

CABINET

MINUTES of the meeting held on Tuesday, 27 January 2015 commencing at 2.00 pm and finishing at 4.16 pm

Present:

Voting Members: Councillor Ian Hudspeth – in the Chair
Councillor Rodney Rose
Councillor Mrs Judith Heathcoat
Councillor Nick Carter
Councillor Melinda Tilley
Councillor Lorraine Lindsay-Gale
Councillor David Nimmo Smith
Councillor Lawrie Stratford
Councillor Hilary Hibbert-Biles

Other Members in Attendance: Councillor Brighthouse (Agenda Items 6 & 11)
Councillor Fooks (Agenda Item 9)
Councillor Hards (Agenda Item 7, 9 & 10)
Councillor Howson (Agenda Item 9)
Councillor Mallon (Agenda Item 6)
Councillor Mathew (Agenda Item 7)
Councillor Price (Agenda Items 7 & 8)

Officers:

Whole of meeting	Joanna Simons (Chief Executive); Sue Whitehead (Chief Executive's Office)
Part of Meeting Item	Name
7	Lorna Baxter, Chief Finance Officer; Maggie Scott, Head of Policy
8	Kate Teronni, Deputy Director, Joint Commissioning
9	Bev Hindle, Deputy Director, Strategy & Infrastructure
10	Planning; John Disley, Policy & Strategy Manager Sue Scane, Director for Environment & Economy

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

1/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(Agenda Item. 2)

Councillor Hibbert Biles declared an interest in Item 9, LTP4 as she lived on a road highlighted during an address by the Chairman of South Newington Parish Council.

2/15 MINUTES

(Agenda Item. 3)

The Minutes of the meeting held on 16 December 2014 were approved and signed.

Cabinet noted that a reply was outstanding in respect of the suggestion made by Councillor Smith that in future councillors make payments through personal cheques directly rather than using the County Council finance system.

3/15 QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS

(Agenda Item. 4)

Councillor Howson had given notice of the following question to Councillor Nimmo Smith:

“Can the cabinet member confirm for the record whether the mandatory turn left sign across the junction of Hythe Bridge Street with Worcester St applies to all road users or only motorised vehicles? If, as has been suggested, cyclists can still cycle from Hythe Bridge street across the junction and into George St in both directions, what safety measures are in place to prevent 'incidents' from taking place at busy times of day, especially for cyclist travelling towards George St that might cause injury to cyclists?”

Councillor Nimmo Smith replied:

“With reference to permitted movements, the ONLY movements not permitted to 'motorised vehicles' are straight on and right turns from Hythe Bridge Street as indicated by the left turn arrow head on the traffic signals. Cyclists ARE permitted to make these movements and 'Except For Cyclists' sub plate signs, installed within the traffic signal head assemblies, are due to be installed on site (both sides of Hythe Bridge Street approach).

The exemption for cyclists described above are as advertised and consulted on (during June / July 2014) within the permanent Traffic Regulation Order amendments required for the scheme.

A Stage 3 Road Safety Audit (post construction) site inspection has already been undertaken (Thursday 8th January 2015) and a report of findings will be submitted to the Project team shortly who will fully consider the concerns raised and agree appropriate actions. This audit, as per the previous stages

has been completed by a team of Auditors who are completely independent to the project team.

In addition to the above, a list of 'remedial' works has been agreed with the Contractor and works to complete/remedy these items, including the ponding issue at the Hythe Bridge Street crossing point, are scheduled to be undertaken from Monday 26th January 2015.

Additional road markings will be undertaken during that period including the marking of a central refuge area where cyclists can wait before progressing to George Street. These markings will also serve as a visible means to further educate motorists of the presence of cyclists at this point."

Supplementary: Responding to a query why the sign "Except Cyclists" had not been part of the original works and had been put up before the refuge in the middle of the road, Councillor Nimmo Smith replied that the rules for cyclists had not changed and the ability to go straight across had not changed.

Councillor Fooks had given notice of the following question to Councillor Nimmo Smith:

"The County Council passed a motion on April 1st which committed the Council to considering the impact on the health of Oxfordshire residents, from NOx and particulates, as new large developments are proposed and new transport strategies developed. This of course includes the major retail developments in Oxford and the development of LTP4. Given that Public Health England estimated in a recent report that 55 deaths of people over 25 in Oxford in 2010 were due to particulate air pollution, will you ensure that LTP4 and the Oxford Transport Strategy adopt their air quality targets where they exist, and for Oxford adopt the targets in Oxford's Air Quality Action Plan, namely

- Mean NO₂ concentrations of less than 45 ug/m³ by 2020 and 40 ug/m³ by 2025 at the latest
- A 35% reduction in transport CO₂ emissions from 2005 to 2020
- A 50% reduction in transport NO_x and PM emissions from 2005 to 2020?

Further, what would you estimate the cost falling on the County Council if European infraction proceedings, following a failure to meet EU limit values for PM₁₀ and NO₂, meant a fine on the UK Government which would be passed on to the Transport Authority?"

Councillor Nimmo Smith replied:

"As part of finalising our LTP, we will be looking at where and to what extent the county should adopt targets. Our view is that we shouldn't automatically

adopt targets agreed by other organisations because the content of the strategy should be the focus.

In the case of Air Quality Action Plans, if the view is that our proposed strategy does not do enough to improve air quality, then our City or District Council colleagues need to tell us what more we should do. Changes in air quality are notoriously difficult to relate to specific interventions, because there are so many factors involved, including the weather. If we commit to target, this suggests the council should be prepared to do and spend whatever it takes – to the detriment of other objectives - to meet that target, even if we are chasing an impossible aim that may be more affected by external factors than what we do.

It is also worth noting that in the published LTP4 Strategic Environmental Assessment: Appendix C - Effects on Human Health, in the Recommendations for Mitigation and/or Enhancement, the proposal is that we

- Continue to work with the Highways Agency, District Councils, Network Rail and train operators to identify air quality improvements associated with the road and rail network to complement measures identified in Air Quality Action Plans.
- Carefully plan schemes in terms of location, scale and design at project level to ensure air quality reductions are realised.
- Apply restrictions on more polluting vehicles within Oxford to encourage a cleaner fleet. Consideration could be given as to how to apply a “polluter pays” principle within demand management measures

Our approach is therefore that we should adopt an ambitious strategy which substantially cuts transport emissions in the city, but that we shouldn't commit to meeting air quality targets 'at any cost'.

In terms of what (if any) financial impact there could be from fines, as I understand it no agreement has been reached on how these would be shared between local and central government”

Supplementary: Responding to a query he agreed that there ought to be targets to aspire to. He added that with regard to the deaths referred to in the question that although air pollution had been an exacerbating factor there had been underlying conditions leading to the deaths.

Councillor Pressel had given notice of the following question to Councillor Nimmo Smith:

"I'm getting constant complaints from incredulous people in my division and beyond about the new junction at Hythe Bridge Street/Worcester Street.

One problem is that pedestrians have to wait far longer than before to cross even one street; most need to cross two. As a result they often cross before it is safe to do so.

Even worse, this must be the only cross-roads in the world where traffic from the north (Beaumont Street) has a green light at the same time as traffic from the west (Hythe Bridge Street) AND cyclists from the west can legitimately go straight on (into George Street), as they used to and as many of them need to. Because the traffic from the north can now go in three different directions at the junction, cyclists trying to cross the stream of traffic in order to go up George Street are now in extreme danger.

And you claim to be trying to encourage more walking and cycling!

Please can you tell me why the new junction was designed in this way, with apparently no thought given to the safety of cyclists?"

Councillor Nimmo Smith replied:

"Along with the changes made recently to Becket Street, Osney Lane and Hollybush Row, the new arrangements at the Hythe Bridge Street/George Street junction are essential to facilitate diversion routes during the construction of the Frideswide Square scheme. This will help minimise delays to all road users resulting from the works in the square, and will allow us to construct the scheme as quickly and efficiently as possible.

The changes at Hythe Bridge Street/George Street are necessary during the construction phase, but will also remain in place once Frideswide Square has been completed. Opening up this junction allows traffic heading from north Oxford to Hollybush Row and vice-versa to route via Park End Street, thereby reducing traffic in Hythe Bridge Street and helping the whole system flow more smoothly. It also allows traffic accessing Worcester Street car park from north Oxford to do so without passing through Hythe Bridge Street and Frideswide Square. The junction is therefore intended to operate as part of a system that includes the new layout in Frideswide Square.

The county council will shortly carry out additional work on the junction of Worcester Street and Hythe Bridge Street following feedback from cyclists. A number of comments have been raised by cyclists and the council has carried out an independent road safety audit as part of the normal process following any work of this sort.

Whilst the junction is not unique, in that there are many junctions across the UK with traffic lights operating with opposing flows under the same phase, with vehicles having to give way to traffic before making a right turn.

We have looked closely at how the junction is working for cyclists following our own observations and comments received from cyclists since the junction was re-opened and decided to make some minor changes which should make a big difference.

It is worth noting that under the previous layout cyclists were allowed to make all movements as long as they gave way to on-coming traffic at the pedestrian controlled crossing. Under the new junction operation, this has not changed, but we will be introducing a 'storage area' in the middle of the junction to provide an area for them to wait for traffic to clear before they proceed.

We will continue to monitor the junction to establish the operation of the junction. During the course of the main Frideswide Square work the signal timings will be altered to cater for alterations in traffic flows through this part of the city. This means that what you see now will change regularly and be adjusted to suit the phasing of the works at the Main Square until the permanent signal timings for traffic or pedestrians is set. As with any new road layout, we will be monitoring this junction carefully, both during construction of Frideswide Square and once the whole scheme is complete."

Supplementary: Councillor Nimmo Smith responding to further queries stated that the scheme had been designed well, and modified as necessary. He undertook to provide a written answer on the number of accidents at the junction since the completion of the work.

Councillor Smith had given notice of the following question to Councillor Carter:

"The expansion of Windmill School in Headington to 3 form entry was agreed by Cabinet in March 2013. The new build, and other necessary works, we were informed would be completed for the start of term in September 2015. Unfortunately the school has experienced delay after delay; the timetable for the start of various projects has slipped considerably. An example would be the MUGA; this was supposed to be constructed last summer. Could Cllr Carter assure me that the tenders for works, under the council's contract with Carillion will be timely and to budget with a September 2015 completion and full occupation by the school at the start of the autumn term ?"

Councillor Carter gave a verbal response and indicated that he would provide a written summary. In response to a further question Councillor Carter gave an assurance that he would keep Councillor Smith informed and that the work would be completed. He added that if communication had been one of the problems then going forward it would not continue to be a problem.

4/15 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda Item. 5)

The following requests to address the meeting had been agreed

Item 6 – Councillor Brighthouse,

Councillor Mallon
Item 7 –Councillor Hards
Councillor Price,
Councillor Mathew
Councillor Brighthouse
Councillor Gill Sanders
Item 8– Councillor Price,
Item 9 Mr Braithwaite
Councillor Fooks,
Councillor Howson
Councillor Hards
Councillor Curran
Councillor Pressel
Item 10 – Councillor Hards

5/15 PREPARING FOR FUTURE FINANCIAL PRESSURES

(Agenda Item. 6)

In response to government announcements about future public spending cuts the Leader of the Council presented the findings of a report from Ernst and Young on the options for the future configuration of local government in Oxfordshire.

Councillor Brighthouse, Opposition Leader, commented that the paper was interesting, and at this stage it dealt solely with finance which was probably right. However it raised more questions than it supplied answers. She highlighted the wider devolution debate sparked by the independence referendum in Scotland. The potential reorganisation of local authorities was wider than the finance aspects and she welcomed the debate at Council. It was important to look at successful aspects of the current system such as the locality working. Engagement at the local level and efficient local government were key. The proposals here could not be considered in isolation from the budget and corporate plan.

Responding to a question Councillor Brighthouse indicated that she could not indicate how her Group felt on the options as they had yet to debate them fully.

Councillor Mallon welcomed the report but suggested a fourth option that he believed combined the savings of Option 1 with the local accountability of Option 3. He proposed that there be three unitary councils as suggested in Option 3 but that those unitary councils shared services as was already happening at district level, giving savings suggested by Option 1. It therefore gave the best of Option 1 with local accountability. Councillor Mallon argued that it would allow a local mandate with local priorities that recognised the differences between areas in Oxfordshire. He asked that work be undertaken to enable his option to be considered as part of the Council debate in March.

Following comments and questions from Cabinet, Councillor Mallon expounded his view that his proposal would allow both tailoring to local

needs and strategic working on larger issues, whilst delivering the saving needed.

Councillor Hudspeth indicated that the report was the start of a debate and he welcomed further options being put forward. He undertook to consider the further option suggested by Councillor Mallon with a view to including that as Option 4 in the debate at Council.

During his introduction of the contents of the report Councillor Hudspeth referred to comments widely made that the report was error strewn. However no errors had been pointed out to him, although he was happy to consider any that could be identified. He highlighted the reputation of Ernst & Young. During discussion it was further noted that the figures included in the report were based on publicly available information much of it from the District Councils.

Cabinet generally welcomed the report and that it would generate an opportunity to debate the issues raised at full Council.

RESOLVED: following consideration of the Ernst and Young report to refer it to Council in order that all Members can debate the issues, including the further suggestion from Councillor Mallon.

6/15 SERVICE & RESOURCE PLANNING 2015/16 - JANUARY 2015

(Agenda Item. 7)

Cabinet considered the final report in the series on the Service & Resource Planning process for 2015/16 to 2017/18, providing councillors with information on budget issues for 2015/16 and the medium term. It set out the proposed 2015/16 budget; the updated Corporate Plan; the draft 2015/16 – 2017/18 Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) and the updated Capital Programme 2014/15 – 2018/19.

Councillor Hards, Shadow Cabinet Member for Finance, highlighted the difficulty of the task ahead, referring to the huge increases in costs for Adult Social Care and Children, Education & Families and the resultant pressures on the budget. He expressed relief that there was the option to raise Council Tax by 1.9% before a referendum was required. The pressures would cause difficulty for any organisation but he felt that it was particularly difficult for the Council given the impact on resilience caused by responding to the on-going difficult financial position. He raised a number of queries around the detail of the report relating to the Better Care Fund figures, the Care Act funding and questions on the business rate and RSG.

Councillor Stratford responded to the queries raised indicating that the Better Care Funding was expected but was not available yet; the Revenue Support Grant he was confident would be available when needed despite the new payment arrangements and further thought would need to be given to the implications of the Care Act. Councillor Heathcoat, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care added that there would need to be some flexibility within adult

social care but welcomed that the Health & Wellbeing Board had agreed the £8m Better Care Fund. She thanked the Chief Executive and John Jackson for their efforts to make this happen. She recognised that the budget decisions would be difficult but referred to actions being taken to ensure that the Directorate would manage. The implications of the Care Act were an unknown at this stage.

Councillor Price, Shadow Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, stated that she had heard it said at many meetings that the Council had had to pull back to their statutory role and expressed concern for the future given the volatility of demand and the uncertainty around the Care Act. There was a need to address problems around the learning disability budget and to ensure that in social care we were doing more than just reacting to cuts. Councillor Heathcoat in response stated that they were indeed doing more than reacting to cuts and were looking at integrating provision, supported by truly pooled budgets.

Councillor Mathew referred to the decision taken at Council not to provide paper copies to councillors except where they were members of a committee and asked that this decision be reversed. He acknowledged the need to balance the books but felt that this decision was short sighted as it was not possible to read more than a few pages on a computer. Cabinet in particular would lose the benefit of the advice of well-informed councillors. It affected the ability of councillors to do their job.

Councillor Stratford introduced the contents of the report, thanking Lorna Baxter, Chief Finance Officer and her Team for all their efforts. The budget was a challenging one and their help and assistance to him had been invaluable. He referred to the ability to raise Council Tax by 1.9% and in welcoming that it would give a little headroom noted that the Council would need to look at replenishing reserves.

During discussion Cabinet Members highlighted aspects of the budget in their own areas of responsibility.

RESOLVED:

to approve:

- (1) a £0.500m project development budget for the Didcot Northern Perimeter Phase 3 Scheme;
- (2) a budget increase of £0.364m for the Frideswide Square Transport and Public Realm scheme and to proceed to construction of the works on the main square.

to RECOMMEND Council to approve:

- (a) the Corporate Plan, Directorate Business Strategies and Performance Indicators;

- (b) in respect of revenue:
 - (1) a budget for 2015/16 and a medium term plan to 2017/18, based on the proposals set out in the December 2014 report to Cabinet and the variations in Section 3.2;
 - (2) a council tax requirement (precept) for 2015/16;
 - (3) a council tax for band D equivalent properties;
 - (4) virement arrangements to operate within the approved budget;
 - (5) the virement of £2.8m from corporate contingency to children's social care included in section 3.4;

- (c) in respect of treasury management:
 - (1) the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy;
 - (2) to continue to delegate the authority to withdraw or advance additional funds to/from external fund managers to the Treasury Management Strategy Team;
 - (3) that any further changes required to the 2015/16 strategy be delegated to the Chief Finance Officer in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Finance;
 - (4) the Prudential Indicators as set out in Appendix A of Section 3.5;
 - (5) Minimum Revenue Provision Methodology Statement as set out in Appendix B of Section 3.5;
 - (6) The Specified Investment and Non Specified Investment instruments as set out in Appendix C and D of Section 3.5;
 - (7) The Treasury Management Policy Statement as set out in Appendix E of Section 3.5;

- (d) approve a Capital Programme for 2014/15 to 2018/19 including the Highways Structural Maintenance Programme 2015/16 and 2016/17;

- (e) to delegate authority to the Leader of the Council, following consultation with the Chief Finance Officer, to make appropriate changes to the proposed budget.

7/15 HOUSING RELATED SUPPORT

(Agenda Item. 8)

Housing related support services have largely been protected from cuts for the past four years, but the scale of financial challenge facing the County Council now has required action to be taken to reduce the budget by 38% in line with the actual funding available. On 29 May 2014 the members of the Health Improvement Board agreed a proposal for how to implement the reduction of funding for housing related support services to go forward to consultation with other stakeholders.

Cabinet had before them a report that outlined the findings from the public consultation and which set out proposals on the way forward following that consultation and consideration and approval by the members of the Health Improvement Board on 20 October 2014 and of the Health and Wellbeing Board on 13 November 2014.

Councillor Price, Shadow Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, stated that she was glad that the consultation had been extended. She welcomed the use of public health funding to allow the reduction to be phased over two years. She referred to the ongoing work looking at the domestic abuse service and urged Cabinet to lobby the Police & Crime Commissioner for a contribution to this service. She welcomed further pooling and input from District Councils.

Councillor Heathcoat, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, introduced the contents of the report stressing the openness of the process followed. The proposals had been discussed at the Health Improvement Board and at the Health & Wellbeing Board and the District Council representatives had been fully engaged. She thanked the Chief Executives and the Oxfordshire Councils Leaders Group and Natalia Lachkou for their hard work in delivering what was a good outcome.

RESOLVED: to approve the proposed plan for re-commissioning of housing related support services, as revised following the consultation.

8/15 LTP4 AND OXFORD TRANSPORT STRATEGY

(Agenda Item. 9)

Connecting Oxfordshire: Local Transport Plan 2015-2031 (the 'Local Transport Plan') sets out the Council's county-wide policy and strategy for transport. It has an important role in helping to secure the infrastructure necessary to support economic and housing growth in the County, by setting out clearly what we want to achieve and why it is necessary.

Following internal, stakeholder and public consultation on goals and objectives last summer Cabinet considered a report seeking approval to the consultation draft of the Plan that, will go forward for public consultation in February/March, returning for final Cabinet approval and adoption by Full Council (as it is a statutory document) by summer 2015.

Cabinet was advised that the consultation period would be for 8 weeks rather than the 6 weeks referred to in the report.

Mr Braithwaite, Chairman of South Newington Parish Council, spoke on the apparent absence of any definite proposals in the draft LTP4 for reducing HGV use of the A361 between Banbury and Chipping Norton. He stated that the route was an obvious one from Banbury and attracted a significant number of vehicles yet there was no route strategy included in the Plan. This was despite an acknowledgement by officers that it was not suitable due to

the route passing through a number of small towns. He asked that the problem be addressed in a coherent way within the plan

Councillor Fooks, speaking as a local councillor, welcomed a number of good things in the plan including the reference to cyclists, the rail strategy (although she would have liked to see a reference to the use of Witney), the Northern Gateway and the strategic link road from the A40. She queried whether another bridge was planned over the ring road to reduce the problems for cyclists attempting to cross it. However with regard to Park & Ride sites she felt that there appeared to be a lack of joined up thinking and that the City Council and County Council could have formulated a better approach together. She added that an index to the Plan would be helpful.

Councillor Hudspeth responded to the points made commenting that as a cyclist he found it easy to cross the ring road at Wolvercote roundabout by getting off his bicycle. The County Council had discussed its plans for Park & ride with the City Council and he explained that the aim was to take the sites outside of the ring road so that users of the Park & Ride were not adding to congestion within the ring road. It had the added benefit of freeing up space for affordable homes.

Councillor Howson, speaking as a local councillor, noted that surface railways were generally more cost effective than tunnels. He recognised the increasing numbers of journeys each day and that, even with increased bus use, traffic problems would continue. He commented on two specific proposals, to ban cross city traffic by 2031 closing the north-south route across the City and to introduce traffic management restrictions on the Banbury Road. He felt that there was a lack of clarity and that the Council could usefully have employed DoT value for money tools, as happened at Lewisham Council.

Councillor Hards, speaking as a local councillor, made reference to the Science Vale parts of the Plan and report. He noted that there was recognition of the need to deal with pinch points and that the work on Milton Interchange would cause problems initially but be helpful over the long term. He expressed concerns over issues of access to Didcot. In particular he drew attention to concerns over future bus access and the threat to current bus arrangements. There was to be consultation over the further phase of Orchard Centre development and it was important that this scheme did not jeopardise the bus service. Councillor Hudspeth agreed that it was important not to lose that link.

Councillor Nimmo Smith in moving the recommendations thanked officers and the cross-party working group involved in the preparation of the draft documents. It was a county wide document with specific strategies and those strategies had been prioritised to areas of most growth or activity. Strategies had not been developed for smaller urban areas such as Henley or Chipping Norton, but should there be development pressures then they could be needed in the future. Dealing with HGV movements was a difficult balancing act that needed to recognise the legitimate rights of vehicles whilst

addressing problems. Bev Hindle, Deputy Director, Strategy & Infrastructure Planning confirmed that the Plan contained the flexibility to produce further strategies over time. He gave assurances that officers were aware of the City Council plans for Park & Ride. On the Orchard Centre site officers had been clear about not wishing to lose bus penetration through that site.

During discussion Councillor Hibbert Biles referred to previous plans to take HGVs out of Chipping Norton. She noted that a chapter on strategies for smaller towns had been removed and that she felt unable to support the Plan until that chapter had been included. Councillor Stratford asked that the lead member and officers liaise closely with Cherwell District Council over the preparation of their Bicester Transport Strategy to ensure that it harmonised with LTP4 and was practical, realistic and deliverable.

RESOLVED: (on a show of hands by 8 votes to 1) to approve the draft Local Transport Plan for Public Consultation.

9/15 COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDERS - REQUIRED TO DELIVER CITY DEAL

(Agenda Item. 10)

The Council's Major Infrastructure Delivery Commercial Team is managing the delivery of a number of major highway improvement schemes. Some of these schemes require additional land to enable delivery of the proposed improvements which will reduce congestion, improve movement, access and safety and encourage use of sustainable transport. Cabinet considered a report that provided a list of schemes (with supporting compulsory purchase order land details) that require additional land.

The report further requested approval for the Director for Environment and Economy in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment to exercise delegated authority for use of Compulsory Purchase powers for the purchase of land for these schemes, in the event that this land required cannot be purchased by negotiation.

Councillor Hards, speaking as a local councillor, welcomed the schemes and the steps proposed to secure the land needed but urged that officers ensure that they identify all the land required for CPO purposes at the start of the process.

Councillor Nimmo Smith in moving the recommendations commented that the reason for the proposed CPO's was to keep options open to enable progress on these very important schemes.

RESOLVED: to:

- (a) approve delegation of the exercising of compulsory purchase powers to the Director of Environment and Economy in consultation with the Executive Cabinet member, for the purchase of land required for the delivery of the following major infrastructure schemes as outlined in

this report, further to the Council seeking (exhaustively) to acquire the necessary land through negotiation with the landowners:

- Chilton Interchange
- Featherbed and Steventon Lights
- Harwell Phase 1
- Harwell Phase 2 - Hagbourne Hill
- Ducklington Lane Corridor Improvements, Witney

- (b) note that in so far as the whole or any part or parts of land required is not acquired by negotiation the making of a compulsory purchase order, under provisions contained in Part X11 of the Highways Act 1980 for the acquisition of the land, will be progressed. This could include providing the necessary attendance, expert witness provision, etc. at a public inquiry if required.

10/15 CABINET BUSINESS MONITORING REPORT FOR QUARTER 2
(Agenda Item. 11)

Cabinet had before them a report that provided details of performance for quarter two (2014-15) for the Cabinet to consider. The report is required so that the Cabinet can monitor the performance of the Council in key service areas and be assured that progress is being made to improve areas where performance is below the expected level.

Councillor Brighouse, speaking as Chairman of the Performance Scrutiny Committee advised that the Committee was looking at all Performance Indicators on a regular basis but also focussing on a different aspect each time. The main issue at the last meeting had been around adult social care and the increase in safeguarding alerts. The next meeting would look at section 106 agreements and the Carillion contract.

Councillor Heathcoat in response, whilst acknowledging the seriousness of the issue, commented that some members of the Committee had perhaps not been aware that the increase in safeguarding alerts was caused by increasing awareness both of safeguarding issues and the ways it could be reported and dealt with. Councillor Brighouse added that it was important to test that this was the cause of the increase

Following discussion Cabinet:

RESOLVED: to note the performance reported in the dashboards.

11/15 DELEGATED POWERS OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE - JANUARY 2015

(Agenda Item. 12)

.....

RESOLVED: to note the executive decision taken by the Chief Executive under the specific powers and functions delegated to her under the terms of Part 7.3 of the Council’s Constitution– Paragraph 6.3(c)(i):

<i>Date</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Reasons for Urgency</i>
14 January 2015	Request for Exemption from the Contract Procedure Rules – Request in relation to further education provision for learners with special educational needs	Approve an exemption from tendering with the Council’s Contract Procedure Rules in respect of contracts in respect of commencing or continuing contracts in the academic year 2014/2015 for the provision of education to learners with higher special educational needs which result in contracts with a value of over £75,000	To ensure continuity of provision for individuals with higher special educational needs.

12/15 FORWARD PLAN AND FUTURE BUSINESS

(Agenda Item. 13)

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

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

..... in the Chair

Date of signing

2015