

County Council

10 September 2024

Schedule of Business

County Hall, New Road, Oxford, OX1 1ND

www.oxfordshire.gov.uk Fax: 01865 783195 Media Enquiries 01865 815266

Agenda Annex

OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

MEETING OF COUNCIL – 10 SEPTEMBER 2024

SCHEDULE OF BUSINESS

ITEM/TIME	ITEM	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Secondar; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
1 10:30	Minutes To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 9 July 2024 (CC1) and to receive information arising from them.	
2	Apologies for Absence	
3	Declarations of Interest	
4 10:35 10 mins	Official Communications Congratulations to Oxfordshire students who have recently received their results for A levels, GCSEs and other specialist qualifications. Our thanks go to all the teachers, schools and settings who have made it possible for students to achieve their goals. This year we have also seen encouraging and improved outcomes in results for students with Special Educational Needs. Among young people for whom the Council is a Corporate Parent, we have had four university graduates, two with first class degrees and one graduate from the University of Oxford as well as nine new starters at universities this month. Our care experienced children have done better than ever at GSCE and A level. Congratulations to all of them.	

	<p>We have learned of the passing in August of former Councillor Teresa Smith. She was first elected as the Labour Member for the then Oxford South Division in 1985 with a majority of 5,460 votes, returned again in 1989, and stood down ahead of the 1993 elections. Our thoughts are with her family and friends.</p> <p><u>Save the dates:</u> Monday 16th December 2024 Carol Service with the Bishop of Dorchester, 6.30pm at St Michael's Church Abingdon</p> <p>Friday 10th January 2025 Chair's charity civic dinner, 7pm in Oxford.</p> <p><u>The following events were attended by the Chair of Council since the July Council meeting:</u></p> <p>10/07/2024 Europa School Leavers Ceremony - Culham 11/07/2024 Earth Trust Rose Planting - Long Wittenham 12/07/2024 British Empire Medal Presentation - Oxford 13/07/2024 Youth Concert St Edmunds School - Oxford 15/07/2024 OALC AGM at County Hall – Oxford 20/07/2024 Wantage Fire Station - Wantage 10/08/2024 Banbury Fire Station - Banbury 17/08/2024 Mayors Charity Lunch - Bicester 18/08/2024 Chair OCC Chairty afternoon tea at the Earth Trust - Long Wittenham 30/08/2024 Bullingdon Prison groundbreaking ceremony Bullingdon prison 6/09/2024 Vale of White Horse DC Chair's charity event - Faringdon 08/09/2024 Battle of Britain Mayor's civic service – Carterton</p>	
<p>5</p>	<p>Appointments</p> <p>Council is requested to approve the following change to the membership of the Audit & Governance Committee:</p>	

	<p>Councillor Hicks to replace Councillor Baines</p> <p>Council is asked to note changes to committee membership given effect by the Monitoring Officer on 21 August 2024 under the delegated authority set out in the Constitution under Part 7.2, section 6.4 (l) using the functions under Section 16(1) and Section 16(2) of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 to give effect to the wishes of the political groups as regards membership of scrutiny committees and committees of the Council:</p> <p>Pension Fund Committee - Councillor Stevens to fill the vacancy</p> <p>Audit & Governance Committee - Councillor Johnston replaced Councillor Hanna.</p>	
<p>6</p> <p>10:45</p> <p>25 mins</p>	<p>Petitions and Public Address</p> <p><i>Any person may address the Council on an item on the agenda subject to the provisions in CPR 10.2 of the Constitution</i></p> <p>Petitions – 3 minutes to speak</p> <p>Public Address – 3 minutes to speak on this occasion (reduced from 5 minutes at the discretion of the Chair – CPR 10.3)</p>	<p>Petitions</p> <p>Lesley McCourt: Remove the traffic restrictions in Crowell Road</p> <p>Pete Nellist: SEND Services</p> <p>Ella Buckingham: SEND Services</p> <p>Hannah Pearce: SEND Transport Services</p> <p>Public Address</p> <p>Item 14 Motion by Cllr Povolotsky: Claire Brenner</p> <p>Item 17 Motion by Cllr Sudbury: Dr Steve Smith</p> <p>Item 19 Motion by Cllr Povolotsky: Anna Gurl</p>

<p>7.</p> <p>11:10</p> <p>10 mins</p>	<p>Questions from Members of the Public</p> <p>See Annex 2 for questions and responses. One supplementary question allowed for each.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Oxford City Councillor Linda Smith 2. Peter West 3. Bernadette Evans 4. Ian Yeatman 5. Richard Parnham 6. Emily Scaysbrook 7. Angus Wilkinson 	<p>Cllr Sudbury Cllr Gant Cllr Gant Cllr Gant Cllr Gant Cllr Gant Cllr Gregory</p>
<p>8</p> <p>11:20</p> <p>20 mins</p>	<p>Questions with Notice from Members of the Council</p> <p>See Annex 3 for questions and responses. One supplementary question allowed for each.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hicks to Gant 2. Cherry to Sudbury 3. Povolotsky to Gant 4. Povolotsky to Leffman 5. Povolotsky to Gregory 6. Pressel to Gant 7. Pressel to Gant 8. Pressel to Fawcett 9. Coles to Sudbury 10. Bartholomew to Roberts 11. Phillips to Gant 12. Middleton to Leffman 13. Middleton to Fawcett 14. Baines to Gant 15. Baines to Gant 16. Baines to Roberts 17. Walker to Roberts 18. Walker to Roberts 19. Walker to Roberts 	
<p>9</p> <p>11:40</p> <p>20 mins</p>	<p>Report of the Cabinet (Pages 11-14)</p> <p>Leader (Cllr Liz Leffman) Pg 11: Item 1</p> <p>Finance (Cllr Dan Levy) Pg 11: Item 2 Item 3</p>	<p>Q Brighthouse</p> <p>Q Bartholomew Q Baines Q Enright Q Phillips</p>

	<p style="text-align: right;">Pg 12: Item 4</p> <p>Infrastructure & Development Strategy (Cllr Judy Roberts)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Pg 12: Item 5</p>	<p>Q Lygo Q Bartholomew</p> <p>Q Baines Q Cherry Q Enright Q Bartholomew</p> <p>Q Hicks</p>
<p>10</p> <p>12:00</p> <p>10 mins</p>	<p>Treasury Management Annual Performance 2023/24 (Pages 15-28)</p> <p>Movers 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</p> <p>Council is RECOMMENDED to note the Council's treasury management activity and outcomes in 2023/24.</p>	<p>M Levy SEC Leffman</p>
	<p>EXEMPT ITEM 11 WILL BE TAKEN IN PRIVATE SESSION</p>	
<p>11</p> <p>12:10</p> <p>30 mins</p>	<p>Proposed Leadership Restructuring - Tiers 3 and 4</p> <p>Movers 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</p>	<p>M Leffman SEC Sudbury S Brighthouse S Baines S Phillips</p>
<p>12:40</p> <p>30 mins</p>	<p>LUNCH</p>	
<p>11A</p> <p>13:10</p> <p>30 mins</p>	<p>URGENT MOTION by Councillor Sally Povolotsky</p> <p>Accepted by the Chair of the Council under CPR 2.2. (xiii):</p> <p><i>"I have decided to accept a proposed urgent motion for the Council meeting tomorrow Tuesday 10 September 2024.</i></p> <p><i>Under Council Procedure Rule 2.2. (xiii) Council will "consider any business which, by reason of special circumstances which shall be specified in the minutes, the Chair agrees should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency."</i></p>	<p>M Povolotsky SEC Gawrysiak</p>

The motion proposes to respond to a decision by the Secretary of State on 4 September 2024 to approve the Thames Water Resources Management Plan. This was announced after the agenda for this Council meeting had been published. A period of 60 days has been given for feedback which will expire before the next Council meeting on 5 November 2024.

At the Council meeting on 9 July 2024, Council passed a motion of no confidence in Thames Water and reiterated its opposition to the planned design for SESRO (South East Strategic Reservoir Option) with 29 votes in favour; none against and 13 abstentions. Council Motions in November 2021 and December 2023 opposing the SESRO plans were passed unanimously.

I believe that these reasons amount to special circumstances that justify taking this motion as a matter of urgency. I propose to take the item before Item 12 - the first Motion with Notice.”

This Council notes that on Wednesday 4th September the Secretary of State approved the Thames Water Resources Management Plan (TWRMP) despite community and council opposition, technical data concerns and damning comments from the Environment Agency.

This Council has passed many motions of concern including a vote of no confidence in Thames Water and we continue to express our concerns that the TWRMP is not fit for purpose and its schemes need independent scrutiny and review, including Waste Management, leaks and the South East Strategic Reservoir Option (SESRO) proposal.

This Council notes that Thames Water has 60 days to take into account feedback and we ask the Leader of the Council and the relevant Cabinet Member to urgently ensure that this Council’s voice and that of our

	<p>residents are heard and that our recommendations have been taken into account.</p> <p>We reiterate our objection to the plan on the table and continue to call for a public inquiry into the plan, and ask the Leader to request an urgent audience with the Secretary of State to ensure Oxfordshire's voice is heard.</p>	
<p>12</p> <p>13:40</p> <p>30 mins</p>	<p>Motion by Councillor Kate Gregory</p> <p>Movers 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</p> <p>The Two Child limit to benefit payments was introduced by the Conservative Government in 2017 and is supported by the current Labour Government. It prevents families from claiming Child Tax Credit or Universal Credit for more than 2 children in the household.</p> <p>Council notes the recent research conducted by the End Child Poverty Coalition which has found that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.5 million children in the UK live in households subject to the two-child limit on benefit payments. That is roughly one-in-ten children in the UK. • In 2023/24 the two-child limit cost families up to £3,235 per child each year. • Scrapping the two-child limit would lift 250,000 children out of poverty overnight, and significantly reduce the level of poverty that a further 850,000 children live in. • Scrapping the two-child limit would cost £1.3 billion, however it is estimated that child poverty costs the economy £39 billion each year. <p>In Oxfordshire 10,850 children in 3050 households are currently affected by the two-child limit to benefit payments.</p> <p>Council believes that the two-child limit is a cruel policy that should be scrapped Council resolves to:</p>	<p>M Gregory SEC Johnston</p> <p>Am Baines SEC Hicks S Pressel S Brighthouse</p> <p>S Smith S Middleton S Graham S Corkin</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask the Leader of the Council to write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Prime Minister expressing Oxfordshire County Council's strong belief that the two child limit to benefit payments should be scrapped. • Ask the Leader to write to all MPs covering the Oxfordshire area, asking them to commit their public support. 	
<p>13</p> <p>14:10</p> <p>30 mins</p>	<p>Motion by Councillor Sally Povolotsky</p> <p>Movers 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</p> <p>In September 2023, Ofsted and the Care Quality Commission declared their judgment post inspection that the Local Area Partnership (LAP) had multiple systemic failures.</p> <p>Despite the Priority Action Plan (PAP), the Council is failing to meaningfully engage with and capture the voice of the user, our young people.</p> <p>Council calls on Cabinet to consider;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meaningfully involving young people and youth organisations throughout all policy-making processes within SEND improvement and the PAP. Co-management and co-creation structures are the best way to ensure direct participation. 2. Any consultations or engagement with young people by this council must have a visible public follow-up to the outcomes. 3. All Council policies and frameworks that affect young people, must include an impact assessment, and ensure there are mitigation measures in place for those youth groups that might be negatively impacted by a new policy or framework. 	<p>M Povolotsky SEC</p> <p>Am Reeves SEC Corkin</p> <p>S Gregory S Howson S Brighthouse</p>

	<p>4. Ensuring all future events, in person/online, run by or funded by OCC, especially those related to the PAP, LAP, and SEND improvement, are open to all young people with the attendance of their parent or carer.</p> <p>5. Launching a rapid task force for the voice of the young person and SEND users, and task them to create a framework for a Youth Forum within 3 months of this meeting date.</p> <p>6. The leader to appoint a SEND Champion to enable seldom heard voices in the SEND community to feed into SEND improvement and services, and that person to sit on the SEND Improvement board.</p> <p>Note: The motion, if passed, would constitute the exercise of an executive function in which case it will be referred to the Cabinet together with any advice the Council may wish to give, in accordance with Rule 13.5.1 (i) of the Council Procedure Rules in the Constitution.</p>	
<p>14</p> <p>14:40</p> <p>30 mins</p>	<p>Motion by Councillor Eddie Reeves</p> <p>Movers 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</p> <p>This Council deplores the government's decision to cut Winter Fuel Payments (WFPs). Age UK estimates that the government's changes to WFPs could hit 2 million people across the country, who badly need the money to stay warm this winter.</p> <p>This Council resolves to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request Cabinet to launch a countywide awareness campaign working with our City and District Councils, local NHS partners, and charitable, civic and religious groups, to encourage elderly residents who are eligible for means-tested benefits such as Pension Credit to register and claim them to ensure 	<p>M Reeves SEC Walker</p> <p>Am A Levy SEC Ley</p> <p>Am B Baines SEC O'Connor S Pressel S Brighthouse</p> <p>S Corkin S Field-Johnson</p>

	<p>that they continue to receive WFPs this Winter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request that the Leader of the Council writes to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, urging a review of the government’s precipitous decision to means-test WFPs without public consultation and asking HM Treasury to ensure that vulnerable pensioners, particularly those who are eligible for, but who do not – or cannot – claim, other benefits under current thresholds are protected from fuel poverty. • Request that the Cabinet reprioritises monies within the Council’s budget for 2024/5 held within the Budget Priority Reserve and/or within other relevant contingency funds, with a view to establishing an Oxfordshire Winter Fuel Payment Protection Fund, akin to the Oxfordshire Resident Support Scheme, to ensure that pensioners who are in genuine hardship, but who are not eligible for other government support, are helped through the Winter. <p>Note: The motion, if passed, would constitute the exercise of an executive function in which case it will be referred to the Cabinet together with any advice the Council may wish to give, in accordance with Rule 13.5.1 (i) of the Council Procedure Rules in the Constitution.</p>	
<p>15</p> <p>15:10</p> <p>25 mins</p>	<p>Motion by Councillor Mark Cherry</p> <p>Movers 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</p> <p>Council requests Cabinet to consider approving the Councils for Fair Tax declaration.</p> <p>This commits Councils to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead by example and demonstrate good practice in our tax conduct, right across our activities. • Ensure IR35 is implemented robustly and contract workers pay a fair share of employment taxes. • Not use offshore vehicles for the purchase of land and property, 	<p>M Cherry SEC Baines S Johnston S Middleton S Enright</p>

	<p>especially where this leads to reduced payments of stamp duty.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertake due diligence to ensure that not-for-profit structures are not being used inappropriately by suppliers as an artificial device to reduce the payment of tax and business rates. • Demand clarity on the ultimate beneficial ownership of suppliers, UK and overseas, and their consolidated profit & loss position, given lack of clarity could be strong indicators of poor financial probity and weak financial standing. • Promote Fair Tax Mark certification especially for any business in which we have a significant stake and where corporation tax is due. • Support Fair Tax Week events in the area, and celebrate the tax contribution made by responsible businesses that are proud to promote responsible tax conduct and pay their fair share of corporation tax. <p>Council also requests the Leader of the Council to write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer supporting calls for urgent reform of UK procurement law to enable local authorities to better penalise poor tax conduct and reward good tax conduct through their procurement policies.</p> <p>Note: The motion, if passed, would constitute the exercise of an executive function in which case it will be referred to the Cabinet together with any advice the Council may wish to give, in accordance with Rule 13.5.1 (i) of the Council Procedure Rules in the Constitution.</p>	
<p>16</p>	<p>Motion by Councillor Stefan Gawrysiak</p> <p>Movers 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</p> <p>In December Oxfordshire County Council removed 7 beds from the Chiltern care home. These beds were removed without any consultation with the GP's who run them,</p>	<p>M Gawrysiak SEC Povolotsky</p> <p>Am Reeves SEC</p> <p>S Leffman S Ley S O'Connor</p>

	<p>Henley Town Council and the community of South Oxfordshire and Henley. This lack of consultation by the Council is unacceptable.</p> <p>These beds were originally provided as NHS beds.</p> <p>Following FOI requests to the Integrated Care Board Buckinghamshire Oxfordshire Berkshire West (ICB BOB) and the Council we have firmly established that these beds are NHS Beds funded by ICB, the Council and Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust and cannot be closed without consultation.</p> <p>Dr Broughton interim Chief Executive of the ICB BOB states 28th February 2024 “The beds have not ‘lost NHS funding’, “The beds continued to be overseen by the Oxford University Hospital Hub team.”</p> <p>These beds are NHS beds which cannot be removed without consultation.</p> <p>This Council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deplores the removal without consultation. 2. Believes these beds which serve a population of 140,000 of South Oxfordshire should be reinstated. <p>This Council requests that Cabinet:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Asks partners to seek to reinstate the 7 Chiltern Court Beds serving South Oxfordshire. 4. Conduct a consultation if they still wish to remove the beds. <p>Note: The motion, if passed, would constitute the exercise of an executive function in which case it will be referred to the Cabinet together with any advice the Council may wish to give, in accordance with Rule 13.5.1 (i) of the Council Procedure Rules in the Constitution.</p>	S Lygo
--	---	--------

<p>17</p>	<p>Motion by Councillor Pete Sudbury</p> <p>Movers 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</p> <p>In 2023, this Council unanimously agreed a motion committing to have due regard to the needs of future generations whilst meeting the needs of today.</p> <p>We recognise that we are currently failing that by adding to accumulated damages from legacy climate pollution, which already vastly exceeds safe limits. That overshoot has doubled in the last 15 years.</p> <p>We note:</p> <p>"Baked in" economic damages of close to 20% of global GDP by 2050.</p> <p>Reputable scientific/ energy industry bodies recognise the need for "negative emissions"; removing CO2 from the atmosphere, scaling to multiple billions of tonnes annually from the 2030s and we are alarmed at the lack of credible plans to build up the required technologies to the level of sequestration required, partly due to lack of current demand.</p> <p>We also regret unavoidable negative impacts on future generations' wellbeing from the requirement to finance this removal of our waste. We agree it is unacceptable to leave our children and grandchildren with potentially an impossible, unaffordable task to avoid a ghastly future.</p> <p>We take our responsibility to future generations seriously and therefore request Cabinet to commit to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoting local R&D and commercialisation of emerging negative emission technologies (NETs). • Going beyond net zero, into negative emissions on our own account, at the 	<p>M Sudbury SEC Hicks Smith Middleton</p>
-----------	--	--

	<p>earliest reasonable opportunity, in ways that have local environmental/ economic benefit and/or contribute to scaling up NETs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working with our partners, suppliers and our networks to build a significant level of "demand pull", further stimulating the growth of NET supply chains. <p>Note: The motion, if passed, would constitute the exercise of an executive function in which case it will be referred to the Cabinet together with any advice the Council may wish to give, in accordance with Rule 13.5.1 (i) of the Council Procedure Rules in the Constitution.</p>	
<p>18</p>	<p>Motion by Councillor Ian Middleton</p> <p>Movers 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</p> <p>In 2018 this Council passed a motion stating that it was opposed to the licensing of a badger cull in Oxfordshire.</p> <p>When DEFRA announced that badger culling would be phased out by 2025, many people believed that the cull had ended. Sadly, culling in Oxfordshire intensified, seemingly with the intent of shooting as many badgers as possible before the deadline. Over 50% of the county is in the killing zones.</p> <p>A new DEFRA policy now allows epidemiological culling or 'epi-culling', which involves killing up to 100% of badgers across a large area in response to a new cluster of herd breakdowns. Epi-Culling was first introduced in Cumbria, and has been adopted on a trial basis in parts of England over the past five years. Oxfordshire is now being considered by DEFRA for future epi-culling programmes.</p> <p>A recent scientific report shows that epi-culling is ineffective as a control measure. However, DEFRA, Animal and Public Health Agenda, the bTB Hub/NFU and British Cattle</p>	<p>M Middleton SEC Sudbury</p> <p>Am A Middleton SEC Sudbury (amending own motion)</p> <p>Am B Baines SEC</p> <p>S Johnston</p>

	<p>Veterinary Association, continue to advocate its use.</p> <p>This Council therefore :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Re-affirms our opposition to badger culling and condemns the introduction of epidemiological culling which has been shown to be an ineffective control measure for bTB. 2. Asks the Cabinet to consider a specific policy that badger culling will not be permitted on Council owned land. 3. Requests that the Leader writes to DEFRA making clear our continued opposition to the cull and any extension of it in size and scope, especially with regard to epidemiological culling. <p>Note: The motion, if passed, would constitute the exercise of an executive function in which case it will be referred to the Cabinet together with any advice the Council may wish to give, in accordance with Rule 13.5.1 (i) of the Council Procedure Rules in the Constitution.</p>	
<p>19</p>	<p>Motion by Councillor Sally Povolotsky</p> <p>Movers 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</p> <p>Council notes it's been 12 months since Ofsted SEND report which resulted in identification of widespread and/or systemic failings leading to significant concerns.</p> <p>Council notes the undue stress and costs for families to take cases of education needs for SEND children to tribunal.</p> <p>People Scrutiny in October 2023, heard that no tribunal would be sanctioned without a director's approval, yet the number of parents appealing to SEND tribunal is at a record high.</p> <p>Council recognises that tribunals often put families through extreme financial and mental strain, and that working together in a trauma-</p>	<p>M Povolotsky SEC Gregory Howson Leffman</p>

	<p>informed, restorative and truly co-produced way, will help this county's young people achieve better outcomes.</p> <p>Council notes that the appointment of a SEND cabinet member has been ineffective on improving the county wide provision and the role should be reviewed urgently by the leader of this council.</p> <p>Council recognises that unmet need is a combination of lack of provision and the previous government's "mainstream" agenda.</p> <p>Council asks the Cabinet to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. work towards better decisions actioned early on in cases so that families don't need the tribunal service to redress the unlawful practice. 2. form a rapid task force to work with officers to investigate tribunal case numbers and seek to develop a better solution between this council and SEND families in Oxfordshire. 3. explore the expansion of EOTAS and alternative provision for neurodivergent children unable to attend school, especially whilst the SEND provision undergoes enhancements and service growth in the county. <p>Note: The motion, if passed, would constitute the exercise of an executive function in which case it will be referred to the Cabinet together with any advice the Council may wish to give, in accordance with Rule 13.5.1 (i) of the Council Procedure Rules in the Constitution.</p>	
<p>20</p>	<p>Motion by Councillor Charlie Hicks</p> <p>Movers 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</p> <p>Council notes the success of bus franchising in Greater Manchester, where, since bringing buses back into public control, bus use is higher and bus services are more reliable.</p>	<p>M Hicks SEC Leffman Gant</p>

	<p>Subject to the outcome of the feasibility study, Council requests Cabinet to bring buses back into public control in Oxfordshire (through bus franchising) and to create an accessible and integrated transport network for Oxfordshire.</p> <p>To enable the development of an accessible and integrated transport network, Council asks the Leader to write to the Secretary of State for MHCLG asking for the greatest possible devolution of transport and spatial planning powers as part of the devolution deal.</p> <p>Note: The motion, if passed, would constitute the exercise of an executive function in which case it will be referred to the Cabinet together with any advice the Council may wish to give, in accordance with Rule 13.5.1 (i) of the Council Procedure Rules in the Constitution.</p>	
--	---	--

This page is intentionally left blank

Amendments to Motions

Item 12 Motion by Councillor Gregory

Amendment proposed by Councillor Baines, seconded by Councillor Hicks

The Two Child limit to benefit payments was introduced by the Conservative Government in 2017 and ~~is supported by the current Labour Government.~~ **This legacy of 14 years of Conservative Government** prevents families from claiming Child Tax Credit or Universal Credit for more than 2 children in the household.

Council notes the recent research ~~conducted by the End Child Poverty Coalition~~ which has found that:

- 1.5 million children in the UK live in households subject to the two-child limit on benefit payments. That is roughly one-in-ten children in the UK.
- In 2023/24 the two-child limit cost families up to £3,235 per child each year.
- Scrapping the two-child limit would lift 250,000 children out of poverty overnight, and significantly reduce the level of poverty that a further 850,000 children live in.
- ~~Scrapping the two-child limit would cost £1.3 billion, however it is estimated that child poverty costs the economy £39 billion each year.~~

In Oxfordshire 10,850 children in 3050 households are currently affected by the two-child limit to benefit payments.

Council believes:

- **Reckless decisions by the former Government in supporting unfunded spending commitments has left a black hole in our nation's finances.**
- **Governments and political parties should never commit to unfunded spending commitments, this threatens the stability of our economy.**
- ~~T~~**hat the two-child limit is a cruel policy that should be scrapped once the fiscal environment allows.**

Council resolves to:

- Ask the Leader of the Council to write to the ~~Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Prime Minister~~ **Minister for the Cabinet Office** expressing Oxfordshire County Council's strong belief that the two-child limit to benefit payments should be scrapped **welcoming the establishment of a new child poverty unit and a ministerial taskforce to break down barriers to opportunity for every child.**
- Ask the Leader to write to all MPs covering the Oxfordshire area, asking them to commit their public support **for these measures.**

Amendment results in 245 words

Item 13 Motion by Councillor Povolotsky

Amendment proposed by Councillor Reeves, seconded by Councillor Corkin

In September 2023, Ofsted and the Care Quality Commission declared their judgment post inspection that the Local Area Partnership (LAP) had multiple systemic failures.

Despite the Priority Action Plan (PAP), the Council is failing to meaningfully engage with **elected members on a cross-party basis or** ~~and~~ capture the voice of **families affected and** ~~the user~~, our young people.

Council calls on Cabinet to consider;

1. **More** ~~More~~ meaningfully involving young people and youth organisations throughout all policy-making processes within SEND improvement and the PAP. ~~Co-management and co-creation structures are the best way to ensure direct participation.~~
2. Any consultations or engagement with young people by this council must have a visible public follow-up to the outcomes **and tangible metrics to ensure outcomes are delivered.**
3. All Council policies ~~and frameworks~~ that affect young people, must include an impact assessment, and ensure ~~there are~~ **that reasonable** mitigation measures **are put** in place for those youth groups that might be negatively impacted ~~by a new policy or framework.~~
4. Ensuring that where appropriate all future events, in person/online, run ~~by or~~ funded by OCC, especially those related to the PAP, LAP, and SEND improvement, are open to ~~all~~ **appropriate** young people with the attendance of their parent or carer.
5. Launching a rapid task force for the voice of the young person and SEND users, and task them to create a framework for a Youth Forum within ~~3~~ **three** months ~~of this meeting date.~~
6. The leader to appoint a SEND Champion **from an opposition group** to enable ~~seldom heard~~ **that a wider range of** voices in the SEND community to **are able to** feed into SEND improvement and services, and that **such** person ~~to sits~~ on the SEND Improvement board.

Amendment results in 241 words

Item 14 Motion by Councillor Reeves

Amendment A proposed by Councillor Levy, seconded by Councillor Ley

This Council ~~deplores~~ **notes** the government's decision to cut Winter Fuel Payments (WFPs). Age UK estimates that the government's changes to WFPs could **affect** ~~hit~~ 2 million people across the country, **some of whom** ~~who badly~~ need the money to stay warm this winter.

This Council resolves to:

- Request Cabinet to launch a countywide awareness campaign working with our City and District Councils, local NHS partners, and charitable, civic and religious groups, to encourage elderly residents who are eligible for means-tested benefits such as Pension Credit to register and claim them to ensure that they continue to receive WFPs this Winter.
- Request that the Leader of the Council writes to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, urging a review of the government's precipitous decision to means-test WFPs without public consultation and asking HM Treasury to ensure that vulnerable pensioners, particularly those who are eligible for, but who do not – or cannot – claim, other benefits under current thresholds are protected from fuel poverty.
- ~~• Request that the Cabinet reprioritises monies within the Council's budget for 2024/5 held within the Budget Priority Reserve and/or within other relevant contingency funds, with a view to establishing an Oxfordshire Winter Fuel Payment Protection Fund, akin to the Oxfordshire Resident Support Scheme, to ensure that pensioners who are in genuine hardship, but who are not eligible for other government support, are helped through the Winter.~~
- **Request that the Cabinet enhances its efforts to support vulnerable people, including pensioners, through its Adult Social Care responsibilities and its Cost of Living support programme and through backing for groups within Oxfordshire offering support and advice to residents.**

Amendment results in 196 words

Amendment B proposed by Cllr Baines, seconded by Cllr O'Connor

This Council depl~~ores~~ **notes** the ~~G~~**g**overnment's decision to ~~cut~~ **means-test** Winter Fuel Payments (WFPs). ~~Age UK estimates that the government's changes to WFPs could hit 2 million people across the country, who badly need the money to stay warm this winter.~~

This Council ~~resolves to:~~

- **Recognises that the new Government inherited a terrible fiscal inheritance with a £22 billion of unfunded spending commitments which had not been reported to the Office for Budget Responsibility. Left unaddressed this poses a major risk to the nation's economy with the budget deficit increasing by 25%.**
- **Welcomes the Government's commitment to increasing the uptake of Pension Credit, aligning Pension Credit and Housing Benefit, extending the Household Support Fund and protecting the triple lock.**
- Requests Cabinet to launch a countywide awareness campaign working with our City and District Councils, local NHS partners, and charitable, civic and religious groups, to encourage elderly residents who are eligible for means-tested benefits such as Pension Credit to register and claim them to ensure that they continue to receive WFPs this Winter.
- ~~Request that the Leader of the Council writes to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, urging a review of the government's precipitous decision to means-test WFPs without public consultation and asking HM Treasury to ensure that vulnerable pensioners, particularly those who are eligible for, but who do not — or cannot — claim, other benefits under current thresholds are protected from fuel poverty.~~
- Requests that the Cabinet reprioritises monies within the Council's budget for 2024/5 held within the Budget Priority Reserve and/or within other relevant contingency funds, with a view to establishing a **new Oxfordshire Winter Fuel Payment Protection Fund**, akin to the Oxfordshire Resident Support Scheme, to ensure that pensioners **and adults of working age** who are in genuine hardship, ~~but who are not eligible for other government support,~~ are helped through the Winter **and beyond**.

Amendment results in 197 words

Amendment A was received first and will be debated first.
If Amendment A is passed, then the following version of
the amendment from Councillor Baines will be taken:

Amendment C

This Council notes the ~~G~~government's decision to cut **means-test** Winter Fuel Payments (WFPs). ~~Age UK estimates that the government's changes to WFPs could affect 2 million people across the country, some of whom need the money to stay warm this winter.~~

This Council ~~resolves to:~~

- **Recognises that the new Government inherited a terrible fiscal inheritance with a £22 billion of unfunded spending commitments which had not been reported to the Office for Budget Responsibility. Left unaddressed this poses a major risk to the nation's economy with the budget deficit increasing by 25%.**
- **Welcomes the Government's commitment to increasing the uptake of Pension Credit, aligning Pension Credit and Housing Benefit, extending the Household Support Fund and protecting the triple lock.**
- Request Cabinet to launch a countywide awareness campaign working with our City and District Councils, local NHS partners, and charitable, civic and religious groups, to encourage elderly residents who are eligible for means-tested benefits such as Pension Credit to register and claim them to ensure that they continue to receive WFPs this Winter.
- ~~Request that the Leader of the Council writes to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, urging a review of the government's precipitous decision to means-test WFPs without public consultation and asking HM Treasury to ensure that vulnerable pensioners, particularly those who are eligible for, but who do not – or cannot – claim, other benefits under current thresholds are protected from fuel poverty.~~
- ~~Request that the Council enhances its efforts to support vulnerable people, including pensioners, through its Adult Social Care responsibilities and its Cost of Living support programme and through backing for groups within Oxfordshire offering support and advice to residents.~~
- **Requests that the Cabinet reprioritises monies within the Council's budget for 2024/5 held within the Budget Priority Reserve and/or within other relevant contingency funds, with a view to establishing a new Oxfordshire Resident Support Scheme, to ensure that pensioners and adults of working age who are in genuine hardship are helped through the Winter and beyond.**

Amendment results in 197 words

Item 16 – Motion by Councillor Gawrysiak

Amendment proposed by Councillor Reeves

In December Oxfordshire County Council removed ~~7~~ **seven** beds from the Chiltern care home. ~~These beds were removed~~ without any consultation with the GP's who run them, Henley Town Council ~~and~~ **or** the community of South Oxfordshire ~~and Henley~~. This lack of consultation by the Council is unacceptable **and must not be repeated**.

These beds were originally provided as 'NHS beds'.

Following FOI requests to the Integrated Care Board Buckinghamshire Oxfordshire Berkshire West (ICB BOB) and the Council, ~~we have~~ **it has been firmly** established that these beds are NHS ~~B~~beds funded by ~~the~~ ICB, ~~this~~ Council and ~~the~~ Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust. ~~and cannot~~ **They should not therefore have been** closed without **full and proper public** consultation.

Dr Broughton interim Chief Executive of the ICB BOB states 28th February 2024 "The beds have not 'lost NHS funding', "The beds continued to be overseen by the Oxford University Hospital Hub team."

These beds are NHS beds which cannot be removed without consultation.

This Council:

1. Deplores the **beds'** removal without **said** consultation.
2. Believes **that a full and objective account as to why** these beds, which serve a population of 140,000 of South Oxfordshire, ~~should be reinstated~~ **were removed and what replacement measures have since been taken**.

This Council requests that Cabinet:

3. Asks partners to seek to **account for the reasons why the** ~~reinstated the 7~~ **seven** Chiltern Court Beds serving South Oxfordshire **cannot be reinstated, bearing in mind the new measures that have since been in place and, in the absence of such an account, take steps to reinstate them**.
4. Conduct **all necessary public** consultations ~~if they still wish to remove the~~ **beds**.

Item 18 Motion by Councillor Middleton

Amendment A proposed by Councillor Middleton, seconded by Councillor Sudbury

In 2018 this Council passed a motion stating that it was opposed to the licensing of a badger cull in Oxfordshire.

When DEFRA announced that badger culling would be phased out by 2025, many people believed that the cull had ended. Sadly, culling in Oxfordshire intensified, seemingly with the intent of shooting as many badgers as possible before the deadline. Over 50% of the county is in the killing zones.

~~A new DEFRA policy now allows epidemiological culling or 'epi-culling', which involves killing up to 100% of badgers across a large area in response to a new cluster of herd breakdowns. Epi-Culling was first introduced in Cumbria, and has been adopted on a trial basis in parts of England over the past five years. Oxfordshire is now being considered by DEFRA for future epi-culling programmes.~~

~~A recent **Numerous** scientific reports shows that epi-culling is ineffective as a control measure. However, DEFRA, Animal and Public Health Agenda, the bTB Hub/NFU and British Cattle Veterinary Association, continue to advocate its use.~~

While it's welcomed that the new government has abandoned plans to allow up to 100% of badgers to be killed in some areas, there was a hope that they would cancel the cull completely and focus on cattle based measures, including support for farmers over improved biosecurity, and a move towards testing and vaccination. However it seems likely that the cull will continue for at least the next 5 years meaning even more badgers in Oxfordshire will be senselessly slaughtered.

This Council therefore :

1. Re-affirms our opposition to badger culling ~~and condemns the introduction of epidemiological culling~~ which has been shown to be an ineffective control measure for bTB.
2. Asks the Cabinet to consider a specific policy that badger culling will not be permitted on Council owned land.
3. Requests that the Leader writes to DEFRA making clear our continued opposition to the cull and any extension of it in size and scope, ~~especially with regard to epidemiological culling.~~

Amendment results in 250 words

Amendment B proposed by Councillor Baines

In 2018 this Council passed a motion stating that it was opposed to the licensing of a badger cull in Oxfordshire.

When ~~DEFRA~~ **the previous Conservative Government** announced that badger culling would be phased out by 2025, many people believed that the cull had ended. Sadly, culling in Oxfordshire intensified, seemingly with the intent of shooting as many badgers as possible before the deadline. Over 50% of the county ~~is~~ **was** in the killing zones.

The new Government has announced a new bovine TB eradication strategy working with farmers, vets, scientists and conservationists to rapidly strengthen and deploy a range of disease control measures. This comprehensive TB eradication package includes a new wildlife surveillance programme, a new Badger Vaccinator Field Force and a badger vaccination study, will allow the Government to end the badger cull in the next five years.

~~A new DEFRA policy now allows epidemiological culling or 'epi-culling', which involves killing up to 100% of badgers across a large area in response to a new cluster of herd breakdowns. Epi-Culling was first introduced in Cumbria, and has been adopted on a trial basis in parts of England over the past five years. Oxfordshire is now being considered by DEFRA for future epi-culling programmes.~~

~~A recent scientific report shows that epi-culling is ineffective as a control measure. However, DEFRA, Animal and Public Health Agenda, the bTB Hub/NFU and British Cattle Veterinary Association, continue to advocate its use.~~

This Council therefore :

1. Re-affirms our opposition to badger culling and condemns the introduction of epidemiological culling which has been shown to be an ineffective control measure for bTB.
2. Asks the Cabinet to consider a specific policy that badger culling will not be permitted on Council owned land.
3. Requests that the Leader writes to DEFRA ~~making clear our continued opposition to~~ **welcome the Government's new TB eradication package and plans to end the badger cull by the end of the Parliament.** ~~and any extension of it in size and scope, especially with regard to epidemiological culling.~~

Council will first be asked if it accepts Cllr Middleton's Amendment A to his own motion. If Council does not accept it, it will be debated and put to a vote.

If the motion is amended by Amendment A then the following version of the amendment from Councillor Baines will be taken:

Amendment C

In 2018 this Council passed a motion stating that it was opposed to the licensing of a badger cull in Oxfordshire.

When ~~DEFRA~~ **the previous Conservative Government** announced that badger culling would be phased out by 2025, many people believed that the cull had ended. Sadly, culling in Oxfordshire intensified, seemingly with the intent of shooting as many badgers as possible before the deadline. Over 50% of the county ~~is~~ **was** in the killing zones.

The new Government has announced a new bovine TB eradication strategy working with farmers, vets, scientists and conservationists to rapidly strengthen and deploy a range of disease control measures. This comprehensive TB eradication package includes a new wildlife surveillance programme, a new Badger Vaccinator Field Force and a badger vaccination study, will allow the Government to end the badger cull in the next five years.

~~Numerous scientific reports show that epi-culling is ineffective as a control measure. However, DEFRA, Animal and Public Health Agenda, the bTB Hub/NFU and British Cattle Veterinary Association, continue to advocate its use.~~

~~While it's welcomed that the new government has abandoned plans to allow up to 100% of badgers to be killed in some areas, there was a hope that they would cancel the cull completely and focus on cattle based measures, including support for farmers over improved biosecurity, and a move towards testing and vaccination. However it seems likely that the cull will continue for at least the next 5 years meaning even more badgers in Oxfordshire will be senselessly slaughtered~~

This Council therefore :

1. Re-affirms our opposition to badger culling **and condemns the introduction of epidemiological culling** which has been shown to be an ineffective control measure for bTB.
2. Asks the Cabinet to consider a specific policy that badger culling will not be permitted on Council owned land.
3. Requests that the Leader writes to DEFRA ~~making clear our continued opposition to~~ **welcome the Government's new TB eradication package and plans to end the badger cull by the end of the Parliament** ~~and any extension of it in size and scope.~~

Amendment results in 217 words

This page is intentionally left blank

Questions from Members of the Public

Questions are listed in the order in which they were received.

<p>1. CITY COUNCILLOR LINDA SMITH</p> <p>What is the County Council doing to prevent the far too frequent flooding of Watlington Road under the rail bridge? Does the County Council have any understanding of the cause of the problem and what could be done to prevent it in future?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR PETE SUDBURY, DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL WITH RESPONSIBILITY FOR CLIMATE CHANGE, ENVIRONMENT AND FUTURE GENERATIONS</p> <p>Thank you for highlighting this concern. I can confirm that our gully emptying crew attended to the flooding under the railway bridge on Saturday, 24th August. They removed all surface water and cleaned all highway surface water drainage assets. Since this visit, we have not been made aware of any additional flooding.</p> <p>Regarding further investigation, our Highway Operations Team will examine the water pump within the embankment of the railway structure.</p>
<p>2. PETER WEST</p> <p>As a part of the July 9th Council meeting, I posed a question to you regarding compensation for businesses that had lost money or closed due to the introduction of the LTNs. However despite representations to you personally, Martin Reeves, Bill Cotton and formal presentations to the Council, witnessed by many, you wrote the following.</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose of our transport strategy is to make Oxford accessible, attractive, and sustainable. We therefore expect our plans to improve the city's economic performance, not worsen it. • In many parts of the city, a minority of visitors arrive by car (in the city centre fewer than 10%), so improving access by non-car modes should lead to greater economic benefit than improving access for cars. • Business performance will always be influenced by a wide variety of factors, including wider trends in consumer preferences. • Over the longer term, it is possible to gauge whether national and local policies (which extend well beyond transport) have supported economic growth in the city. However, the data to make a causal link between specific transport policies and the performance of individual business simply does not exist, either in Oxford or anywhere else. Even if

<p><i>The County Council is not aware of any empirical evidence linking reduced income and/or closure directly to changes in patterns of patronage as a result of LTNs.</i></p> <p>I would be grateful if you would either confirm that the council has received empirical (definition; information gathered through observation, experimentation or sense experience) or not. Should you have to correct your response I would be pleased if you would make a public apology for the error.</p>	<p>it did, local authorities have to take a broader and longer-term view, so individual cases cannot and should not drive policy.</p> <p>The empirical evidence comment was related to the <u>direct</u> and <u>singular</u> relationship between a loss of income and LTNs. There will be many and varied factors that will impact on a specific business in question; cost of living challenges, energy prices and changing consumer habits (e.g., internet shopping, home delivery, a change in ideology, such as seeking more sustainable brands etc) to name just a few. Indeed, the biggest issue often cited by large and small retailers alike, up and down the country, is the outdated business rates regime.</p> <p>The high street is constantly evolving and at a faster rate than perhaps there has ever been, most likely due to rapidly changing consumer habits (mentioned above) and the COVID-19 pandemic. Businesses are sadly closing across the county and country. In many of these locations, LTNs will not be present but trading conditions will still be challenging, even where there is free parking (e.g., Abingdon). There is every sympathy for all businesses that are struggling in these times but to simply say it is solely down to one factor is oversimplifying a very complex issue. Indeed, there is evidence to suggest that by providing an environment that is easily accessible on foot or by bike can benefit retail. More people access the city on foot, by bike or using public transport than by car so enhancing access by these more space efficient modes will benefit the majority of residents and visitors. Furthermore, raw data on St Clement's and Cowley Road show an increase in footfall from 2019 (pre-LTN and COVID-19) to 2023/24 (post LTN and COVID-19) – footfall is widely accepted as a good barometer for the 'health' of the high street.</p> <p>In the city, many customers already arrive by non-car modes (in excess of 90% recorded in city centre pedestrian surveys in 2022) and the filters will make access by bus, walking and cycling even more attractive in the future – in the city centre and beyond.</p>
<p>3. BERNADETTE EVANS</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p>

<p>The Council tells us it will be monitoring the impact of the traffic filters on Oxford's SMEs with a shopfront by way of measuring footfall. Botley Road businesses are made up of builders/trades yards with parking, retail parks with parking, wholesalers with parking and smaller independents. Monitoring customers via footfall won't be accurate for these businesses given so many arrive in a vehicle, so what proposals do the council have for accurately measuring the impact of the traffic filters on these businesses?</p>	<p>We are monitoring footfall and spend data for key locations / areas – city centre, Jericho, Cowley Road, Cowley, Headington and Summertown. This will not provide data for individual shops and businesses, but it will do at the local area level. The data can then be compared to wider regional/national data.</p> <p>We will also be actively seeking feedback from shops and businesses throughout the consultation that will initially run during the first six months of the trial to help us understand how they are being impacted by the traffic filters.</p> <p>Overall, the filters should make access to Botley Road businesses for deliveries and servicing easier due to reduced traffic levels across the city and also of course because vans and HGVs will be exempt when the filters are operating. We have been engaging with businesses since February 2022; we listened to concerns about the impact of the proposals on their deliveries and that is one of the reasons why HGVs and other goods vehicles are exempt from the filters.</p> <p>As regards the customers shopping at businesses along the Botley Road, these will of course be accessible by car from the west if not using a permit; for those who use a traffic filter permit, <u>any</u> route will still be possible. Indeed, many of the trips to the larger retail units/sheds are low frequency and as such people should be able to use their day passes to drive there through a filter if they need to. For those travelling to the smaller businesses who don't want to use a permit, driving will still be possible but catching the bus or walking and cycling will be more attractive options than at the moment given the positive impact the filters will have on levels of traffic and congestion.</p>
<p>4. IAN YEATMAN</p> <p>Several areas, such as Greater Leys, Herschel Crescent, Donnington Bridge, and Jericho, are currently considered unsuitable for double-decker</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>As part of our successful Enhanced Partnership, bus companies have made significant investments in the vehicle fleet with 159 new zero emission buses being placed into service this year – the largest single such investment ever made in Oxfordshire. This comes despite the impact of the pandemic, which has made bus operations more difficult and expensive to maintain.</p>

<p>buses, causing significant challenges for residents, particularly those with limited mobility. Is the council working with the bus company to explore the possibility of introducing a smaller bus service in these areas?</p>	<p>On most routes, double deck vehicles are necessary because of the popularity of Oxford's bus network. Although there may be plenty of capacity available at the periphery of the city, the key radial corridors into the centre attract high loadings which necessitate the use of larger vehicles. The majority of vehicles in the companies' fleets are double deck for this reason, and relatively few single decks are available.</p> <p>Whilst one of our main bus companies has access to a small number of minibuses, these would not be suitable for use on existing routes and therefore it would be necessary to create new routes to serve areas off the commercial network. As a single bus costs £200,000 per year to operate, this would be very expensive and would not be the most effective use of funds or staff when the majority of residents remain within a 10-minute walk of a bus stop, as opposed to other areas where the very existence of any bus services depends on Council income. Additional routes would also abstract passengers and revenue from the commercial network, making it less financially sustainable – experience from the PickMeUp service indicated that over 40% of users simply switched from the main bus network.</p> <p>Where residents are unable to access the commercial network, the Council provides the Comet community bus service which is available between 10am and 2pm on weekdays to facilitate essential travel. In south Oxford, similar services are provided by the Daybreak organisation located on Greater Leys.</p> <p>Officers continue to explore options for Donnington Bridge, although this would result in significant unbudgeted expenditure compounded by that already required as a result of Network Rail's extension of the Botley Road closure.</p>
<p>5. RICHARD PARNHAM</p> <p>Did, at any point since the start of 2023, Network Rail and / or its contractors offer Oxfordshire County Council the opportunity to</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>When the original plans were drawn up, there was an intention to open the road between the different work stages, though this didn't happen due to original project delays. Work commenced 11 April 2023 and was due, on this phase, to be completed on 31 Oct 2024. All</p>

<p>fully (or partially) reopen Botley Road to any form of motorised traffic, in either 2023 or before November 2024?</p>	<p>this was set out in public information and on the web page Oxford City Station Phase 2C Botley Road Oxfordshire County Council .</p> <p>Since the communication of the recent further delays to the project, we are aware of several options being explored by Network Rail and understand a partial reopening is not feasible and a temporary re-opening not practical. Network Rail provide up to date information on their website Botley Road bridge replacement - Network Rail .</p>
<p>6. EMILY SCAYSBROOK</p> <p>In a city like Oxford with so many tourists, footfall does not meaningfully reflect trade for all city businesses. Cash is also still used extensively, especially by said tourists, and so credit card data is not sufficiently reflective either. With that in mind, will the recently-reappointed traffic filters evaluation company, Steer, reexamine its approach to evaluating the impact of the traffic filters on Oxford businesses, and promise to meaningfully engage with them - both individually and including neighbourhood business groups like the High Street Association, Jericho Traders, Cowley Road traders etc - directly?"</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>One of the ways we will assess the effects of the traffic filters on businesses, will be by analysing footfall and spend data in the city centre and five other locations: Cowley Road, Cowley Centre, Headington, Jericho and Summertown. Footfall data provides information on general activity levels, while spend data, based on credit card transactions, provides insight into the level of economic activity in an area. We will also be running a consultation during the first six months of the trial, actively seeking the views of the public and wider stakeholder groups. This will include businesses – we will encourage them to let us know the detail of how the trial is impacting them. Data from the traffic filter trial monitoring and evaluation together with consultation feedback will be considered by the county council’s Cabinet in deciding whether to make the scheme permanent.</p>

7. ANGUS WILKINSON

It is roughly 12 months since the last ofsted/CQC inspection of SEND provision within Oxfordshire. Is the Cabinet content that OCC's planning and actions since then have had sufficient urgency, intensity, and resource to deliver the demonstrable changes that the Improvement Notice demanded?

COUNCILLOR KATE GREGORY, CABINET MEMBER FOR SEND IMPROVEMENT

Thank you for your question on this important issue. Since the inspection of the authority in 2023, a significant amount of work has taken place to address the weaknesses identified across the local area partnership. These include but are not limited to:

- The production of a priority action plan which was approved in December 2023
- The establishment of an improvement board with an independent chair and representatives from Oxfordshire parent/carer forum, the SEND youth forum, senior leadership from the integrated care board, schools and multi-academy trusts from January 2024. The Board meets monthly and monitors progress against the priority action plan and our broader transformation programme.
- The establishment of specific workstreams focused on addressing the weaknesses and involving representatives from across the partnership including parent/carers
- The continuation of our Enhanced Pathways initiative working to support mainstream schools to be more inclusive
- Refreshing our approach to assessments for EHCPs so that we meet statutory deadlines – our performance is now above the national average
- Rolling out our trauma informed restorative approach with mainstream schools
- Supporting our special schools to share best practice with mainstream schools through our 'inreach/outreach' programme
- The development of a Quality Improvement Framework for EHCPs to improve the quality of assessments
- Stabilisation of the senior leadership team and an increase in capacity to address backlogs

The council has committed significant resource of £1m to the support of SEND services and to the work of the area partnership. We have taken on additional staffing and appointed permanent staff and are developing schools led approaches to Alternative Provision, leading to an increased stability in the service.

Our progress is regularly monitored by the Department for Education and in July this year a full stocktake of our progress took place. We are awaiting the outcome of that stocktake.

	<p>We will also have a 'deep dive' into our progress in October this year as well as a number of other 'inspection' type events. We are particularly pleased that the early years and key stage 2 performance indicators show that children with SEND are performing above the national average in some areas.</p>
--	--

Whilst we know we have more work to do to turn around what a recent report called a 'broken' system (ISOS 2024), we await the outcome of our recent monitoring to ascertain whether we are making sufficient and robust progress.

This page is intentionally left blank

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

<p>1. COUNCILLOR CHARLIE HICKS</p> <p>Has the Council, or Active Travel England, undertaken any audits of the quality of active travel schemes and/or designs in Oxfordshire using review tools provided by Active Travel England (which can be found at https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/active-travel-england-scheme-review-tools)? If so, please can the Cabinet Member share which schemes and/or designs were reviewed and what they scored?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Active Travel England continue to expand their range of tools for Local Authorities and the specific tools mentioned (https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/active-travel-england-scheme-review-tools) were launched in February 2024.</p> <p>Officers are attending regular training sessions hosted by ATE as new tools are released to ensure tools are used appropriately. Where the use of tools are specifically requested for example through the Active Travel Funding Tranches this is adhered to. Schemes reaching the current deployment phase were in planning before the tools were released so the tools would not have been used for these. Upcoming schemes will have the tools applied where appropriate based on the type of scheme, and where resources are available to support the cost of collecting the required data and this is reasonable and in proportion to the overall cost of the scheme. Other analysis tools are also used such as Healthy Streets assessments and the Cycling Level of Service – among others to ensure the projects we deliver are of a high quality and benefit our communities and provide a safe and useful experience for those walking, wheeling and cycling. For details on specific projects please do engage with the relevant project manager.</p>
<p>2. COUNCILLOR MARK CHERRY</p> <p>Would the Cabinet Member note that there is a large number of trees that fall into to the ownership of Oxfordshire County Council in Banbury Ruscote</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR PETE SUDBURY, DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL WITH RESPONSIBILITY FOR CLIMATE CHANGE, ENVIRONMENT AND FUTURE GENERATIONS</p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council’s Tree Service conduct a cyclical programme of tree inspection and tree care across the whole county. This encompasses all trees growing within land denoted as public highway, with the planned frequency of the cyclical programme being every four years.</p>

<p>and every few years Council contractors need tree surgery work.</p> <p>Constituents quite rightly raised concerns of overgrown trees on roads like Warwick Road, Fairway Road, Cromwell Road and Edmonds Road.</p> <p>Would the Cabinet Member assure me, as the local member for Banbury Ruscote, that there are adequate funding resources to move forward tree surgery work when needed in a planned Council tree maintenance schedule?</p>	<p>Banbury was due to be surveyed with associated works issued last financial year, however this work is currently one year behind on our original programme schedule. As such, Banbury will be surveyed this autumn/winter with the aim to issue works next spring.</p> <p>As Cllr Cherry has raised, the aforementioned roads contain mature tree stock. Historically the Tree Service have conducted pollarding works on trees across this area, trees on roads such as Cromwell will have further pollarding specified. This ensures trees remain appropriate for context and situation in which they are growing.</p> <p>The tree care budget is managed to enable the Tree Service to prioritise tree care in line with the planned survey schedule and inspection outputs.</p> <p>Through the inspection process, if specific tree care is determined by the Tree Service as being a greater priority than other tree care operations in the area, the budget plan can change to accommodate this need. This may include phasing of work to ensure it can be accommodated within the budget available.</p> <p>Officers will provide further detail once the tree surveys are concluded in his division.</p>
<p>3. COUNCILLOR SALLY POVOLOTSKY</p> <p>Steventon Bridge has now been a single channel coming up to 3 years, and we have lacked communication as to next steps and timelines. Given the high likelihood of continued and sustained damage to the structure, can the Cabinet Member please inform my residents how long he expects the repairs to take and how long they will</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Works to strengthen the bridge are planned to commence in October and be finished by the end of March 2025. There are still some design considerations to resolve around utility services due to their depth and potential location. They are carrying out trial holes to verify its location. This is in the area currently protected by the road narrowing. The outcome of these findings may influence whether the single traffic channel needs to remain a permanent feature. The current design of the strengthening works does not include modification to the single traffic channel, but this may enable consideration for it to be removed. A firm decision on whether the</p>

<p>last, and will the single traffic channel be a permanent feature after repairs?</p>	<p>single traffic channel should remain as a permanent feature, potentially with enhanced facilities for cyclists, has not yet been made.</p>
<p>4. COUNCILLOR SALLY POVOLOTSKY</p> <p>The voice of young people is lacking in this chamber and throughout many of our services, given many of the decisions in this chamber are medium and long-term plans. Will the Leader of the Council commit to looking at options for a youth council under the chair of councils remit to engage young people across our communities for better engagement, input and ideation around this Council’s policies and strategies for place and service shaping in the future?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LIZ LEFFMAN, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>The Council is committed to ensuring the voices of children and young people inform our decision making and shape our services. Cabinet has also agreed (as of April 2024) a mission statement relating to future generations: “We affirm the fundamental importance of meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of the future generations to meet their own needs. We will take a nationally leading role in putting intergenerational fairness at the heart of our decision-making.”</p> <p>Supporting this commitment is a work programme which focuses on two key areas: i) youth engagement with local democracy; and ii) enhancing youth engagement. Examples of recent and planned activity are provided below.</p> <p>Encompassing young people in our democratic structures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are planning a Future Generations Week between 18 and 24 November 2024, which aligns with UK Parliament Week. The programme will be co-produced with children and young people and will include sounding boards for primary and secondary age children and a debate in the council chamber. • We are looking at how we can actively involve young people in the work of council committees. <p>Enhancing youth engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We supported young people to participate in a Future Generations in Policy Making event at the Blavatnik School of Government in May 2024. • As part of the council’s annual budget and business planning consultation and engagement programme, 64 secondary school-aged children took part in two

	<p>sounding board events and two focus groups in June and July 2024. The activities enabled them to take part in citizenship conversations, learn about how the council and local politics work, and to share their service and budget priorities through individual and group discussions and using our online budget simulator.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children’s Services is developing a participation and engagement strategy, a sub strategy to the council’s corporate consultation and engagement strategy 2022-2025. The strategy sets out how children, young people and families can participate in a range of different opportunities to influence decisions and outcomes that affect them within children’s services, including through groups, forums, boards and co-production. • The council is scoping its first citizens’ assembly focusing on travel and transport. Planned for early 2025, children and young people will be recruited to participate alongside adults. Citizens’ assemblies are deliberative processes that bring together people from all walks of life to focus on a specific topic and reach collective recommendations for decision makers to respond to. • We have also run a range of dedicated focus groups and engagement activities for children and young people as part of our wider consultation and engagement activity. <p>Finally, I would like to confirm that we have a very active Future Generations champion in Cllr Charlie Hicks. Rather than making this the Chair’s remit, I would suggest asking Cllr Hicks to consider further ways of engaging effectively with young people.</p>
<p>5. COUNCILLOR SALLY POVOLOTSKY</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member for SEND Improvement please publish the registered tribunal data for the last 8 years (since 2016) to this chamber and explain the rise in tribunals and the time delay from</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR KATE GREGORY, CABINET MEMBER FOR SEND IMPROVEMENT</p> <p>Thank you for this question about this very important matter. Like other English local authorities, Oxfordshire has experienced significant challenges in the SEND system. The national system implemented from 2014, was recently described by the ISOS partnership as ‘broken’ (July 2024). The national increase in appeal tribunals is</p>

appeal registered to appeal conceded/heard/withdrawn and the number of tribunal rulings OCC have appealed to the upper tribunal?

reflective of this broken system and the position in Oxfordshire mirrors this. We have seen a significant rise in Tribunal appeals since 2016. The national figures show a rise of 24% in the number of appeals lodged in 2022-2023, which is four times the number lodged in 2014-15 when the SEND reforms were first introduced. Oxfordshire's increase in tribunals from 2022 to 2023 was 26%.

The rise in tribunal appeal numbers is driven locally and nationally by a number of factors. For Oxfordshire, the increase in requests for Education Health and Care Plans (EHCPs) alongside an increasing statutory school aged population, has led to an increase in appeals. We are aware that one of the issues driving the increase is a lack of special school places in the state and independent sectors and hence our drive to deliver over 300 additional special places by 2028. We were delighted to open Bloxham School alongside Gallery Multi-Academy Trust in January 2023 which will cater for 120 pupils with ASD/MLD need. Planning is also underway for our new special school in Didcot which will provide for 120 pupils with SEMH/ASD needs.

We recognise that parents and carers have the right to appeal to Tribunal if they are not satisfied with outcome. In line with the national picture, there has been a substantial increase in the number of appeals and the proportion of EHCPs that go to appeal.

The table below shows the figures for appeals since 2016 (This table is reproduced in larger print at the end of the document.)

	Number of appeals	Hearings	Withdrawn	Conceded	Partly Agreed/Allowed	Agreed/Allowed	Dismissed	Other (please state)	Total number of Statements/ EHCPs
2016	27	8	13	4	N/A	8	0	2	2,420
2017	50	8	27	4	N/A	6	2	11	2,755
2018	67	12	17	14	N/A	11	1	24	3,076
2019	66	4	25	19	N/A	4	1	17	3,554
2020	92	21	9	31	1	16	4	31	3,380
2021	193	29	3	78	22	6	1	83	4,070
2022	276	20	11	159	14	4	2	86	4,914
2023	347	29	8	178	21	4	4	132	6,160
								Other = struck out, transferred or still active)	
	2024 January to July only								
	217	12	4	63	3	9	0	138	
									Current total - 6,934

Against a backdrop of increasing requests for EHCPs, in Oxfordshire, the proportion of appeals as a percentage of all EHCPs has risen from 1% in 2016 to 5.6% in 2022 and 2023. The figures for the final 2 years suggesting that, maybe, the proportion is beginning to plateau.

We are aware that nationally the majority of appeals are upheld by the Tribunal court, with over 93% of parents having their case agreed by the Court in full or in part. We are aware that this route is stressful and can be expensive for parents and is not a step that they take lightly.

At the local authority, we face challenges in capacity of accessing other resource from across the public sector system which may lead to lack of access to expert advice (such as speech and language assessments) being provided to the local authority. This can further delay assessments and lead parents to sourcing private, alternative advice.

Once an appeal is registered by parents/carers, SENDIST (the Tribunal court) will set a timetable for dates. Given the significant volume of appeals now facing the court, this can now take over a year since the original registration. The local authority

and parents have no choice but to work to the timetable as set out by the Court. Once registered, the local authority will make a decision as to whether to defend or concede its decision. During this time further evidence may be collected and parents may decide to withdraw their appeal, in the majority of cases this is because a suitable resolution has been reached.

As the figures above show, the rate of concessions has risen from 15% of appeals in 2016 to 51% of appeals in 2023. However, for the year to date, concessions have declined to 29% of appeals. We have not during this time appealed any rulings to the upper tribunal. There are very specific rules about when an appeal can be made.

Our work as a local area partnership (across the Council and the Health sector) is focused on transforming outcomes for children and young people so that parents do not need feel they need to appeal. This work includes working with mainstream schools to support inclusion through our enhanced pathway work, our approach to restorative practice and supporting our special schools to work with mainstream colleagues. All these actions combined with our investment in new school places will help us continue to support children and young people with SEND and their families. We plan to roll out an EHCNA guidance document for settings which describes information to submit to support robust decision making. The impact of this is that there is an increase in the number of EHCNA request that progress to an assessment.

We have a significant recruitment and retention campaign in place for Educational Psychologists, and nationally there are a shortage of EP's making this a hard to recruit to post. We are also onboarding more agency EPs to support us in meeting statutory timeframes. The timeliness of assessments is impacted by the 38 week school year and delays can occur because of school holidays making parts of the year more difficult to gather information.

We are regularly monitored by the Department for Education on our progress to tackle the challenges we face in Oxfordshire to achieve the very best outcomes for

	<p>all our children and young people. We recognise that more progress needs to be made but also that we can already see the 'green shoots' of improvement.</p>
<p>6. COUNCILLOR SUSANNA PRESSEL</p> <p>Because vehicles can no longer drive under the railway bridge in Botley Road (though someone did try), Abbey Road and especially Mill Street are often full of cars dropping people off and picking them up – or just turning round, because they didn't realise they couldn't get through.</p> <p>They often park dangerously and drive fast. This is unpleasant for the residents, who are already suffering the effects of living in a 24-hour building site. What can be done to help them?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>With regards to parking enforcement in the Botley Road, Abbey Road and especially Mill Street these are priority areas for the Enforcement Officers. The Council has asked the enforcement contractor to ensure that an officer is present in the area during the peak hours when drop off and pick-ups take place.</p> <p>Dangerous driving or speed can only be enforced by the Police, and this will need to be raised with them. Officers will also make the Police aware of your concerns.</p>
<p>7. COUNCILLOR SUSANNA PRESSEL</p> <p>Thames Water is sporadically working on Osney Bridge. They claim to be trying to mend their water main. One of the two narrow traffic lanes over the bridge has been coned off for many months. Why were they told that it was fine for TW staff to park their cars in this lane? I thought we were trying to discourage commuters from driving into the City?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>This is required for them to attend site and allow them to bring equipment, carry out inspections, and manage traffic management.</p>

<p>8. COUNCILLOR SUSANNA PRESSEL</p> <p>We have been asking for years for Localities to be able to send recommendations to Cabinet. The Peer Review said this should happen. Why is it still not happening?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR NEIL FAWCETT, CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE SERVICES</p> <p>During the review of Locality Meetings, chaired by my predecessor in this Cabinet role (Cllr Phillips) an all-member survey was undertaken as part of the review. The results from this survey showed that only a minority of respondents wanted to make fundamental changes to the locality meetings. The working group, comprising Locality Chairs and senior officers, agreed that there was no desire to introduce new powers or responsibilities, particularly those that might duplicate the role of overview and scrutiny committees.</p> <p>That being said, there are existing provisions within the Constitution under Cabinet Procedure Rules (Part 4) and the Protocol on Councillors' Rights and Responsibilities (Part 9) which already enable councillors to raise issues to Cabinet, with the endorsement of a cabinet member:</p> <p>Part 4.2 paragraph 2.5: "Any member of the Council may make a request through a member of the Cabinet that an item be placed before the Cabinet. If the Cabinet Member endorses the request and so notifies the Proper Officer, that Officer will arrange for the Cabinet to consider in the context of the Forward Plan arrangements to make consideration of that item. When any such item is considered by the Cabinet the agenda for the meeting will give the name of the Councillor who asked for the item to be considered. The individual member shall be invited to attend and speak at the meeting during consideration by the Cabinet of that item."</p> <p>On behalf of the Cabinet, all of whom attend a locality, we will be happy to receive any written requests that have been discussed and agreed in the meeting.</p>
<p>9. COUNCILLOR ANDREW COLES</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR PETE SADBURY, DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL WITH RESPONSIBILITY FOR CLIMATE CHANGE, ENVIRONMENT AND FUTURE GENERATIONS</p>

<p>Councillor Sudbury will be aware of the flood drainage ditch in Woodford Way, in my division, which is one of the few in Oxfordshire which falls to the county council to maintain. Last year I repeatedly expressed my concerns, through our localities meetings, about its current state. It is overgrown with vegetation, looks very unsightly, is often littered with rubbish and sometimes abandoned shopping trollies etc. I have repeatedly questioned whether it is fit for purpose. Could Councillor Sudbury update me please on what plans the council has to address these concerns and reassure residents as to its current state and condition, bearing in mind Witney is particularly vulnerable to flooding, especially in the winter months?</p>	<p>The Area Operations team are aware of the work required to the ditch on Woodford way and although there has been some delay with this work, for which we apologise. I can confirm that arrangements are in hand for this vegetation clearance to be undertaken during September.</p>
<p>10. COUNCILLOR DAVID BARTHOLOMEW</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At your decisions meeting on July 18th you approved £0.5million expenditure to develop the Workplace Parking Tax. 2. A Team Leader for the project has been/is being recruited at a salary of c.£50k per annum. 3. The Leader has said that the tax will go ahead. 	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</p> <p>In July I approved the procurement of technical transport consultancy support required for the development of a WPL, delegated the award of the contract to the Director of Economy and Place, and authorised officers to progress the development of the WPL including the undertaking of the required future public consultation. The funding for these activities is part of the £2.488m approved as part of the budget in February – it is not new funding.</p> <p>It is not possible to carry out a public consultation on a WPL without first developing and assessing the proposals, for which technical support is required.</p> <p>The council advertised recently for a 2 years fixed term Technical Lead - Oxford Workplace Parking Levy to lead the development of the WPL working alongside other OCC colleagues, consultants and other appointed specialists to develop</p>

<p>Given these three points, what is the purpose of the proposed public consultation on the tax?</p>	<p>proposals from concept to consultation, including ongoing liaison with employers affected by the scheme and other external stakeholders. The postholder would not be involved in the operation of the WPL. If the implementation of a WPL is approved in future, operational staff would be recruited to administer the scheme.</p> <p>The Work Place Parking Levy programme assumes a Cabinet decision on its implementation during 2026. Only a decision to develop the Work Place Parking levy has been made.</p> <p>To be clear recommendations to Cabinet will be informed by technical work, public consultation and engagement with affected employers. It is also important to note that the final decision on a WPL rests with the Secretary of State for Transport, so the council will only be able to implement the scheme if the Secretary of State approves it.</p> <p>The purpose of the public consultation on the Workplace Parking Levy is to gather feedback and input from employers, the public, and other stakeholders to inform the development of the WPL and the local and national decision-making process. The consultation is a legal requirement, and an integral part of the scheme development. People’s feedback allows us to refine our proposals and assess the potential impacts of the Workplace Parking Levy.</p>
<p>11. COUNCILLOR GLYNIS PHILLIPS</p> <p>At the last Council meeting on 9th July, you advised that there would be a meeting of officers in July ‘to discuss likely timeframes for the implementation of speed enforcement measures at the Barton Park junction’. Would the Cabinet member advise when these speed enforcement measures will be</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Officers met on site with representatives of Thames Valley Police and a supplier of enforcement equipment in August and are carrying out further technical appraisal work. Subject to the outcome, funding from the Vision Zero programme will be allocated for the installation of the equipment, with Thames Valley Police then managing its operation. Timescales will be dependent on a number of factors but with the expectation – should the suitability of the site be confirmed – that installation would be carried out in the first half of 2025.</p>

<p>installed? And are safety barriers at the pedestrian crossing points being actively considered?</p>	<p>Preliminary work on the installation of safety barriers for pedestrians has been carried out but this did identify a number of constraints and current work is focussed on the installation of the red light and speed cameras.</p>
<p>12. COUNCILLOR IAN MIDDLETON</p> <p>At the end of July the Leader wrote to the Home Secretary Yvette Cooper reminding her of this council's strong objections to proposals to re-open Campfield House Immigration Detention Centre in Kidlington. This was a follow up to the passing of my motion in October 2022 when the leader wrote to the former Home Secretary expressing our opposition to the plans. Following the new government's cancellation of the Rwanda Resettlement Scheme it was hoped that the plans for Campfield would also be cancelled since the scheme was cited as one of the principal reasons for the re-opening. However since the Leader's letter to Ms Cooper was sent, the government has surprisingly announced its intention to continue with plans to reopen the centre. Does the leader agree with me that this is a hugely retrograde move, especially given that Oxford is looking to become a City of Sanctuary, and that not only is it going to have little impact on dealing with the backlog of asylum claims, it could also jeopardise inward investment into an area designated as a centre of innovation and technology?"</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LIZ LEFFMAN, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>Yes, I agree that this is indeed a hugely retrograde step by the Home Secretary, and I very much regret her decision for all the reasons that Cllr Middleton gives. Calum Miller, the MP in whose constituency Campfield House is situated, has also voiced his objections which I agree with and fully support.</p>

<p>13. COUNCILLOR IAN MIDDLETON</p> <p>Members from all groups have expressed concerns about a lack of feedback about issues affecting their divisions. I've also had similar complaints from District and Parish Councillors. There have been repeated acknowledgements of these shortcomings by the administration with promises to improve communication, especially on E&P projects and other key decisions, yet the problem persists. I have personally experienced this on more than one occasion and was recently told by a senior officer that they did not believe it was "necessary" to inform me of a significant and controversial development directly affecting my division before an announcement was made to the media. Could the Cabinet Member for Community and Corporate Services confirm that these failures of communication are going to be urgently addressed and provide assurances that officers will be made aware of the importance of informing members about decisions and events directly affecting their divisions before such information is released to the media?"</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR NEIL FAWCETT, CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE SERVICES</p> <p>I would like to thank Cllr Middleton for raising the question of communications to members. It's very important that local members are kept informed about issues affecting their division and will ask that all officers are reminded of the importance of doing so.</p> <p>I have also had my own experience of such situations and understand how frustrating it can be.</p> <p>It may not always be possible to brief local members in advance of communications being issued, but that should be very much the exception.</p> <p>We are also committed to improving communications with our district, town and parish councils. We recently signed up to the Oxfordshire Councils Charter, which is aimed at improving ways of working across all tiers of local government in the county.</p>
<p>14. COUNCILLOR BRAD BAINES</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member please explain why the principal inspection report for Donnington Bridge was not submitted for ten months after the original</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal inspections are generally carried out every 6 years and allow a detailed assessment of all parts of a bridge. The purpose of these inspections

<p>inspection in May 2023, and whether he has confidence that similar delays and emergency intervention will not befall other bridges in the County?</p>	<p>is to ensure any potential issues are identified and addressed promptly to maintain the safety and integrity of the bridge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is an operational activity and it is not required for me to have sight of these. • Following the report, further work was carried out by our teams and a subsequent risk update was provided and approved by the client on 15th August 2024 which identified the need to install the weight restriction. • More detailed, specialist and intrusive testing is required, and this work is being commissioned with a view to determine what works will be required at the earliest opportunity. • We have many structures across Oxfordshire, and we continue to inspect them in line with our asset strategy. It is only when these inspections are carried out, we will be clear as to the extent of any works required. • I would like to assure you that decisions to impose restrictions of this kind are not taken lightly, and always on the basis of expert advice and recommendation • The primary outcome of the decision is to protect the users of the bridge and protect the asset from any further unnecessary stress and damage.
<p>15. COUNCILLOR BRAD BAINES</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member confirm when he was first informed of the findings and consequences of the principal inspection report for Donnington Bridge submitted to the Council on 28/03/2024?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</p> <p>I can confirm that I was informed by our Head of Service for Highway Maintenance, that there was a need to impose a weight restriction on Friday 16th August 2024.</p>

	<p>(Officers had been working hard to understand the risk report received by the client team on 15th August following on from an extensive analysis of the findings of the information supplied by our contractors.)</p>
<p>16. COUNCILLOR BRAD BAINES</p> <p>Since the Botley Road is set to be closed for a further indefinite period whilst Network Rail upgrade the Botley Railway Bridge, with the Leader speculating that the delay could last another year, does the Cabinet Member consider it to be legally and judiciously appropriate for an updated Cabinet decision to be taken on the proposed traffic filter scheme, given that the original decision may be taken three years prior to implementation and the changed circumstances since then?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</p> <p>I have sought officer advice and see no reason to revisit the November 2022 Cabinet decision on the trial traffic filters.</p> <p>There is no automatic requirement for all decisions made by the council to be revisited solely due to the passing of time.</p> <p>The council considers that the original justification for trialling traffic filters – that motorised traffic in Oxford needs to be reduced to facilitate efficient bus operation, safer cycle routes, more liveable streets and reduced congestion and pollution – will remain valid once Botley Road reopens. The traffic filters are to be introduced as a trial, with the expectation that the scheme may be adjusted in response to monitoring and consultation feedback during the trial. Cabinet was made aware of the imminent closure of Botley Road in the report, which also contained an officer recommendation that the trial only starts after the Botley Road re-opens, and so in this regard, the circumstances remain unchanged.</p> <p>Furthermore, the November 2022 Cabinet decision delegates authority to officers (in consultation with the relevant Cabinet member) to make minor changes to the scheme before it comes into force in case tweaks are needed.</p>
<p>17. COUNCILLOR LIAM WALKER</p> <p>Parents and learner drivers right across Oxfordshire continue to struggle to book driving</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</p> <p>The County Council has no control over matters of this nature.</p>

<p>tests in the county with many having to travel hours away or spend hours searching for a cancellation. Is there anything that the county council can do to assist with improving this service in Oxfordshire?</p>	
<p>18. COUNCILLOR LIAM WALKER</p> <p>The new £51million park and ride at Eynsham has now been completed but as yet there is no access into the site. Can she confirm when the access will be constructed and also confirm how much the site is costing each week whilst it remains closed?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</p> <p>The Eynsham park and ride was funded by a ring-fenced and non-inflation indexed grant award, which had obtained all the relevant consents and approvals to allow it to proceed to construction. Any delays to its commencement would have resulted in the inflationary pressures impacting on the affordability of the scheme.</p> <p>Completing the park and ride site ahead of the bus lanes which required more complicated approval, has saved millions of pounds in inflation and construction costs. This was a conscious decision, taken at a time when costs were rising rapidly across all industries.</p> <p>Delays caused by funding pressures, including inflation, has meant that the wider A40 improvements scheme has needed to be redesigned. The revised scheme will deliver a connection for the park and ride, bus lanes and walking and cycling infrastructure along the A40. We are discussing this revised scheme with Homes England and DfT and hope to progress with its delivery later this year.</p> <p>Following the completion of the permanent landscaping at the Eynsham park and ride, I can inform the council that ongoing maintenance of the site is being provided as part of the existing delivery contractor. It is important to note that the council is not incurring any additional costs on this maintenance, as it is covered by the construction contract.</p> <p>To clarify, the total project cost of the park and ride did not cost £51m. From the projected £51m total cost for the wider Science Transit (ST2) scheme, around £32m</p>

	<p>was allocated for the delivery of the park and ride, with the remaining going on the delivery of the eastbound bus lane. This eastbound bus lane now forms part of the proposed new A40 improvement scheme.</p> <p>Regarding the opening of the park and ride facility, the park and ride will be opened when the necessary infrastructure to connect it to the A40 is delivered. This connection and the bus lanes serving the park and ride are scheduled to be constructed under the revised A40 improvements scheme, which is currently under discussions with Homes England and the Department for Transport. Our discussions with them are nearing completion.</p> <p>Subject to the successful conclusion of these discussions, we plan to hold a public engagement on the plans in later in the year. This will kickstart the delivery phase of the scheme, with a projected completion date of the relevant infrastructure to allow the park and ride to operating being in 2027.</p>
<p>19. COUNCILLOR LIAM WALKER</p> <p>Work to improve the Cotswold Railway Line seems to have slowed down. Please can the cabinet member provide an update on the Cotswold Line improvements and when we can expect the car park at Hanborough Station to be expanded and if the Hanborough Subgroup has now been established?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDY ROBERTS, CABINET MEMBER FOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</p> <p>The North Cotswold Line Task Force (NCLTF) engaged with the previous Government earlier this year, meeting with the-then Rail Minister and had extensive follow-on discussion with DfT Civil Servants, rail industry colleagues and consultants from SLC Rail (who support the work of the Task Force). A further discussion with the Rail Minister – to seek support and funding for project development – was scheduled for 10 June, but due to the General Election being called during that period, had to be rescheduled.</p> <p>The NCLTF invited MPs along to a Parliamentary event on 4 September to update line of route MPs (most newly elected). This was hosted by Lord Faulkner and NCLTF members, including Councillor Liz Leffman and John Disley (Head of Transport Policy). This included discussion about the substantial amount of new</p>

residential development proposed in the vicinity of Worcestershire Parkway station. The NCLTF encompasses five counties and a number of sub-regional transport board areas, with a very substantial amount of planned development, and enhanced rail services are critical to delivering improved connectivity in the most sustainable way

Our new OxRail 2040: Plan for Rail strategy will set out the need for full double-tracking from Oxford, through to Worcester. We will also propose 25kv AC overhead electrification from Oxford to Hanborough railway station (Didcot-Banbury via Oxford proposed for wiring). Hanborough station will be developed as a two-platform station, connected by a footbridge and ideally as a Tier 2 'Mobility Hub' to serve a wider area of West Oxfordshire

We are in discussion with GWR/Network Rail and West Oxfordshire District Council about the scope to expand the existing station car park and any formation of a 'Hanborough station sub-group' is dependent on progress with the wider NCLTF ambitions. Such a group would probably be led by Place Planning and involve local Members, Blenheim Palace and West Oxfordshire Community Transport and is likely to be formed later next year.

	Number of appeals	Hearings	Withdrawn	Conceded	Partly Agreed/Allowed	Agreed/Allowed	Dismissed	Other (please state)	Ttal number of Statements/ EHCPs
2016	27	8	13	4	N/A	8	0	2	2,420
2017	50	8	27	4	N/A	6	2	11	2,755
2018	67	12	17	14	N/A	11	1	24	3,076
2019	66	4	25	19	N/A	4	1	17	3,554
2020	92	21	9	31	1	16	4	31	3,380
2021	193	29	3	78	22	6	1	83	4,070
2022	276	20	11	159	14	4	2	86	4,914
2023	347	29	8	178	21	4	4	132	6,160
								Other = struck out, transferred or still active)	
	2024 January to July only								
	217	12	4	63	3	9	0	138	
									Current total - 6,934

This page is intentionally left blank