brighthouse, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Children, Education and Young People's Services. Cllr Tim Bearder, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care

**Date response requested:**<sup>2</sup> 18 April 2023

### Response to report:

*Enter text here.*

### Response to recommendations:

Recommendation	Accepted, rejected or partially accepted	Proposed action (if different to that recommended) and indicative timescale (unless rejected)
To develop and introduce a Council wide staff retention strategy.		

<sup>1</sup> Date of the meeting at which report/recommendations were received

<sup>2</sup> Date of the meeting at which report/recommendations were received<sup>9</sup>

## Annex - Overview & Scrutiny Recommendation Response Pro forma

To have a partnership approach to key worker housing with the District Councils, including exploring the potential for Section 106 funding.		
---	--	--

## **Divisions Affected - All**

# **REPORT OF THE PEOPLE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: HOME TO SCHOOL TRANSPORT POLICY WORKING GROUP**

Cllr Nigel Simpson  
Chair of the People Overview & Scrutiny Committee  
April 2023

## **RECOMMENDATION**

1. The Cabinet is **RECOMMENDED** to —
  - a) Agree to respond to the recommendations contained in the body of the report of the Home to School Transport Policy Working Group report (Annex A), and
  - b) Agree that relevant officers will continue to update Scrutiny for 12 months on progress made against actions committed to in response to the recommendations, or until they are completed (if earlier).

## **REQUIREMENT TO RESPOND**

2. In accordance with section 9FE of the Local Government Act 2000, the People Overview & Scrutiny Committee hereby requires that, within two months of the consideration of this report, the Cabinet publish a response to this report and its recommendations.

## **SUMMARY**

3. The Home to School Transport Policy Working Group was established by the People Overview & Scrutiny Committee to consider the Home to School Transport Policy, to provide a review of the existing policy, identify financial pressures and the methods for achieving savings associated with the agreed 2022/23 budget, and to make recommendations to Cabinet in accordance with the Council's stated strategic direction particularly in relation to reducing its climate impact.
4. The Working Group acknowledges the significant financial pressures facing this policy area and supports the Council's commitment to equitable policies and agrees and supports the Council's commitment to decarbonise home to school transport as quickly as practicable.

5. Overall, the Working Group was assured of, and supports, the council's plans and progress and makes a number of recommendations to improve this work further.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

6. The People Overview & Scrutiny Committee endorses the recommendations set out in the report of the Home to School Transport Policy Working Group (Annex A).

## NEXT STEPS

7. The People Overview & Scrutiny Committee will review the published Cabinet response to this report and its recommendations at the meeting of the Committee after Cabinet's response in accordance with part 6.2, 13(f), of the Constitution of the Council.
8. The Committee does not intend to examine the provision of Home to School Transport again in this municipal year.

Annex:	A - Report of the Home to School Transport Policy Working Group B – Pro-forma template – response to recommendations
Background papers:	<a href="#">School Admissions Code 2021, DfE (statutory guidance)</a> <a href="#">Home to School Travel and Transport Guidance, 2014, DfE</a> <a href="#">Post-16 transport and travel support to education and training, January 2019, DfE (statutory guidance)</a> <a href="#">Oxfordshire County Council's Home to School Transport Policy</a>
Contact Officer:	Marco Dias, Interim Scrutiny Officer <a href="mailto:marco.dias@oxfordshire.gov.uk">marco.dias@oxfordshire.gov.uk</a>

# Annex A

## Report of the Home to School Transport Policy Working Group

### Table of Contents

<b>1. Foreword by the Chair .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. Introduction .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. The Working Group’s Inquiry .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4. Background .....</b>	<b>4</b>
Home to School Transport – Law and Policy .....	4
Legislation and statutory guidance .....	4
Council Policy.....	5
<b>5. Financial Pressures.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>6. Discretionary School Transport (Spare Seats Scheme) .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>7. Geographic Considerations and Split-Site Schools.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>8. Walking Route Safety.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>9. Independent Travel Training .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>10. Transport Eligibility Appeals .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>11. Decarbonisation of School Transport.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>12. Conclusion .....</b>	<b>14</b>

## 1. Foreword by the Chair

*Introduction by Chair of the Working Group - Cllr Andy Graham*



The review of the Home to School Transport Policy has been undertaken by Cllr Gregory, Cllr Waine and myself, with the support of officers, to investigate the policy with due regard to making recommendations to the Cabinet to ultimately make improvements where practical and realistic in the context of ever growing costs and budget pressures.

In addition to that, the working group has made every effort to establish where inequities exist, or exceptional circumstances should be highlighted, to ensure that the policy is as inclusive and fair as possible.

However, we have had to be conscious that the policy is laid out by statute and national legislation, and there have been occasions where that could be deemed to conflict with changes which might be deemed reasonable in one area of the county yet would set a case of being iniquitous elsewhere.

However, where discretion in the policy can be applied, we have sought to highlight specific examples to overcome that.

Ultimately, we have made every effort to ensure that the interest of all our children and those that have responsibility of ensuring they get to school and back safely has been at the forefront of our deliberations.

This review is not an attempt to solve all the issues involved but to make supportive recommendations in some of those areas that will make a difference and improve services for residents across Oxfordshire.

Councillor Andy Graham  
Chair of the Home to School Transport Policy Working Group

## **2. Introduction**

1. On 17 February 2022, the People Overview & Scrutiny Committee established a working group with the following terms of reference
  - i. to consider the Home to School Transport Policy and the options for any changes to the policy;
  - ii. to consider the impact on carbon emissions;
  - iii. to consider the equalities implications; and
  - iv. to agree a report and recommendations to the Cabinet for submission to the People Overview & Scrutiny Committee for endorsement.
2. The following Members were appointed to the Working Group:
  - Cllr Andy Graham (Chair)
  - Cllr Kate Gregory
  - Cllr Michael Waine
  - Cllr Juliette Ash (until October 2022)
3. This report will be presented to the People Overview and Scrutiny Committee for endorsement on 30 March, and subsequently to the Cabinet.

## **3. The Working Group's Inquiry**

4. On 7 April 2022, the Working Group held its first meeting, at which it considered a report on catchment areas, heard oral evidence from the Corporate Director – Children's Services and Admissions and Transport Services Manager, and agreed principles for its inquiry.
5. On 3 May 2022, the Working Group agreed a project plan, elected Cllr Graham as its chair and agreed that Cllr Ian Corkin was to have observer status in his capacity as Chair of the People Overview & Scrutiny Committee.
6. On 22 July 2022, the Working Group considered written submissions from Councillors, a report on home to school transport policy, and options to engage stakeholders in its inquiry; and heard oral evidence from the Deputy Director – Education, Admissions and Transport Services Manager and Principal Officer – Road Safety.
7. From August to November 2022, the inquiry was paused due to Member availability.
8. On 18 November 2022, the Working Group considered a report on the After-School Activity Travel Bursary, received an update on the decarbonisation of home to school transport, reviewed financial challenges facing the Home to School Transport budget, discussed discretionary SEND expenditure and the application of the Home to School Transport Policy to split-site schools. The Working Group heard oral evidence from the Corporate Director – Children's Services, Deputy Director of Education, Head of Access to Learning, Admissions and Transport Service Manager, and Team Leader – Supported Transport Services.

9. On 5 January 2023, the Working Group considered Home to School Transport data, a report on the decarbonisation of Home to School Transport, and a report on Independent Travel Training. The Working Group heard oral evidence from the Cabinet Member for Climate Change Delivery and Environment, Corporate Director – Children’s Services, Deputy Director of Education, Head of Access to Learning, Admissions and Transport Service Manager, Director of Highways and Operations, Head of Supported Transport, Climate Action Delivery Manager, Team Leader – Supported Transport Services, and Consultant from Gefleet. The Working Group would like to thank everyone, especially external contributors, for sharing their time and expertise with the Working Group.

## **4. Background**

10. 10. Education Authorities have a duty to provide free school transport to children and young people in certain situations and this is often referred to as Home to School Transport. Oxfordshire is a mostly rural county and the Council provides home to school transport to over 10,000 pupils every year at a cost of over £25 million per year.

### **Home to School Transport – Law and Policy**

11. Home to School Transport in Oxfordshire is delivered in accordance with the relevant legislation and guided by the Council’s policy to enable it to successfully meet local needs. As described under paragraph 17, the Council currently provides home to school transport above and beyond what is required by law.

### **Legislation and statutory guidance**

12. Statutory home to school transport eligibility is prescribed by the Education Act 1996 (the ‘1996 Act’) as amended by the Education and Inspections Act 2006, and education authorities, such as the County Council, must:
- Provide free transport to children under 8 years of age who attend their nearest suitable school if the walking distance to that school exceeds two miles.
  - Provide free transport to children aged 8 to 16 years who attend their nearest suitable school if the walking distance to that school exceeds three miles.
  - Provide free transport if a child is entitled to free school meals or their parents are in receipt of working tax credits and
    - the child is aged 8 to 11 years and attends their nearest suitable school, which is over two miles from their home,
    - the child is aged 11 to 16 years and attends one of their three nearest suitable schools and that is between two and six miles of their home, or
    - the child is aged 11 to 16 and attend a school that is between two and 15 miles of their home and their parents have chosen that school on the grounds of their religion or belief and, having regard to that religion or belief, there is no nearer suitable school.



- Make transport arrangements if a child attends their nearest suitable school and cannot be expected to walk to it because of their special educational needs, disability or mobility problems.
  - Publish an annual transport policy statement specifying the arrangements for the provision of transport or otherwise that the authority considers necessary to make to facilitate the attendance at education or training of all persons of sixth-form age receiving education or training.
  - Make such arrangements for the provision of transport and otherwise as the authority considers necessary to facilitate the attendance of adults – including those with education, health and care plans – at education or training.
13. Local authorities must have regard to the relevant statutory guidance issued by the Department for Education: *Home to school travel and transport guidance (2014)*<sup>1</sup> and *Post-16 transport and travel support to education and training (2019)*<sup>2</sup>.

### **Council Policy**

14. [Oxfordshire County Council's Home to School Transport Policy](#) sets out how it fulfils its home to school transport duties for children in Reception to Year 11.
15. Key principles of the Policy are:
- Free travel to 'nearest school' in excess of statutory walking distance or sub-statutory distance if walking route is assessed as unsafe.
  - Free travel for post-16 children with special educational needs (SEND) to the nearest college or school at which their needs can be met.
  - Providing a 'spare seat' scheme, under which children who are not entitled to home to school transport may apply to use excess home to school transport capacity for a fee.
  - Providing a formal appeals process.
16. Under the Policy, transport is provided using the most cost-effective means – most often a free bus pass.
17. The following elements of the Policy are discretionary:
- Free travel to the nearest suitable education setting for post-16 students.
  - The Spare Seat Scheme.
  - Free travel from RAF Benson to Icknfield Community College.
  - The 'split village' entitlement, whereby children are provided with free travel to the catchment school in villages where (a) at least 20 per cent of addresses are nearest to the catchment school and the rest are nearest to another school and (b) the catchment school is beyond the statutory walking distance or there is no safe walking route.

---

<sup>1</sup> [DFE-00501-2014](#)

<sup>2</sup> [DFE-00022-2019](#)

- Free travel to the nearest school in Oxfordshire even though there is a nearer school in an adjoining authority if the school is over the statutory walking distance.
  - The maintenance of free travel for entitled children who move house in Year 11 and continue to attend the same school provided that transport can be provided other than by taxi and the new journey distance is no further than 15 miles.
18. The council also provides free travel to respite care for SEND students and free travel to after-school clubs for SEND students. Such travel is not included in the Home to School Transport Policy and is funded from dedicated budgets administered by the Home to School Transport Team. There is no legal requirement that the council provides such transport.

## 5. Financial Pressures

19. 19. Home to School Transport in Oxfordshire has a yearly budget of £25.5m (2022/23), which, similarly to other areas of the Council and in line with national trends, is facing significant pressures as a result of demographic changes (15% increase in young people aged 5 to 14 between 2011 and 2021)<sup>3</sup> and inflationary pressures. This has resulted in an estimated overspend of £1.2m in the 2022/23 financial year.
20. Currently expenditure on mainstream students is significantly exceeded by expenditure on free travel for SEND students. The average cost to transport a mainstream child is just over £1,100 per year whereas a SEN child typically costs over £6,000 per year. The most significant item of discretionary expenditure is free travel for Post 16 students and this is one of the areas of increasing cost together with Special Schools transport, as the number of eligible pupils is increasing year on year.
21. Given the significant variations in the numbers of pupils per route every year, contracts need to be retendered on a yearly basis (especially on contracts to specialist settings) which in the current economic climate has meant that inflationary pressures have most clearly been seen in this area, with a 30% increase in the cost of some contracts and over 10% increase in the cost of contracts overall.
22. The current trends show decreasing demand in the primary school sector and increasing demand in the secondary school sector. This is likely to continue in the coming years and is also likely to increase costs as transport for secondary school pupils is usually more expensive than primary school, as distances travelled are typically greater, we use larger vehicles and these contracts are costing significantly more at this time.
23. The Working Group considered the geographical distribution of Home to School Transport and noted that most schools with over 100 pupils being transported

---

<sup>3</sup> [Oxfordshire Insight](#)

were mainstream secondary, but in terms of special educational needs schools the proportion of pupils transported was very high (i.e. 91 out of 118 pupils in John Watson School are currently transported by the Council). This also tends to be the type of transportation which is most costly.

#### School-run services

24. The Working Group discussed potential options to mitigate these financial pressures and noted that Supported Transport have worked with a number of schools in Oxfordshire to develop provision that best meets local needs.
25. The Working Group noted that the organic development of self-run transport schemes by schools had the capacity to deliver better outcomes and/or reduce costs and suggests that the Council be proactive in exploring the potential for more such schemes and to identify the support schools might seek to do so.

**Recommendation 1: The Council engage with schools regarding whether there are circumstances in which they would consider providing home to school transport for pupils entitled under the Home to School Transport policy.**

#### Changes to the scope of provision

26. Travel to After School Clubs for SEND students is not part of the Home to School Transport Policy, however, the Home to School Transport Team are responsible for authorising expenditure from this £51,000 budget. There is no statutory responsibility for free travel to After School Clubs, and this is a cash limited budget.
27. Similarly, travel to respite care for SEND students is not part of the Home to School Transport Policy. However, the Home to School Transport Team are responsible for authorising expenditure from this £63,400 budget.
28. The legal and policy position is that Post 16 travel should only be provided at the beginning and end of the school/college day, but it has been common for transport to be provided on a bespoke basis to reflect course timings. This comes at a considerable cost to the Council and the Working Group recommends that Cabinet decide whether to maintain budgets or implement plans that from September free travel is provided only at the beginning and end of the school/college day, which is estimated to save the Council £100,000 per year.

**Recommendation 2: That Cabinet decide between:**

**A: Home to School Transport only be provided for post-16 students at the beginning and end of a school day.**

**B: Budgets to remain the same for travel to after school clubs and respite care, with the Service ensuring that budgets are not overspent.**

## **6. Discretionary School Transport (Spare Seats Scheme)**

29. Parents have a legal duty to make necessary arrangements to ensure that their children attend school regularly, and the Council only has a requirement to provide Home to School Transport for eligible children as set out in paragraph 12 above.
30. Often the provision of home to school transport for entitled children creates surplus capacity (i.e. spare seats on a bus) and the Council operates a Spare Seats Scheme which enables this surplus capacity to be used by unentitled children.
31. The prices charged by the Council for discretionary home to school transport are lower than the costs to the Council, for example in September 2022 the average cost of a seat was approximately £800-£900, and the over 3-mile spare seat fare was £733 for the year. This means that these seats are effectively subsidised and increases in discretionary capacity would result in an increase in costs to the Council.
32. The Working Group considered the possibility of adjusting routes to ensure that all spare seats are used effectively, which would have the benefit of increasing the provision of Home to School Transport to pupils, whilst simultaneously reducing overall costs to the Council.
33. Selling spare seats that arise opportunistically is a simple and fair countywide approach to supporting families, being environmentally friendly while making better use of spare capacity, and the Working Group recognises that adjusting routes to create spare capacity may be difficult to develop and apply fairly in a countywide policy that does not increase costs to the local authority. The Working Group therefore recommends the implementation of a pilot scheme to consider the principle and viability of route adjustment to increase the take-up of spare seats.

### **Recommendation 3: The Council pilot adjusting a small number of Home to School Transport routes to fill as many unfilled spare seats as practicable.**

34. Given the significant financial pressures facing the Council, the Working Group agreed that spare seats should be offered “at cost” as a fair way of ensuring that extra capacity remains available while mitigating the cost pressures facing this scheme.
35. However, the Working Group recognises that it will be important to fully consider all factors influencing the cost of routes, as well as the administrative impact of amending the scheme, for example by the addition or amendment of price bands. The working group therefore recommends that a moratorium on all changes be implemented until outstanding issues with the scheme are fully resolved.

### **Recommendation 4: The Council’s Home to School Transport Policy be amended so that spare seat prices are commensurate with the cost of**

**providing them, including through the introduction of further price bands which better align with the costs of different routes**

**Amendment 4B: That a moratorium on changes to the Spare Seats Scheme is set up swiftly to allow time for the Council to address outstanding issues.**

## **7. Geographic Considerations and Split-Site Schools**

36. Oxfordshire is a mostly rural county and this reality has an impact on the provision of home to school transport outside Oxford City and the major urban areas of the county.
37. There are three schools in Oxfordshire with campuses on two locations (referred to as 'split-site schools'), Lord Williams School, Cherwell School, and King Alfred's School. All three schools have campuses dedicated to different year groups (lower and upper school), and this can have implications on the entitlement of pupils as set out in paragraph 12 (i.e. where one of the sites is within the statutory two miles walking distance, but the other site is not).
38. At present the distance is calculated based on the primary site where a pupil begins the majority of their education, and the Working Group discussed how there may be occasions where the primary site changes (i.e. as pupils progress years) and this may result in the primary site subsequently being over two miles away from a pupil's residence, but the entitlement being calculated based on the previous site which is closer, an inconsistency which the Working Group agreed should be remedied.

**Recommendation 5: The Council reassess Home to School Transport entitlement when a child begins to receive the majority of their tuition at a different site of a split-site school to that in relation to which their transport entitlement was originally assessed. The entitlement to be re-evaluated when they move to the second site or at the start of their tuition, taking both sites into consideration and planning accordingly.**

39. Oxfordshire's demographics are changing and growing. Between 2011 and 2021 the county's population increased by 71,500 residents, from 653,800 to 725,300, an increase of 10.9%.<sup>4</sup> This increase in residents has been accompanied by an increase in dwellings and the associated infrastructure, including school places, sometimes in new schools.
40. Projections show that the county's population is expected to continue increasing with several new schools planned and this can create inconsistent arrangements for families where a new school has been built and is now the closest school where this may not have been the case in previous years. Although a rare occurrence, such situations can create difficult conditions for families and the Working Group agreed that possible exceptions and transitional

---

<sup>4</sup> [Oxfordshire Insight](#)

arrangements should be explored where new schools have implications for the statutory distance but sticking to the letter of the policy could have negative consequences for families, for example resulting in two siblings attending different schools where it may be more convenient for them to attend the same school.

**Recommendation 6: The Council look at possible exceptions and transitional arrangements to provide spare seats to children if a new school has become the nearest available, but one or more siblings attend the previously nearest school.**

## **8. Walking Route Safety**

41. There is an expectation in law that, where necessary, a child will be accompanied to school by a responsible person, such as a parent or other adult, if there is a safe walking route available. Children of statutory school age are eligible for free travel to the nearest available school to their address even if it is less than the statutory walking distance, if it would not be safe for a child accompanied by an adult to walk from the home to the school. If the route is subsequently determined to be safe to walk the free transport is discontinued.
42. Route Assessments are carried out by a member of the Traffic and Road Safety Team, in accordance with Oxfordshire County Council's Home to School Travel and Transport Policy, the statutory guidance issued by the Secretary of State in 2014 and the Road Safety manual 'Assessment of Walked Routes to School' which is issued by Road Safety GB.
43. The shortest publicly available route may include:
  - Footpaths
  - Shared footpath/cycle tracks
  - Bridleways and other pathways
  - Recognised roads
  - Paths along trunk roads
  - Footpaths along which there is a permissive right of way
44. As per national policy, routes are not classed as unavailable solely due to any of the following factors:
  - Lonely routes
  - Routes that pass close to canals, rivers, ditches, lakes or ponds
  - Routes that require railway crossings if a suitable authorised crossing is present
  - The absence of street lighting
45. At present the route safety assessment does not include:
  - Local weather conditions
  - Temporary surface conditions such as mud or puddles
  - Difficult terrain and the arduousness of the route

46. The Working Group discussed how some routes deemed safe and available can become impassable for a significant amount of time, for example where a river or stream regularly floods in winter, and such factors should be taken into account when reviewing routes. At present assessments are not regularly reassessed but there may be occasions where circumstances have changed materially since an assessment was carried out and the Council should regularly reassess routes (i.e. every few years) as a matter of best practice. The Working Group also discussed the perceived lack of transparency on how routes are assessed and what information is used as part of the assessment. The Working Group agreed that it would be beneficial to improve the transparency of the process, including consultation with councillors.

**Recommendation 7: That walking route safety assessments are regularly and consistently reassessed where circumstances may have changed, ensuring councillors are consulted (i.e. at localities meetings) and that data on assessments is made publicly available. Route safety assessments should also consider both short and long term weather conditions.**

## **9. Independent Travel Training**

47. Independent Travel Training aims to assist SEND students to gain valuable transferable knowledge and skills enabling them to travel safely and independently, whether that be walking, taking a bus, a train or cycling. The programme also aims to familiarise the student with their local home and school community and can result in significant cost-savings for the Council.
48. Oxfordshire County Council commenced a programme of Independent Travel Training in November 2019. The programme was suspended between March 2020 and June 2021 due to Covid 19, and has since resumed.
49. The Council currently employs one independent travel trainer with the intention of training schools (train the trainer) to use a structured programme developed by the Council that allows them to train a student on aspects relating to independent travel. There are currently 73 students in the programme being trained by schools and to date 23 students have been trained.
50. In total the scheme has cost £139,640 and achieved an estimated £186,000 savings based on the cost of transporting a student on OCC arranged transport estimated at £6,000 per student per annum, meaning that the scheme has achieved savings of £46,360 over its lifetime and has delivered benefits to the students trained.
51. The Working Group reflected that independent travel training is a valuable programme with eminently desirable aims, such as:
- Gain an understanding of road safety theoretically and practically in a safe way
  - Develop increased self-esteem, confidence, and resilience
  - Enhance their quality of social engagement

- Develop mathematical & literacy skills (i.e. timetables, money, etc.)
  - Access work experience, training, further education or work independently
  - Increase their risk assessment skills
52. In addition to benefits to the pupils, the programme also has the potential to deliver further savings to the County Council based on its existing performance and the Working Group agreed that it would be beneficial to expand the programme to empower more students and deliver the programme's benefits.

**Recommendation 8: The Council to explore investing to save in supporting independent travel by increasing the budget, exploring delivery models and recruiting more independent travel trainers.**

## 10. Transport Eligibility Appeals

53. Home to School Transport and Travel Guidance 2014 states that local authorities should have in place both complaints and appeals procedures for parents to follow should they have cause for complaint about the service or if they wish to appeal about the eligibility of their child for travel support.
54. The appeals process should be a clear and transparent two stage process for parents who wish to challenge a decision about:
- The transport arrangements offered
  - Their child's eligibility
  - The distance measurement in relation to statutory walking distances
  - The safety of the route
55. The transport appeal process used in Oxfordshire follows the framework outlined in the Home to School Transport and Travel Guidance 2014.
56. Stage One is a review by a senior officer and in Oxfordshire this is the Admissions and Transport Services Manager.
57. A parent has 20 working days from receipt of the local authority's home to school transport decision to make a written request asking for a review of the decision. The written request should detail why the parent believes the decision should be reviewed and give details of any personal and/or family circumstances the parent believes should be considered when the decision is reviewed.
58. Within 20 working days of receipt of the parent's written request a senior officer reviews the original decision and sends the parent a detailed written notification of the outcome of their review, setting out:
- The nature of the decision reached
  - How the review was conducted
  - Information about other departments and/or agencies that were consulted as part of the process.
  - What factors were considered



- The rationale for the decision reached
  - Information about how the parent can escalate their case to Stage Two (if appropriate)
59. Stage Two of the appeals process is review by an independent appeal panel. A parent has 20 working days from receipt of the Local Authority's Stage 1 written notification of the result of the Stage 1 review to make a written request to escalate the matter to Stage 2.
60. Within 40 working days of receipt of the parents request for a Stage Two appeal an independent appeal panel needs to consider written and verbal representations from both the parent and officers involved in the case and then gives a detailed written notification of the outcome (within 5 working days), setting out the same information as during Stage One, with the addition of:
- Information about the parent's right to put the matter to the Local Government Ombudsman
61. Between 1 March 2021 and 28 February 2022 a total of 285 appeals were submitted, 50 were SEND cases and 235 were mainstream cases.
62. Of the SEND cases, 8 were eligible for free travel, 23 had no right to appeal and 19 had a Stage 1 processed. Of the Mainstream appeals, 184 were not eligible to appeal, 39 were eligible for free travel and 12 had a Stage 1 review processed.
63. A total of 9 Stage 2 appeals were submitted, 5 were SEND cases and 4 were Mainstream. Of the SEND appeals, 1 was awarded, 2 were awarded in part, 1 was refused, and 1 was adjourned. Of the Mainstream appeals, 3 were awarded and 1 was refused.
64. The Working Group noted that a substantial proportion of appeals were upheld and that in many cases the original decision was due to the correct information not having been submitted. The Working Group agreed that learning from the appeals process could be used to improve the Council's guidance to help the submission of correct and relevant information earlier in the process.

**Recommendation 9: Feedback from transport eligibility appeals to be used to improve digital capabilities (communications, guidance and data collection) and to improve outcomes.**

## **11. Decarbonisation of School Transport**

65. The Working Group considered the Council's ambition as set out in the work commissioned on decarbonising the external market for Home to School Sransport services that "Oxfordshire County Council wishes to reach a position where all its tendered supported transport services specify carbon neutrality as soon as practically possible", an ambition which the Working Group supported. As of 2019, the carbon footprint of the 770 vehicles used by or on behalf of OCC was estimated at 4,200 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>e.

66. The Working Group heard how OCC wants to understand how it can influence the market to reach a position of carbon neutrality by specifying higher vehicle standards in its tender documents and incentivising the use of cleaner vehicles and practices through its contract award mechanisms. OCC also wishes to understand the likely cost over and above the 'status quo' position, how it can measure progress towards targets and indeed what those targets should be. As such the Council would like to understand costs according to different scenarios. By taking this action, OCC hopes to influence the taxi and coach industry as a whole to reduce its carbon emissions and also to establish best practice for others local authorities to follow.
67. The Council is currently working to an ambitious timetable:
- Easter 2025 **new** contracts which can be fulfilled with a car-based vehicle (hackney cab or private hire) will be expected to use of a zero emission or ultra-low emission vehicle
  - Easter 2027 **all** contracts which can be fulfilled with a car-based vehicle (hackney cab or private hire) will be expected to use of a zero emission or ultra-low emission vehicle
  - Easter 2027 **new** contracts which can be fulfilled with a MPV or small minibus (up to 3.5 tonnes GVW) will be expected to use a zero emission or an ultra-low emission vehicle
  - Easter 2030 **all** contracts using vehicles under 3.5 tonnes GVW will be required to use a zero-emission vehicle or an ultra-low emission vehicle operating in zero emission mode for the while of the contracted route.
68. The Working Group positively welcomed the Council's ambition, report on progress and its discussion with the Cabinet Member.
69. The Working Group discussed the importance of consulting with contractors to ensure that they have the opportunity to transition to low-emission vehicles. The Working Group also discussed the importance of ensuring policy and targets work together and the need for the Council to demonstrate ambition while also being pragmatic towards the realities of operators and the potential financial implications of change.
70. The working group heard how this work is being picked up at the Climate Action Program Board and how recommendations from the Working Group and Committee can feed into that forum.

**Recommendation 10: That the contents of this report be referred to the next Climate Action Program Board.**

## **12. Conclusion**

71. The Working Group has made a total of 10 recommendations with the aim of improving Home to School Transport in Oxfordshire.

72. The Working Group recognised the pressures faced by Home to School Transport in Oxfordshire and hopes its recommendations will help this service become even more equitable and sustainable long term.

Councillor Andy Graham  
Chair of the Home to School Transport Policy Working Group

Contact Officer: Marco Dias, Interim Scrutiny Officer,  
[marco.dias@oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:marco.dias@oxfordshire.gov.uk)

April 2023

This page is intentionally left blank

## Annex B - Overview & Scrutiny Recommendation Response Pro forma

*Under section 9FE of the Local Government Act 2000, Overview and Scrutiny Committees must require the Cabinet or local authority to respond to a report or recommendations made thereto by an Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Such a response must be provided within two months from the date on which it is requested<sup>1</sup> and, if the report or recommendations in questions were published, the response also must be so.*

*This template provides a structure which respondents are encouraged to use. However, respondents are welcome to depart from the suggested structure provided the same information is included in a response. The usual way to publish a response is to include it in the agenda of a meeting of the body to which the report or recommendations were addressed.*

### Issue: Home to School Transport Policy

**Lead Cabinet Member(s):** Cllr Liz Brighthouse, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Children, Education and Young People's Services

**Date response requested:**<sup>2</sup> 18 April 2023

### Response to report:

*Enter text here.*

### Response to recommendations:

Recommendation	Accepted, rejected or partially accepted	Proposed action (if different to that recommended) and indicative timescale (unless rejected)
The Council engage with schools regarding whether there are circumstances in which they would consider providing home to school		

<sup>1</sup> Date of the meeting at which report/recommendations were received

<sup>2</sup> Date of the meeting at which report/recommendations were received<sup>9</sup>

## Annex B - Overview & Scrutiny Recommendation Response Pro forma

transport for pupils entitled under the Home to School Transport policy.		
<p>That Cabinet decide between:</p> <p>A: Home to School Transport only be provided for post-16 students at the beginning and end of a school day.</p> <p>B: Budgets to remain the same for travel to after school clubs and respite care, with the Service ensuring that budgets are not overspent.</p>		
The Council pilot adjusting a small number of Home to School Transport routes to fill as many unfilled spare seats as practicable.		
The Council's Home to School Transport Policy be amended so that spare seat prices are commensurate with the cost of providing them, including through the introduction of further price bands which better align with the costs of different routes		
That a moratorium on changes to the Spare Seats Scheme is set up swiftly to allow time for the Council to address outstanding issues.		
The Council reassess Home to School Transport entitlement when a child begins to receive the majority of their tuition at a different site of a split-site school to that in relation to which their transport entitlement was originally assessed. The entitlement to be re-evaluated		

## Annex B - Overview & Scrutiny Recommendation Response Pro forma

<p>when they move to the second site or at the start of their tuition, taking both sites into consideration and planning accordingly.</p>		
<p>The Council look at possible exceptions and transitional arrangements to provide spare seats to children if a new school has become the nearest available, but one or more siblings attend the previously nearest school.</p>		
<p>That walking route safety assessments are regularly and consistently reassessed where circumstances may have changed, ensuring councillors are consulted (i.e. at localities meetings) and that data on assessments is made publicly available. Route safety assessments should also consider both short and long term weather conditions.</p>		
<p>The Council to explore investing to save in supporting independent travel by increasing the budget, exploring delivery models and recruiting more independent travel trainers.</p>		
<p>Feedback from transport eligibility appeals to be used to improve digital capabilities (communications, guidance and data collection) and to improve outcomes.</p>		
<p>That the contents of this report be referred to the next Climate Action Program Board.</p>		

## **Annex B - Overview & Scrutiny Recommendation Response Pro forma**



**Divisions Affected – ALL**

**CABINET  
18 April 2023**

## **PROPOSAL FROM OXFORD UNITED FOOTBALL CLUB TO OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL AS LANDOWNER**

**Update**

**Report by Corporate Director Customers  
and Organisational Development**

### **RECOMMENDATION**

1. **The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to**
  - (a) Note the progress set out in the report below.
  - (b) Note that the 'Likely Case' timetable set out in appendix 1 remains the probable timeframe for decision making.

### **Executive Summary**

2. In January 2023 the Cabinet agreed to begin negotiations on commercial head of terms for the use of a parcel of land known as 'Land to East of Frieze Way / South of Kidlington Roundabout or the triangle' for the development of a new stadium for Oxford United Football Club (OUFC). At the time of writing this report negotiations for non-binding heads of terms are underway.
3. On 21 March 2023 the Cabinet endorsed a Memorandum of Understanding between Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) and OUFC. The Cabinet agreed a stakeholder engagement and communications strategy and three timetables as routes (optimistic, likely, and elongated) to a final decision regarding the land.
4. Cabinet recognises that heads of terms are non-binding, and that any final decision is to be subject to the scheme addressing a set of strategic priorities set out below:
  - maintain a green barrier between Oxford and Kidlington
  - improve access to nature and green spaces
  - enhance facilities for local sports groups and on-going financial support

- significantly improve the infrastructure connectivity in this location, improving public transport to reduce the need for car travel in so far as possible, and to improve sustainable transport through increased walking, cycling and rail use
  - develop local employment opportunities in Oxfordshire
  - increase education and innovation through the provision of a sports centre of excellence and facilities linked to elite sport, community sport, health and wellbeing
  - support the County Council's net zero carbon emissions pledge through highly sustainable development
5. Furthermore, the Cabinet would need to be satisfied that medium and long term financial liabilities and risks to the Council could be managed and that further work on due diligence would need to be undertaken.
  6. OUFC are continuing to undertake their own community engagement activities and develop a scheme proposal that addresses the strategic priorities set out at paragraph 4.

## **Background**

7. This report follows those received by Cabinet on 18 January 2022, 5 March 2022, 24 January 2023 and 21 March 2023 (all available on the Oxfordshire County Council website). It provides an update on work underway and sets out indicative timetables, the framework for stakeholder engagement and progress in relation to these matters.
8. OUFC approached OCC in late 2021 with a proposal to develop Stratfield Brake playing fields and 'the triangle' for a scheme including a new home stadium and enabling commercial development. In January 2021 the Cabinet resolved to undertake a public engagement exercise to understand local views and set out a series of strategic priorities or objectives that any scheme should address prior to a final decision being made.
9. Following the public engagement activity, the Cabinet meeting held on 15 March 2022 agreed that officers would conduct discussions with OUFC to deepen their understanding of the detailed proposals being made and to consider their compatibility with the strategic objectives set out in paragraph 4 above and that OUFC should provide information to OCC setting out how their proposals would address these strategic priorities.
10. OUFC have chosen to utilise the design process set out by the Royal Institute of British Architects (the RIBA plan of work) and on 10 November 2022, Officers received a response from OUFC in the form of the RIBA stage 0 report. It should be noted that this report has been undertaken in relation to a wider proposal encompassing a land parcel including the Stratfield Brake playing fields. OUFC published their final stage 0 report on their website in December 2022.
11. Following a series of clarifications and stakeholder meetings and a consideration of the proposals, the Cabinet met on 24 January 2023 and

resolved to enter into negotiations for non-binding heads of terms for the use of 'the triangle' for a new stadium. This decision was undertaken recognising the scope and complexity of the original proposal was subject to a series of challenges both in terms of deliverability and the extent to which the strategic priorities would be addressed.

12. OCC have now received an updated vision, strategy and intent document from OUFC called 'Stand United'. This sets out a clear ambition and intent for the scheme and sets out the approach to which the club will address the council's seven strategic priorities. The document 'Stand United' will be published on the county council's website.
13. OUFC have continued to undertake their own stakeholder engagement.

## Progress Update

14. A dedicated page has been published on the county council's website: [www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/stadium](http://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/stadium). This includes an overview of the discussions, the proposed timeline, definitions of roles, and links to cabinet papers and news stories. It aims to provide a simple one-stop-shop for all stadium related information.
15. Officers have begun negotiations on non-binding heads of terms with OUFC. These heads of terms relate to the value of the land if utilised for a stadium and ensuring that any financial or commercial arrangements meet the relevant legislative criteria for the County Council.
16. Officers are currently working with an independent community facilitator to undertake stakeholder meetings to explore views with regards to the OUFC proposals. The meetings are taking place during April and are being led by an independent chair from the Consultation Institute. Cabinet members and senior council officers will be in attendance and the meetings are being formally noted.
17. At this stage no additional technical information has been provided by OUFC regarding the details of the scheme, as such the stakeholder meetings are designed to capture early views as to how OUFC's emerging plans meet the council's seven strategic priorities. The feedback from stakeholders will inform ongoing discussions with the club.
18. Invitations have been sent to local parish councils; district and county councillors representing the local area; Oxfordshire's MPs; local sports clubs; the current leaseholder of the Triangle and adjacent leaseholders; local interest groups including Friends of Stratfield Brake and the Triangle; groups representing OUFC supporters; and representatives of Oxfordshire's business community, including tourism. The council welcomes approaches from other organisations or community groups that would like to be involved.
19. An update briefing by OUFC will take place for county councillors on 17 April 2023 which will take the format of a presentation, questions and answers. A

recording of OUFC's presentation will be published on the council's website, together with a series of FAQs from the presentation.

20. OUFC is undertaking their own engagement activities to help shape their own planning. The County Council welcomes these activities and recognises that they do not replace our own engagement and listening activities.
21. Following the submission of 'Stand United' on 31 March which sets out OUFC's vision and strategy for the stadium on the revised parcel of land known as the 'Triangle'; OCC has confirmed with OUFC that further technical detail will be required to set out how the scheme will address the council's seven strategic priorities. As such the 'likely timeframe' set out in annex 1 remains the assumed scenario and the optimistic timeframe that would have seen a decision made by Cabinet in July 2023 will not be met.

### **Proposed Next Steps**

22. The next steps for this work are focused on OCC undertaking independently facilitated stakeholder meetings. These are planned to take place during April and May 2023. Invitations have been sent to a broad range of stakeholders (as set out in the engagement and communications strategy agreed in March 2023) and OCC remains open to approaches from other stakeholders to participate in this process.
23. Officers are working with the independent third-party specialist to agree and plan the second phase of open engagement, which will commence when OUFC publish their scheme proposals and information relating to how the Council's seven strategic properties will be addressed.
24. The working assumption is that the likely case timetable remains achievable, as such the open engagement is likely to take place between 5 June 2023 and 23 July 2023. With publication of the OUFC scheme details on 5 June.

### **Financial Implications**

25. Financial implications associated with the engagement and communications strategy include officer time and the use of any independent advisors, this will be resourced through existing departmental budgets and supplemented by reserves, if necessary, estimated impact is under £30,000.

Comments checked by:

Lorna Baxter, Director of Finance and S151, [lorna.baxter@oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:lorna.baxter@oxfordshire.gov.uk)

### **Legal Implications**

26. It should be noted that this report relates to Oxfordshire County Council as landowner, and not in its roles as statutory consultee to a planning application. Any potential stadium development would be subject to the usual planning

process and Oxfordshire County Council will undertake its role as a statutory consultee with regards to relevant matters as part of that process.

Comments checked by:

Richard Hodby, Solicitor, Legal Services [richard.hodby@oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:richard.hodby@oxfordshire.gov.uk)

## **Equality and Inclusion Implications**

27. No further equality or inclusion implications have been identified in addition to those noted in previous reports relating to this matter. The publication of a timeframe to decision making and commitment to a period of six weeks for feedback seeks to enable as wide as participation as possible.

## **Sustainability Implications**

28. Whilst there are no specific sustainability implications arising from this report it should be note that any scheme proposal by OUFC must support OCC's net zero carbon emissions pledge through high sustainable development aspirations and overall net zero emissions targets; that any proposal must seek to enforce less reliance on cars and improve sustainable transport through increased walking, cycling, and rail use and that any proposal must achieve a 10% biodiversity net gain.

## **Risk Management**

29. The county council will identify and mitigate financial risks associated with the potential development of a stadium on leased land (should a leasehold rather than a freehold transaction be pursued) as part of the next steps of this work. The council will take appropriate legal and financial advice to develop the mitigations, currently this advice is being sought.
30. Professional fees will need to be incurred before it is clear whether the transaction can proceed. The liability for these fees must rest with OUFC and not the County Council. Whilst the County Council will always act in good faith, if ultimately it was unhappy with the proposals in the professional reports, the County Council must retain the right to refuse to proceed with the transaction without being liable for OUFC's costs.
31. For the avoidance of doubt, the County Council will not be willing to enter into a conditional agreement for lease or transfer before the professional reports are obtained which might tie it to proceed with the transaction despite being unhappy with the proposals in the professional reports.

## **Consultations**

32. The County Council undertook a significant public engagement exercise in January 2022. Lasting four weeks, with specific local targeting, this exercise was open to all and explored the strategic priorities identified in this report. It related to proposals from OUFC covering both the playing fields at Stratfield

Brake and the land known as the 'triangle' and described as land to the east of Frieze Way / south of Kidlington roundabout.

33. If a decision is made to make available the land to OUFC for a stadium, formal consultation would take place as part of the statutory planning process in due course. It is important to stress that County Council cannot replace or undermine the statutory consultation process that will be undertaken by the Cherwell District Council, as the local planning authority.
34. The County Council is aware that OUFC, as the scheme promotor, is undertaking pre-application engagement with community stakeholders and the planning authority; OCC welcomes this work.

Comments checked by:

Paul Grant, Head of Legal and Deputy Monitoring Officer  
[paul.grant@oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:paul.grant@oxfordshire.gov.uk)

CLAIRE TAYLOR: CORPORATE DIRECTOR CUSTOMERS, ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND RESOURCES

Annex: Annex 1: Timetables

Background papers: None

Other Documents: This report follows those received by Cabinet on 18 January 2022, 15 March 2022, 24 January 2023 and 21 March 2023 all published on the county council website [www.oxfordshire.gov.uk](http://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk)

Contact Officer: Vic Kurzeja, Director of Property Services  
[Vic.Kurzeja@Oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Vic.Kurzeja@Oxfordshire.gov.uk)

March 2023

## Annex 1: Timetable

In recognition of the complexity of this project three scenarios have been set out below mapping out a timetable to decision making. Planning assumptions continue to be based on scenario 1 and will be reflected in the Cabinet's forward plan of business.

Scenario 1 – Likely case

Scenario 2 – Optimistic case

Scenario 3 – Elongated case

<b>Scenario 1 – Likely case</b>		
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Cabinet meeting	21 March 2023	Cabinet paper to agree MoU, engagement and communications plan and timetables
Independently facilitated stakeholder meetings	March 2023 – early May 2023	Programme of independently facilitated stakeholder meetings. These are OCC led and not intended to replace or duplicate any OUFC community engagement.
Cabinet meeting	18 April 2023	Progress update in public – n.b. pre-election period, no decision-making process / timetable update only.
OCC receive suite of information from OUFC setting out how strategic priorities will be addressed	14 May 2023	Receipt of information by email from OUFC to OCC.
Cabinet meeting	23 May 2023	Paper setting out final arrangements for engagement.
Period of OCC internal assurance and clarifications regarding OUFC information	15 May – 31 May 2023	Internal process whereby clarifications and outstanding questions are resolved between OCC and OUFC.
Resolution of clarifications, provision of final suite of information.	31 May 2023	Deadline for clarifications.
Publication of information provided by OUFC	5 June 2023	Publication of final suite of information which to undertake open engagement.
Period of open engagement opens	5 June 2023	OCC have committed to a period of 6 weeks to seek feedback from all stakeholders.
Period of open engagement ends	23 July 2023	
Internal drafting and review	24 July - 1 September 2023	Internal process of evidence review, report drafting and assurance.
Cabinet meeting: final Cabinet decision	19 September 2023	Papers published week prior.

<b>Scenario 2 – Optimistic case (now ruled out as a deliverable timeframe)</b>		
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Cabinet meeting	21 March 2023	Cabinet paper to agree MoU, engagement and communications plan and timetables
Independently facilitated stakeholder meetings	March 2023 – early May 2023	Programme of independently facilitated stakeholder meetings. These are OCC led and not intended to replace or duplicate any OUFC community engagement.
OCC receive suite of information from OUFC setting out how strategic priorities will be addressed	31 March 2023	Receipt of information by email from OUFC to OCC.
Period of OCC internal assurance and clarifications regarding OUFC information	3 April – 25 April 2023	Internal process whereby clarifications and outstanding questions are resolved between OCC and OUFC.
Cabinet meeting	18 April 2023	Progress update in public – n.b. pre-election period, no decision-making process / timetable update only – confirm arrangements for next phase for engagement.
Resolution of clarifications, provision of final suite of information.	25 April 2023	Deadline for clarifications.
Publication of information provided by OUFC	5 May 2023	Publication of final suite of information which to undertake open engagement.
Period of open engagement opens	5 May 2023	OCC have committed to a period of 6 weeks to seek feedback from all stakeholders.
Period of open engagement ends	18 June 2023	
Internal drafting and review	19 June 2023	Internal process of evidence review, report drafting and assurance.
Cabinet meeting: final Cabinet decision	18 July 2023	Papers published week prior.



<b>Scenario 3 – Elongated case</b>		
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Cabinet meeting	21 March 2023	Cabinet paper to agree MoU, engagement and communications plan and timetables
Independently facilitated stakeholder meetings	March 2023 – early May 2023	Programme of independently facilitated stakeholder meetings. These are OCC led and not intended to replace or duplicate any OUFC community engagement.
Cabinet meeting	18 April 2023	Progress update in public – n.b. pre-election period, no decision-making process / timetable update only.
OCC receive suite of information from OUFC setting out how strategic priorities will be addressed	14 May 2023	Receipt of information by email from OUFC to OCC.
Cabinet meeting	20 June or 18 July 2023	Paper setting out final arrangements for engagement.
Period of OCC internal assurance and clarifications regarding OUFC information	No later than 21 July - 25 August 2023	Internal process whereby clarifications and outstanding questions are resolved between OCC and OUFC.
Resolution of clarifications, provision of final suite of information.	25 August 2023	Deadline for clarifications.
Publication of information provided by OUFC	1 September 2023	Publication of final suite of information which to undertake open engagement.
Period of open engagement opens	1 September 2023	OCC have committed to a period of 6 weeks to seek feedback from all stakeholders, OCC practice would be to avoid August by which to undertake this. If necessary, the period of engagement could be lengthened through August to cover 6 weeks during July and September.
Period of open engagement ends	13 October 2023	
Internal drafting and review	16 October – 3 November 2023	Internal process of evidence review, report drafting and assurance.
Cabinet meeting: final Cabinet decision	21 November 2023	Papers published week prior.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Divisions Affected – All**

**CABINET**  
**18 April 2023**

**A Programme for Transforming the Council's  
Enterprise Business Systems and Processes**

**Outline Business Case**

**Report by Corporate Director Customers and Organisational  
Development**

**RECOMMENDATION**

1. **Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to**
  - a. Approve the development of detailed requirements and a full business case to review delivery options for corporate support services and underpinning technology including human resources, finance, payroll and procurement in order to deliver services more efficiently, modernise business processes and upgrade current IT systems.
  - b. Approve funding of £1.57m for programme resources to prepare requirements for a transformation and potential procurement process. This funding will be drawn from the council's transformation reserve.
  - c. Note that a further Cabinet decision to commit capital funding and progress to the next stage will be required in due course, which will be based on a full business case.

**Executive Summary**

2. This report presents an outline business case to transform finance, procurement, HR and payroll services and systems. These services are currently delivered in partnership with Hampshire County Council, following a decision in 2015 to move to a shared service delivery model known as the Integrated Business Centre (IBC).

3. This report seeks approval for funding of £1.57m to progress to the next stage of the programme to prepare detailed requirements for a transformation programme and potential procurement process.
4. The outline business case has been developed using indicative order-of-magnitude costs and is based on the council's high-level requirements. Following the development of detailed requirements and a review of delivery models including in-sourcing and mixed delivery options, a further report with an updated business case and recommendations, including cashable and non-cashable benefits, will be produced for cabinet approval.
5. Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP), referred to throughout this report, refers to the provision of the council's business critical finance, procurement, HR and payroll processes, including the management of all related information and resources, by means of either a fully integrated single IT system or a combination of fully integrated best-of-breed IT systems. Options to procure either a single IT system or a combination of fully integrated best-of-breed IT systems will be fully explored as part of the detailed requirements review.
6. The key priority within this programme is the transformational change required to maximise the efficiency and effectiveness of the support services. New or upgraded technology will be required to underpin and enable this change and as such this programme should be considered one of process and systems modernisation that improve efficiency and effectiveness and reduce cost, rather than the upgrading of IT systems.

### **Exempt Information**

7. Annex 1, Outline Financial Case, is exempt as the projected outline implementation cost information relates to the business affairs of the Council and includes confidential financial information that may influence a potential future procurement process. Annex 2, ERP Programme Options Appraisal, is also exempt as it contains sensitive information relating to the business affairs of the Council which may influence the ongoing commercial relationship with Hampshire County Council.

### **Background**

8. In 2015 the council entered into a shared service arrangement that effectively outsourced its HR, finance and procurement support including the technology infrastructure via a partnership agreement with Hampshire County Council's Integrated Business Centre (IBC), which had already been established supporting other public sector bodies.
9. The Integrated Business Centre (IBC) partnership provides back-office services to all council staff, including the Oxfordshire Fire and Rescue Service and more than 200 schools. It makes use of standardised processes, automation, and self-service. This new operating model was implemented in July 2015 at an approximate cost of £7m and it enabled the Council to reduce annual revenue costs by approximately £700k as part of plans for Council-wide savings.

10. The savings have been realised through the economies of scale achieved by sharing services with other organisations and a 'one size fits all' delivery model, with any system changes requiring agreement from all partners. However, the subsequent increased number of partners since 2015 and the shared services operating principles have resulted in a lack of agility and ability to respond to the Council's changing needs.
11. A Case for Change review was undertaken in Q4 2021/22 and was approved by the Strategic Leadership Team. The analysis identified additional opportunities and drivers for change to move from the existing shared services partnership, for example:
  - Improving accessibility of data and information to support accurate decision making.
  - Improved workflow, controls and risk management to improve efficiency and cost controls.
  - Process inefficiencies. The initial savings of £700k have not been revisited and initial work taking into account technology advances and new ways of working suggests there are further opportunities for efficiency savings in management and administrative time.
  - Ability to improve processes end-to-end and realise benefits. The 'one size fits all' operating model restricts the Council from being able to exploit the benefits of a modern ERP solution at pace.
12. The support for IBC's current technology platform will end by 2030, requiring an upgrade to the next generation system. This is tentatively planned to take place in 2027/28 and it is expected, based on indicative estimates, that additional costs will be incurred by the Council in managing the delivery of the resulting changes. As such the time is right to review the current arrangements and there is not a 'do nothing' option.

## Options considered

13. Following the Case for Change exercise an Options Appraisal (see Annex 2) was completed, which explored eight different operating model options via research, engagement with IBC, and informal soft market engagement with suppliers, involving a Request for Information exercise and supplier days. Two options were shortlisted:
  - Option 1 - Back-office services remain outsourced with IBC but improving efficiency and ways of working.
  - Option 2 - Full or partial in-sourcing of back-office services and their enabling ERP technology.
14. To identify a preferred option to meet the Council's requirements, the two shortlisted options were assessed in terms of their strengths and weaknesses and scored based on their degree of alignment with the following critical success criteria:

- Self-service workflow controls – Cost Centre Manager and Manager self-service via a simple and intuitive user experience enabling compliance, effective control and risk management.
  - One source of the truth for Finance, Procurement and HR – Provides access to data and insights resulting in greater business intelligence to support better management decision making.
  - Agile system that can respond to future needs – Adaptable to changes in the Council's operating model, policy, processes, procedures and scheme of delegation.
  - Efficient and intuitive system – Reduces off-system processes and workarounds and reduces the capacity impact on managers, Finance, Procurement and HR.
15. The Options Appraisal recommended Option 2, a full or partial in-sourcing of back-office services and the enabling ERP technology.
- Option 1 was discounted due to the IBC confirming that there will be no change to the existing operating model to more closely align with the Council's needs.
  - The option to 'Do Nothing' was discounted early in the appraisal due to the issues and opportunities identified through the Case for Change analysis.
16. Different options for partial vs. full in-sourcing, including their pros and cons, will be fully investigated during the next stage of the programme.
17. It should be noted that until a full business case has been presented option 2 is the preferred option. At this stage, option 1 does not appear to offer OCC any flexibility but this will continue to be tested as part of the business case.

## Vision and benefits

18. The aim of this Transformation Programme is to partially or fully replace and renew the current service model provisioned by IBC with a new full or partially in-sourced operating model. The ambition for the future is summarised by the following programme vision statement and the critical success factors listed in Paragraph 14. This vision of the future will require a transformational change to processes and ways of working and will form an important enabler of the Council's wider transformation and culture change ambitions.
- “Empowerment and accountability of the workforce through ownership and control of our data using best practice workflow self-service. Allowing the HR, finance and procurement services to focus on their key professional areas working with reliable and trusted data to inform decisions and reduce risk”.*
19. Examples of the potential benefits from implementing the new operating model, including the procurement and implementation of an enabling system, whether a fully integrated single IT system or a fully integrated combination of best-of-breed IT systems. are shown below.

Type	Benefit	Metric
Financial Benefit	Cost avoidance due to the Council leaving the shared services partnership and not contributing to the cost of the IBC SAP upgrade and management of the delivery resulting changes.	Confirmed partner contributions and change costs
Non-Financial Benefit	Self-service workflow controls improve risk management and instil confidence in processes.	Auditable self-service workflow reports, errors reduce
	Efficient and intuitive system that reduces officer time needed to engage with workarounds and time-consuming repetitive tasks.	Reduction in transaction time for managers
	One source of the truth for Finance, Procurement and HR delivers accurate business intelligence and improves management decision making.	New areas of intelligence delivered e.g. Equality data
	Increased automation of finance and HR transactional processes, creating efficiencies and freeing up resources to direct additional time to more complex and value-adding advice and support.	Reduction or elimination of transaction time for officers
	Agile way of working and system that can respond to future Council needs and is aligned to preferred processes	Reduction in time for changes to be reflected within the system/ processes
	Improved workforce experience and resilience enabled by modern and fit-for-purpose systems and processes	Wellbeing survey Employee engagement survey
	Environmental commitments from corporate ERP technology vendors including Net Zero, contributing to the Council's climate agenda.	Reduction from IBC current energy use baseline.

## Scope

20. The scope of the detailed requirements review for this business transformation programme includes the following:

- Services – All transactional finance, procurement and HR and payroll services currently provided by the IBC to the Council and to Schools (Maintained and Voluntary Aided).
- Service Users – The full scope of service users of the existing IBC services and SAP system, including all Council and Schools users.
- Processes – Reviewing the current SAP licenced IBC processes including their integration, including integration with line-of-business systems. Some additional process areas, not currently provided by IBC, have been included within scope for review, for example Business Intelligence and Analytics, Fixed Assets, Capital Projects, Treasury Management and Performance Management.
- Data archiving – A solution is required for archiving existing historical Council data held in the IBC SAP system, which will not be migrated to any potential new ERP system. A solution is also required to host the copy of the Council's legacy SAP system, currently hosted by IBC, which contains the Council's legacy data which was not migrated to Hampshire's SAP system in 2015. This system is still in use by HR as a key reference.

21. Strategic procurement processes are out-of-scope including supplier management, sourcing, and contract management.

## Next Steps

22. The table below shows an indicative summary timeline for the Requirements stage, with a target of November 2023 for seeking Cabinet approval to issue an Invitation to Tender, following completion of all requirements, preparations to procure and further development of the business case.
23. Following Cabinet approval, the decision to progress this requirements stage will be communicated to the organisation, as a key part of the wider Council transformation agenda, and other interested stakeholders and the market. A more detailed overview will be provided to stakeholders who are critical to delivering the outcomes of the Requirements stage. Further updates will be communicated to the organisation as the requirements stage progresses as part of the programme's communication plan.

No.	Milestone	Indicative Date
1	Outline business case final approval and approval to progress the Requirements stage.	18 April 2023
2	Requirements developed and procurement preparation complete – full business case developed.	October 2023
3	Cabinet approval to issue an Invitation to Tender and implement agreed delivery model following consideration of the business case.	November 2023

## Corporate Policies and Priorities

24. Examples of how the implementation of a new operating model, including enabling technology, would contribute to the Council's nine strategic priorities are as follows:
- Improved reporting, analytics and insights will enable improved management decision making. For example, improved forecasting and decision making within social care, health or in relation to inequalities through predictive analytics combining non-financial and financial data.
  - Increased efficiency / officer time savings through improved processes, including intuitive self-service with controlled workflow and greater automation, enabling officers to allocate more time to focus on service delivery.
  - Improved workforce resilience enabled by modern and fit-for-purpose processes and systems, supporting an engaged workforce focusing on service delivery.
  - A strong contribution to the Council's climate agenda, through procuring a cloud hosted solution from a technology vendor with a corporate environmental agenda including a commitment to Net Zero.



## Financial Implications

25. The projected costs in this outline business case are indicative only and are included in Annex 1 of this report. The scope of this report is to seek a decision to progress the requirements stage of the programme only, which will require the following resources at a cost of £1.57m.
26. The funding for the revenue costs in 23/24 would be met from the Transformation Reserve, with 24/25 and future years to be agreed through the Business and Budget Planning process.
27. The total capital funding required for the overall project is not yet determined and a further report and final business case will be presented to Cabinet with capital requirements for a final decision. At this stage it is estimated that costs will exceed £10m but this does not factor in identified savings and is dependent on the preferred delivery model.

### Requirements Stage Resource Costs - £'000s

Item	2023/24	2024/25	Total
Programme, project management & support	247	18	
Technical architecture	56	-	
Service resources	622	58	
Requirements development consultancy	250	-	
Contingency @10%	117	8	
<b>Total revenue costs</b>	<b>1,292</b>	<b>84</b>	
Data preparation strategy consultancy	150	-	150
Contingency @30%	45	-	45
<b>Total capital costs</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>195</b>
<b>Grand total</b>	<b>1,488</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>1,572</b>

Comments checked by:

Ian Dyson, Assistant Director of Finance (ian.dyson@oxfordshire.gov.uk)

## Legal Implications

28. At this stage there are no legal implications arising from this report other than to note that under the IBC Partnership Agreement, if a partner wishes to exit from the arrangements, not less than 13 months' notice is required to be given, which notice must expire on the 31 March in the following financial year. Where a partner withdraws, it is required to meet all reasonable costs incurred as a result of withdrawal from the Partnership / Joint Working Agreement, including redundancy costs of any staff from the joint working areas who are made redundant as a consequence of the partner's withdrawal. An estimate for potential exit costs has been included in Annex 1.

Comments checked by:

Bede Murtagh – Contracts Solicitor

## Staff Implications

29. A programme team will be required to deliver the requirements stage and this will have the implications as set out below. Costs for new resources or backfill have been included within the programme costs.
- Additional finance, procurement and HR service resources to develop detailed requirements. This will comprise new roles requiring recruitment and backfill for an existing members of staff who will be heavily involved with the programme.
  - The requirements stage will require resources for programme management, procurement preparation, IT project management, technical architecture and other technical specialists.

## Equality and Inclusion Implications

30. The Council will be mindful of its equalities duties under the Equality Act 2010 when developing requirements for a potential procurement with due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination in age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, sex, sexual orientation and religion or belief.
31. The requirements specification developed for the potential procurement and the contract document will stipulate that any supplier will comply with the relevant Equality and Diversity legislation. It is expected that any preferred supplier will be fully committed to equality and diversity in their service provision and will ensure compliance with all anti-discrimination legislation.
32. The Equalities Impact Assessment has identified the following potential impacts for people with protected characteristics:
- All groups with protected characteristics - Greater control for the Council in what data is recorded and how the information is monitored and analysed. This will help inform strategies and decision making for groups with protected characteristics.
  - Staff with disabilities (e.g. visual impairment) - The procurement specification will include specific requirements to ensure that any potential new system complies with the council's standards for accessibility, as stipulated by the Public Sector Bodies W3C Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.1 to level AA standard. The specification will also include requirements to ensure interoperability with existing software for staff with disabilities.

## Sustainability Implications

33. Procurement preparations completed during the requirements stage will follow good practice and prioritise low carbon options and investments which support climate action / are consistent with the path to Net Zero. The Invitation to Tender will include a link to the Social Value Portal and reference the National TOM

framework to ascertain suppliers' environmental credentials and commitments. An agreed weighting will be applied to bidders' social value and environmental responses. All of this remains subject to any Cabinet decision to proceed.

## **Risk Management**

34. A full risk register has been established relating to the programme. Ongoing programme management will ensure that identified risks are owned and managed effectively by the Programme Board and other senior stakeholders as appropriate to ensure continued focus on their status and effective mitigation.

## **Consultations**

35. The development of this report involved engagement with the following groups:

- Representative group of senior line managers – One-to-one interviews were conducted to understand the current issues and drivers for change as input to the Case for Change analysis. This analysis was shared with the Senior Leadership Team for feedback and approval in Q4 2021/22.
- Programme Board, which comprises senior officers from Finance, HR, Procurement, IT and Education – Consultation as part of the development of the options appraisal and for the review and approval of the outline business case.
- Technology vendors and system integrator partners – Suppliers were engaged to provide information and demonstrate their solutions to inform the options appraisal and outline business case.
- IT, Innovation and Digital Capital Programme Board and Strategic Capital Programme Board – Engagement as part of the outline business case governance approval process.
- Senior Leadership Team – Engagement to review and approve the outline business case in advance of its consideration by Cabinet.

Claire Taylor  
Corporate Director Customers, Organisational Development and Resources

Annex:                                   Annex 1 – Outline Financial Case  
Annex 2 – ERP Programme Options Appraisal

Background papers:

Contact Officer:                     Tim Spiers, Director of IT, Innovation, Digital and  
Transformation, 01865 816825,  
tim.spiers@oxfordshire.gov.uk

April 2023

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



Divisions: N/A

## CABINET – 18 APRIL 2023

### DELEGATED POWERS – QUARTERLY REPORT

Report by the Director of Law & Governance

#### RECOMMENDATION

1. Cabinet is **RECOMMENDED** to note the executive decisions taken under delegated powers, set out in paragraph 4.

#### Executive Summary

2. Under the Scheme of Delegation in the Council's Constitution (Part 7.1, paragraph 6.3 (c)(i)), the Chief Executive is authorised to undertake an executive function on behalf of the Cabinet. Cabinet receives a quarterly report on the use of this delegated power in relation to such executive decisions; that is, decisions that might otherwise have been taken by Cabinet.
3. This report refers to executive decisions taken during the period January to March 2023 inclusive.

#### Executive decisions – January to March 2023

4. The following executive decisions were taken during this period:

Date	Subject	Decision	Reason
23 Jan 2023	Children's Advocacy and Independent Visitor Services	To make a direct contract award to the National Youth Advocacy Service for Children's Advocacy & Independent Visitor Services from 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2023 to 31 March 2024	A waiver was sought to support the awarding of a direct award for 12 months to the existing provider from 1 April 2023 to 31 March 2024 in relation to the Children's Advocacy and Independent Visitor Services. This will enable commissioners more time to understand the implications of the LPS legislation. Once enacted and fully scoped out, Commissioners can then explore the option of jointly commissioning the Children's Advocacy Contract with Adult's to explore commissioning advocacy contracts across other Local Authority areas.

5. There are no legal implications arising from this report. It is a requirement of the Council's Constitution (Part 7.1, paragraph 6.3(c)(i) that Cabinet receive a quarterly report on the use by the Chief Executive of executive functions. Each of the decisions reported were undertaken in the context of a legal appraisal.

### **Financial Implications**

6. There are no financial implications arising from the recommendations in this report. It is a procedural item reporting on decisions previously taken. Each of the decisions reported were undertaken in consultation with the Director of Finance.

#### **ANITA BRADLEY**

Director of Law & Governance

Background Papers: Nil

Contact Officers: Colm Ó Caomhánaigh, Committee Officer: 07393 001096

April 2023

Division(s): N/A

## CABINET – 18 April 2023

### FORWARD PLAN AND FUTURE BUSINESS

Items identified from the Forward Plan for Forthcoming Decision

#### **CABINET MEETINGS**

**23 MAY 2023**

#### **KEY DECISIONS**

<b>Topic/Decision</b>	<b>Portfolio/Ref</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>A40 Access to Witney - Compulsory Purchase Order and Side Road Orders</b> To seek approval of the Statement of Reasons and Orders Plans and approval to make the Compulsory Purchase and Side Road Orders.</li> </ul>	Cabinet, 2022/012 - Cabinet Member for Travel & Development Strategy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Capital Programme Approvals - May 2023</b> Report on variation to the capital programme for approval (as required).</li> </ul>	Cabinet, 2023/005 - Cabinet Member for Finance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>HIF2 A40 Programme Revised Strategy</b> Approve revised scheme for A40 Programme.</li> </ul>	Cabinet, 2023/001 - Cabinet Member for Travel & Development Strategy

#### **NON-KEY DECISIONS**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Appointments 2023/24</b> To consider Member appointments to a variety of bodies which in different ways support the discharge of the Council's Executive functions.</li> </ul>	Cabinet, 2022/221 - Leader
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Financial Management Report 2023/24</b> To note and seek agreement of the report and any recommendations.</li> </ul>	Cabinet, 2023/050 - Cabinet Member for Finance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Oxfordshire County Council Air Quality Strategy</b> To seek approval of the OCC Air Quality Strategy.</li> </ul>	Cabinet, 2023/051 - Cabinet Member for Travel & Development Strategy, Cabinet Member for

	Climate Change Delivery & Environment, Cabinet Member for Highway Management
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Oxfordshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy</b> To approve Oxfordshire County Council's acceptance of its appointment as Responsible Authority for the Oxfordshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy, subject to the associated funding being considered by officers as sufficient and the Regulations and Guidance implementable and approve the Governance Structure for the Oxfordshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy.</li> </ul>	Cabinet, 2023/049 - Cabinet Member for Climate Change Delivery & Environment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Proposal From OUFC to OCC As Landowner: Arrangements for engagement</b> Paper setting out final arrangements for engagement.</li> </ul>	Cabinet, 2023/081 - Cabinet Member for Finance

## ***CABINET MEMBER MEETINGS***

### ***CABINET MEMBER: HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT - CLLR ANDREW GANT***

***25 MAY 2023***

#### ***NON-KEY DECISIONS***

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Adderbury - Proposed 20 mph Speed Limit and associated speed limit buffers</b> To determine what speed limit changes should be made following consideration of public consultation responses.</li> </ul>	Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Highway Management, 2023/060
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Binfield Heath - Proposed 20 mph Speed Limits and associated speed limit buffers</b> To determine what speed limit changes should be made following consideration of public consultation responses.</li> </ul>	Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Highway Management, 2023/069
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Bodicote - Proposed 20 mph Speed Limit and associated speed limit buffers</b> To determine what speed limit changes should be made following consideration of public consultation responses.</li> </ul>	Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Highway Management, 2023/061

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Chinnor (Henton): 20 mph Speed Limit Proposals</b> To consider any objections arising from Formal Consultation.</li> </ul>	Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Highway Management, 2023/047
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Cumnor: Cumnor Hill - proposed Puffin crossing</b> To consider any objections arising from the formal Statutory consultation.</li> </ul>	Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Highway Management, 2023/053
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Deddington - Proposed 20 mph Speed Limits and associated speed limit buffers</b> To determine what speed limit changes should be made following consideration of public consultation responses.</li> </ul>	Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Highway Management, 2023/062
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>East Hanney - School Road - proposed waiting restrictions</b> To decide on proposed waiting restrictions.</li> </ul>	Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Highway Management, 2023/042
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Hanborough: Regent Drive - proposed new 'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions amendment</b> To consider any objections arising from the formal Statutory consultation.</li> </ul>	Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Highway Management, 2023/059
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Ipsden - Proposed 20 mph Speed Limits and associated speed limit buffers</b> To determine what speed limit changes should be made following consideration of public consultation responses.</li> </ul>	Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Highway Management, 2023/065
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Kidmore End - Proposed 20 Mph Speed Limits and associated speed limit buffers</b> To determine what speed limit changes should be made following consideration of public consultation responses.</li> </ul>	Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Highway Management, 2023/066
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Kingham: Church Street - proposed 'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions</b> To consider any objections arising from the formal Statutory consultation.</li> </ul>	Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Highway Management, 2023/052

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Marcham: Howard Cornish Road - proposed Bus stop clearway</b> To consider any objections arising from the formal Statutory consultation.</li> </ul>	Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Highway Management, 2023/057
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Milcombe - Proposed 20 mph Speed Limits and associated speed limit buffers</b> To determine what speed limit changes should be made following consideration of public consultation responses.</li> </ul>	Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Highway Management, 2023/068
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Milton (Banbury) - Proposed 20 mph Speed Limits and associated speed limit buffers</b> To determine what speed limit changes should be made following consideration of public consultation responses.</li> </ul>	Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Highway Management, 2023/063
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Oxford: Barns Road &amp; other locations - proposed parking permit eligibility amendments</b> To consider any objections arising from the formal Statutory consultation.</li> </ul>	Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Highway Management, 2023/054
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Oxford: North Street, Osney - proposed parking bay &amp; permit eligibility amendments</b> To consider any objections arising from the formal Statutory consultation.</li> </ul>	Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Highway Management, 2023/055
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Oxfordshire: All Controlled Parking Zones - proposed amendment to Carers permit eligibility (OCC social workers)</b> To consider any objections arising from the formal Statutory consultation.</li> </ul>	Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Highway Management, 2023/056
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>St Helen Without - Proposed 20 mph Speed Limits and associated speed limit buffers</b> To determine what speed limit changes should be made following consideration of public consultation responses.</li> </ul>	Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Highway Management, 2023/064
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>South Stoke - Proposed 20 mph Speed Limits and associated speed limit buffers</b> To determine what speed limit changes should be made following consideration of public consultation responses.</li> </ul>	Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Highway Management, 2023/067

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Stanton St John: Proposed 20 mph Speed Limits and associated speed limit buffers</b> Decision required on proposed 20mph speed limit.</li> </ul>	Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Highway Management, 2022/197
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Wallingford: Land North of King Henry Avenue - proposed 20mph speed limit &amp; Bus stop clearway</b> To consider any objections arising from the formal Statutory consultation.</li> </ul>	Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Highway Management, 2023/058
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Wantage: Proposed 20 mph Speed Limits and associated speed limit buffers</b> To consider responses to speed limit consultation.</li> </ul>	Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Highway Management, 2023/025
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Witney Corn Street - proposed permanent 'No Waiting at Any Time' restriction</b> To consider any objections arising from the formal Statutory consultation to the existing experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO).</li> </ul>	Delegated Decisions by Cabinet Member for Highway Management, 2023/113

This page is intentionally left blank