

These notes indicate the decisions taken at this meeting and the officers responsible for taking the agreed action. For background documentation please refer to the agenda and supporting papers available on the Council's web site (www.oxfordshire.gov.uk.)

The decisions take effect at the time and date specified, unless before that time written notice is given in accordance with the Council's Scrutiny Procedure Rules requiring the decision to be called in for review by the relevant Scrutiny Committee.

If you have a query please contact Colm Ó Caomhánaigh (Tel: 07393 001096; E-Mail: colm.ocaomhanaigh@oxfordshire.gov.uk)

CABINET - TUESDAY, 26 APRIL 2022

<i>List published 27 April 2022 Decisions will (unless called in) become effective at 5.00pm on 5 May 2022</i>		
<i>RECOMMENDATIONS CONSIDERED</i>	<i>DECISIONS</i>	<i>ACTION</i>
1. Apologies for Absence	Apologies were received from Councillor Glynis Phillips. Councillors Neil Fawcett and Calum Miller attended remotely.	DLG (A Newman)
2. Declarations of Interest - guidance note opposite	None	
3. Minutes To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 15 March 2022 (CA3) and to receive information arising from them.	The minutes of the meeting held on 15 March 2022 were approved and signed.	DLG (C Ó Caomhánaigh)
4. Questions from County Councillors	See attached Annex.	
5. Petitions and Public Address	<u>Item 7: A40 HIF2 Smart Corridor</u> Graham Smith Ian Leggett Councillor Dan Levy	
6. Tree Policy for Oxfordshire <i>Cabinet Member:</i> Climate Change Delivery & Environment <i>Forward Plan Ref:</i> 2022/014 <i>Contact:</i> Paul Fermer, Assistant Director Operations Tel: 07825 273984 / Andy Lederer, Principal Officer – Arboriculture Tel: 07860 453603		

...Decisions...Decisions...

CABINET - TUESDAY, 26 APRIL 2022

<i>List published 27 April 2022</i> <i>Decisions will (unless called in) become effective at 5.00pm on 5 May 2022</i>		
<i>RECOMMENDATIONS CONSIDERED</i>	<i>DECISIONS</i>	<i>ACTION</i>
<p>Report by Corporate Director Environment & Place (CA6).</p> <p>The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to:</p> <p>a) Approve the updated Tree Policy as at ANNEX 1;</p> <p>b) Approve the inclusion of related matters into the Street Design Guidance;</p> <p>c) Support the additional information provided as ‘Application of Tree Policy Guidance’ as set out at ANNEX 2.</p>	Recommendations approved.	CDEP (P Fermer / A Lederer)
<p>7. A40 HIF2 Smart Corridor - Compulsory Purchase and Side Road Orders</p> <p><i>Cabinet Member:</i> Travel & Development Strategy <i>Forward Plan Ref:</i> 2022/044 <i>Contact:</i> Arjen Bouwmeester, Programme Lead (A40), arjen.bouwmeester@oxfordshire.gov.uk</p> <p>The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to:</p> <p>a) Confirm that the acquisition of the land identified on the map attached to this report (Annex B) (“the Order Map”) being the map accompanying The Oxfordshire County Council (Highways Infrastructure - A40 HIF2 Smart Corridor (Hill Farm to Dukes Cut)) Compulsory Purchase Order 2022 (“the CPO”) is necessary for highway purposes;</p> <p>b) Approve the Joint Statement of Reasons (Annex A) for the CPO</p>	Recommendations approved.	CDEP (A Bouwmeester)

...Decisions...Decisions...

CABINET - TUESDAY, 26 APRIL 2022

List published 27 April 2022

Decisions will (unless called in) become effective at 5.00pm on 5 May 2022

RECOMMENDATIONS CONSIDERED	DECISIONS	ACTION
<p>and The Oxfordshire County Council (Highways Infrastructure – A40 HIF2 Smart Corridor (Hill Farm to Dukes Cut)) (Side Roads) Order 2022 (“the SRO”), together with approving the CPO, the Order Map, the SRO and the plans accompanying the SRO (“SRO Plans”) all substantially in the form annexed to this report but to delegate to the Corporate Director Environment & Place following consultation with the Director of Law & Governance, authority to modify them as necessary;</p> <p>c) Authorise the Director of Law & Governance to make The Oxfordshire County Council (Highways Infrastructure – A40 HIF2 Smart Corridor (Hill Farm to Dukes Cut)) (Side Roads) Order 2022 (“the SRO”) to enable the stopping-up, diversion, alteration, improvement and creation of new lengths of highway or reclassification of existing highways, and giving authority to the acquisition of necessary land pursuant to the CPO and that the Common Seal of the Council be affixed to the SRO and to the SRO Plans. The SRO also enables the stopping up of private means of access as necessary where the scheme design necessitates and re-provision of private means of access;</p> <p>d) Authorise the Director of Law & Governance to make The Oxfordshire County Council (Highways Infrastructure - A40 HIF2 Smart Corridor (Hill Farm to</p>		

...Decisions...Decisions...

CABINET - TUESDAY, 26 APRIL 2022

List published 27 April 2022

Decisions will (unless called in) become effective at 5.00pm on 5 May 2022

RECOMMENDATIONS CONSIDERED	DECISIONS	ACTION
<p>Dukes Cut)) Compulsory Purchase Order 2022 pursuant to Sections 239, 240, 246, 250 and 260 of the Highways Act 1980 (as amended) and Part II and III to Schedule 2, and Schedule 3 to the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 for the purpose of acquiring the land and interests shown on the Order Map and described in the Schedules to the CPO (or such lesser area of land should this in his opinion be appropriate) to facilitate the construction of new highway on such land and that the Common Seal of the Council be affixed to the CPO and to the Order Map;</p> <p>e) Authorise the Director of Law & Governance to advertise the making of the CPO and the SRO and to submit the CPO and SRO to the Secretary of State for Transport for confirmation, together with authorising the Director of Law & Governance to take all other relevant action thereon to promote the confirmation of the CPO and the SRO;</p> <p>f) In the event that any Public Inquiry is convened to consider objections to the CPO and/or SRO and/or planning application (by way of a call-in decision), to authorise the Director of Law & Governance, in consultation with the Corporate Director Environment & Place to prepare and submit such evidence as is necessary in support of the CPO and/or SRO and/or planning application, including enlisting the assistance of outside</p>		

...Decisions...Decisions...

CABINET - TUESDAY, 26 APRIL 2022

List published 27 April 2022

Decisions will (unless called in) become effective at 5.00pm on 5 May 2022

<i>RECOMMENDATIONS CONSIDERED</i>	<i>DECISIONS</i>	<i>ACTION</i>
<p>consultants, legal advisors and Counsel to assist in the preparation and presentation of such evidence;</p> <p>g) As soon as the CPO and the SRO have been confirmed and become operative, to authorise the Director of Law & Governance to comply with all associated requirements in respect of personal, site and press notices of confirmation and to make, seal and give notice of a General Vesting Declaration (or declarations where more than one is required) under the Compulsory Purchase (Vesting Declarations) Act 1981 and/or to serve Notices to Treat and Notice of Entry in respect of those properties to be acquired compulsorily;</p> <p>h) Authorise the Corporate Director Environment & Place in consultation with the Director of Law & Governance to negotiate terms with interested parties for the purchase by agreement or payment of compensation in accordance with the Compensation Code in respect of any interests or rights in or over any land included in the CPO and, where appropriate, to agree terms for relocation;</p> <p>i) Authorise the Director of Property in consultation with the Director of Law & Governance to complete the acquisition of such interests or rights and their transfer to the Council;</p> <p>j) In the event that compensation</p>		

...Decisions...Decisions...

CABINET - TUESDAY, 26 APRIL 2022

<p><i>List published 27 April 2022</i></p> <p><i>Decisions will (unless called in) become effective at 5.00pm on 5 May 2022</i></p>		
<i>RECOMMENDATIONS CONSIDERED</i>	<i>DECISIONS</i>	<i>ACTION</i>
<p>for the acquisition of land and/or rights cannot be agreed between the relevant parties, to authorise the Director of Law & Governance to make a reference to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) for determination of such compensation together with such other questions as may be necessary to determine, including the engagement of appropriate external legal advisors and surveyors and other experts, as required;</p> <p>k) In the event that any question of compensation in relation to the acquisition of land and/or rights is made by way of a reference to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) (whether by the claimant or the Council) to authorise the Director of Law & Governance to take all necessary steps in relation thereto, including advising on the appropriate uses and compensation payable and issuing the appropriate certificates.</p>		
<p>8. Highway Works Bond for Development with Public Bodies</p> <p><i>Cabinet Member:</i> Travel and Development Strategy <i>Forward Plan Ref:</i> 2021/233 <i>Contact:</i> Julian Richardson, Senior Engineer (Road Agreements Team C&W) Tel: 07825 052736</p> <p>The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to delegate powers to negotiate and put in place alternative solutions to a conventional Section 278 Agreement</p>	<p>Recommendations approved.</p>	<p>CDEP (J Richardson)</p>

...Decisions...Decisions...

CABINET - TUESDAY, 26 APRIL 2022

<i>List published 27 April 2022</i> <i>Decisions will (unless called in) become effective at 5.00pm on 5 May 2022</i>		
<i>RECOMMENDATIONS CONSIDERED</i>	<i>DECISIONS</i>	<i>ACTION</i>
Bond with Public Bodies to the Corporate Director for Environment and Place in consultation with the Director of Finance.		
<p>9. Delegated Powers - April 2022</p> <p><i>Cabinet Member: Leader</i> <i>Forward Plan Ref: 2021/201</i> <i>Contact: Colm Ó Caomhánaigh,</i> <i>Committee Officer Tel: 07393 001096</i></p> <p>There were no delegated decisions taken during the period January to March 2022.</p>	Noted	
<p>10. Forward Plan and Future Business</p> <p><i>Cabinet Member: All</i> <i>Contact Officer: Colm Ó Caomhánaigh,</i> <i>Committee Officer Tel: 07393 001096</i></p> <p><i>The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to note the items currently identified for forthcoming meetings.</i></p>	Noted	DLG (C Ó Caomhánaigh)

ITEM 4 – QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS

Questions	Cabinet Member
<p>1. COUNCILLOR FREDDIE VAN MIERLO</p> <p>In reply to a question at the last Cabinet meeting you told me that "There will be no East West corridor. This scheme [HIF1] will form no part of a through route for strategic travel. This is a route for local use not a through route as you so rightly say and we have the powers and the flexibility to be able to make that the case and to make that irrevocably the case."</p> <p>We know that National Highways are working on a solution to reduce the traffic on the A34 and we know that one of their previous plans to do this was to build an East West corridor between the A34 and the M40 south of Abingdon. If they should propose this again, could you outline what powers we have to make sure this is irrevocably not the case?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR DUNCAN ENRIGHT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRAVEL & DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</p> <p>National Highway are currently progressing a study called 'A34 improvements north and south of Oxford.' This study is looking at options to principally address congestion and safety issues on the A34 between the M4 and M40 junctions. National Highways have not shared any information on options with OCC, but say that they may undertake a non-statutory consultation on these this summer, subject to central government sign-off. The County Council would need to consider any proposals carefully before responding to this consultation, in particular taking into account our emerging Local Transport and Connectivity Plan, but also any more specific plans we have for transport measures across Oxfordshire, for example the current Oxford proposals.</p> <p>In terms of next steps following any non-statutory consultation, National Highways would then need to produce an outline and then full business case to secure funding, alongside undertaking any required formal planning submissions. This is likely to be in the form of a Development Consent Order (DCO) process, which would include an examination in public. The DCO process would be overseen by the Planning Inspectorate, with recommendations on whether to progress with granting of permission given to the Secretary of State for a final decision. The County Council as the Highway Authority would be a statutory consultee in this process.</p>

Questions	Cabinet Member
	<p>Further information on the A34 study is at the following link: A34 improvements north and south of Oxford - Highways England (nationalhighways.co.uk)</p> <p>Further information on the Development Consent Order planning process is at the following link: The process National Infrastructure Planning (planninginspectorate.gov.uk)</p>
<p>2. COUNCILLOR FREDDIE VAN MIERLO</p> <p>The paper published for Cabinet March 15th 2022, Didcot Garden Town Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF1), stated without HIF1 a lack of infrastructure may impact strategic development sites, including Chalgrove Airfield. Notwithstanding that SODC's Local Plan explicitly states that it is not reliant on the site within the first 5 years, and no building is anticipated until 2025/6 at the very earliest, the airfield development has never been named in HIF1 applications. Will the Cabinet member correct the record that Chalgrove Airfield is not a reason to deliver the HIF1 project? Can you also report back as to why this development was referred to in the paper?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR DUNCAN ENRIGHT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRAVEL & DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</p> <p>As stated in the Cabinet meeting of the 15th March, the reference to HIF Dicot scheme directly in relation to Chalgrove was an error. Chalgrove site is not linked to the HIF infrastructure or the business case for the funding. However, it is acknowledged that the HIF scheme will support the wider transport networks across South and Vale.</p>
<p>3. COUNCILLOR DAVID BARTHOLOMEW</p> <p>I am advised that the council is to spend £5000 per annum on a councillor aid system called 'Caseworker'. That amounts to £15,000 between now and the end of your administration in 2025. The Conservative Group has</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR GLYNIS PHILLIPS, CABINET MEMBER FOR CORPORATE SERVICES</p> <p>Caseworker.gov is a casework management tool that allows for easy monitoring and responding to residents' queries and comments with improved workflow for elected members, particularly for the management of workloads and assistance</p>

Questions	Cabinet Member
<p>already declared it has no use for this system, and only 12 councillors across all parties have indicated interest. Why are you unnecessarily spending so much council-taxpayer money on this indulgence wanted by less than 20% of councillors?</p> <p>Supplementary Thank you for your response and invitation to contact IT, which I will respectfully decline as I have no use for the system nor has the majority of councillors.</p> <p>You've explained that the system is easy to expand but that doesn't answer the question: Why is the administration spending £15,000 on a councillor-aid system not wanted by over 80% of councillors?</p>	<p>with engagement with residents. Whilst 12 councillors have expressed an interest in being involved so far this can be easily expanded if others would like to use the system, at a cost of under £200 per additional user. We are committed to providing modern and effective ICT tools and equipment to support all Members in their roles and answering residents' queries and comments is an essential element of the councillor role. Please get in touch directly with the ICT team if you would like to use the tool.</p> <p>Response The offer of a software package is in response to the increasing number of questions and queries that members are receiving from residents. The aim is to increase the efficiency of members by providing a tool which improves contacts with residents. Some members are content with the systems that they have put in place but modernising the way we work is vital to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Council. The offer is still open to all members.</p>
<p>4. COUNCILLOR JOHN HOWSON</p> <p>In their recent White Paper on Education the government reiterated the statement from their previous White Paper that they would review the working of the 'in-year' admissions process. As the County is both corporate parent for children in care and also responsible for part of the in-year admissions process, can the Cabinet Member please identify:</p> <p>A] how many children taken into care since the May 2021 County elections, and requiring a change of school, have</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LIZ BRIGHOUSE, DEPUTY LEADER and CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, EDUCATION & YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES</p> <p>In response to part A)</p> <p>58 children of Reception to Year 11 age who required a change of school have been taken into care since the May 2021 County elections.</p> <p>Of these 4 waited more than 21 days for a new school place. Of the 4 , 1 child waited 21 days or over for a change of school in Oxfordshire and 3 waited 21 days or over for an out of county school placement.</p> <p>Therefore 6.8% of the 58 had to wait over 21 days for a</p>

Questions	Cabinet Member
<p>had to wait more than 21 days for a new school place? Of these children, how many were placed in-county and how many out-county?</p> <p>B] how many children with SEND seeking an in-year place since the May 2021 elections had to wait more than 21 days for a place, and whether any parents had to resort to a Tribunal to achieve a school place?</p>	<p>school place.</p> <p>In response to part B)</p> <p>Unfortunately, the SEND Team do not currently store the data requested in a format that allows an easy response to this question, this is not part of the captures that take place and so we are currently unable to let the councillor know how many children with an EHCP are placed in year in more than 21 days. This is because the SEND Team have different admissions processes and timeframes. It should also be noted that the education directorate is moving across to a single Business System called Liquid Logic, which will see all teams within the directorate using the same IT system from August 2022 onwards. From that point, complex data collection and analysis should be significantly enhanced from the current situation which is reliant upon spreadsheets and manual processing.</p>
<p>5. COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT</p> <p><i>Active Travel provision on Woodstock and Banbury Roads</i></p> <p>There has been public discussion recently about infrastructure schemes in the Growth Deal, in particular the Woodstock and Banbury Roads Corridor projects, both of absolutely fundamental importance to the safety and amenity of residents of my division and others.</p> <p>Will the Cabinet member confirm that these projects have not been “scrapped”, but will be kept under active</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR DUNCAN ENRIGHT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRAVEL & DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</p> <p>The Woodstock and Banbury Road projects are currently on the list of growth deal schemes with a limited amount of funding. The Growth Deal schemes list undergoes regular review to ensure Oxfordshire is delivering the best possible outcomes in line with the Growth Deal objectives. Any changes to schemes in the capital programme will be made through the proper decision-making process.</p> <p>As pointed out, this administration is committed to improvements in active travel, and these two key corridors</p>

Questions	Cabinet Member
<p>consideration as part of any review of the Hfl list?</p> <p>Will he confirm that this process sits with elected members, and will be conducted in a fully open and democratically accountable way, with full opportunity for members to contribute on behalf of their residents?</p> <p>Whatever the outcome of this process, will he commit the Council to delivering substantive improvements to Active Travel on these key routes, in line with the publicly-stated principles of the Oxfordshire Fair Deal Alliance and the very welcome unequivocal commitment to Vision Zero, in the shortest possible time-frame?</p> <p>If these schemes are considered for movement within the Growth Deal in response to external pressures and wider policy considerations, what assurances can he give on where the funding for improving these roads will come from, and on what timescales?</p> <p>Notwithstanding any wider discussions, would he consider asking our excellent Active Travel and other officer teams to look at some of the more obvious anomalies in the current provision, such as bike lanes not reaching access points for schools, with a view to short-term mitigation?</p> <p>Finally, as a representative of a Witney division, could the Cabinet member share his own impressions of entering Oxford via these routes? Does cycling round the Wolvercote roundabout and down the Woodstock Road live up to the confident billing passed <i>en route</i> that Oxford is “A Cycling City”?</p>	<p>into the city are no exception. The council will take every opportunity to secure funding to deliver its priorities, but I cannot guarantee when such funding may become available. We are committed to improving transport links in and out of the city, including active travel, and the ongoing work with the Central Oxfordshire Transport Strategy will help define this ambition.</p> <p>Entering Oxford from the A40 in the West on a bike is an interesting experience, particularly given the Oxford North gateway works. The objective of these, and of the A40 scheme as a whole, is to open up a safe and comfortable route for active travel from Oxford to the western towns and villages of Oxfordshire. The continued journey down Woodstock Road is relatively sheltered for cycles by the bus lane, but the quality of the surface is not great and junctions (particularly Wolvercote roundabout) are a block to easy travel - by any mode, but particularly on foot or by bike. We have a lot of work to do to make Oxford as good as the best places to cycle, but that is our objective.</p>

Questions	Cabinet Member
<p>Supplementary Will the Cabinet Member confirm that no decisions have been made about a review or changes to the list of growth deal schemes and, when he says that any decisions will be taken through the proper decision-making process, will he also confirm that Members will have a full opportunity to engage with that process and to input into it?</p>	<p>Response Written response provided after the meeting:</p> <p>All of the so-called "growth board" schemes are reviewed regularly both as a programme in their own right, and as part of the Council capital programme, and as accountable body for the growth deal infrastructure funding. This is particularly important at this time of high inflation, and as they progress through the project phases. None of these projects is removed from our programme, they are all required to deliver the infrastructure we need for new and existing homes and residents. It may be necessary to re-prioritise them as a result of delays for various reasons, or to bring them into line with area strategies, or because they are better funded another way. Where a scheme is removed from the list funded by the housing and growth deal, it still remains on the programme for delivery through other means. In some instances, this may mean they have to wait until a new funding source is identified. You can see all of the capital projects currently on the programme in the Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy: https://www.oxfordshireopenthought.org/oxfordshire-infrastructure-strategy-oxis.</p> <p>The governance structure when deciding on priorities is complex as it includes national as well as local partners. However the simple decision making map is provided as a guide below.</p>

Recommendation Development

Endorsement / Noting Only (No Decision Making)

Formal Decision Point

