



County Council

21 March 2017

Agenda

Declarations of Interest

The duty to declare.....

Under the Localism Act 2011 it is a criminal offence to

- (a) fail to register a disclosable pecuniary interest within 28 days of election or co-option (or re-election or re-appointment), or
- (b) provide false or misleading information on registration, or
- (c) participate in discussion or voting in a meeting on a matter in which the member or co-opted member has a disclosable pecuniary interest.

Whose Interests must be included?

The Act provides that the interests which must be notified are those of a member or co-opted member of the authority, or

- those of a spouse or civil partner of the member or co-opted member;
- those of a person with whom the member or co-opted member is living as husband/wife
- those of a person with whom the member or co-opted member is living as if they were civil partners.

(in each case where the member or co-opted member is aware that the other person has the interest).

What if I remember that I have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest during the Meeting?.

The Code requires that, at a meeting, where a member or co-opted member has a disclosable interest (of which they are aware) in any matter being considered, they disclose that interest to the meeting. The Council will continue to include an appropriate item on agendas for all meetings, to facilitate this.

Although not explicitly required by the legislation or by the code, it is recommended that in the interests of transparency and for the benefit of all in attendance at the meeting (including members of the public) the nature as well as the existence of the interest is disclosed.

A member or co-opted member who has disclosed a pecuniary interest at a meeting must not participate (or participate further) in any discussion of the matter; and must not participate in any vote or further vote taken; and must withdraw from the room.

Members are asked to continue to pay regard to the following provisions in the code that *“You must serve only the public interest and must never improperly confer an advantage or disadvantage on any person including yourself”* or *“You must not place yourself in situations where your honesty and integrity may be questioned.....”*.

Please seek advice from the Monitoring Officer prior to the meeting should you have any doubt about your approach.

List of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests:

Employment (includes *“any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain”*.), **Sponsorship, Contracts, Land, Licences, Corporate Tenancies, Securities.**

For a full list of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and further Guidance on this matter please see the Guide to the New Code of Conduct and Register of Interests at Members’ conduct guidelines. <http://intranet.oxfordshire.gov.uk/wps/wcm/connect/occ/Insite/Elected+members/> or contact Glenn Watson on **07776 997946** or glenn.watson@oxfordshire.gov.uk for a hard copy of the document.

If you have any special requirements (such as a large print version of these papers or special access facilities) please contact the officer named on the front page, but please give as much notice as possible before the meeting.

To: **Members of the County Council**

Notice of a Meeting of the County Council

Tuesday, 21 March 2017 at 10.00 am

Council Chamber - County Hall, New Road, Oxford OX1 1ND



P.G. Clark
Chief Executive

March 2017

Committee Officer: **Deborah Miller**
Tel: 07920 084239; E-Mail: deborah.miller@oxfordshire.gov.uk

In order to comply with the Data Protection Act 1998, notice is given that Items 3, 7 and 12 will be recorded. The purpose of recording proceedings is to provide an *aide-memoire* to assist the clerk of the meeting in the drafting of minutes.

Members are asked to sign the attendance book which will be available in the corridor outside the Council Chamber. A list of members present at the meeting will be compiled from this book.

A buffet luncheon will be provided

AGENDA

1. Minutes (Pages 1 - 6)

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 14 February 2017 (CC1) and to receive information arising from them.

2. Apologies for Absence

3. Declarations of Interest - see guidance note

Members are reminded that they must declare their interests orally at the meeting and specify (a) the nature of the interest and (b) which items on the agenda are the relevant items. This applies also to items where members have interests by virtue of their membership of a district council in Oxfordshire.

4. Official Communications

5. Appointments

To make any changes to the membership of the Cabinet, scrutiny and other committees on the nomination of political groups.

6. Petitions and Public Address

7. Questions with Notice from Members of the Public

8. Questions with Notice from Members of the Council

9. Report of the Council (Pages 7 - 12)

Report of the Cabinet Meetings held on 20 December 2016, 24 January 2017 and 21 February 2017 (CC9).

10. Interim Arrangements for taking Emergency Decisions immediately following the County Council Elections

Under the provisions of section 7 of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), all the existing County Councillors will retire together on the fourth day following the elections (i.e. on 9 May 2017) and the newly elected and re-elected Councillors will take office from that day. All positions under the Council's political management arrangements except for the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Council and the Leader (for each of which there is a specific statutory exemption) fall vacant on that day, until they are filled at the first meeting of the County Council on 16 May 2017. In terms of formal member decision making there will therefore be a hiatus during this period and some provision will need to be made in the event that any urgent decisions are required.

Under the Constitution the Chief Executive has delegated power to take any Executive or non-Executive decision after consultation with the appropriate Director and following consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council or (in the case of non-executive functions) the relevant Committee Chairman and Deputy Chairman. As these positions will not be confirmed until 16 May 2017 this delegation will need to be temporarily varied so that these powers can be exercised following

consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Council and the Leader.

The Council is therefore RECOMMENDED to agree a temporary variation to Part 7.2 of the Constitution Specific Powers and Functions of Particular Officers with effect that from 9 May to 16 May 2017 paragraph 6.3 (c) is to be read as follows:-

“(c) Any function of the Cabinet or of a Council committee or sub-committee, after consultation with the appropriate Director and thereafter with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Council and the Leader, as appropriate.”

11. Constitution Review (Pages 13 - 18)

Under the Constitution, the Monitoring Officer is required to monitor and review the operation of the Constitution to ensure that its aims, principles and requirements are given full effect. This includes making recommendations to Council on any necessary amendments. The Monitoring Officer is authorised to make any changes to the Constitution which are required to:

- Comply with the law
- Give effect to the decisions of Council (or Cabinet, Committees etc.)
- Correct errors and otherwise for accuracy or rectification

Other changes will only be made by Full Council, following a recommendation of the Monitoring Officer.

This report therefore:

- recommends one change for Council's approval;
- notes that the Monitoring Officer will make any consequential changes to the Constitution arising from the Senior Management Review; and
- lists certain changes made by the Monitoring Officer under his delegated powers, for noting.

Council is RECOMMENDED to:

- (a) agree the proposed change to the Council Procedure Rules outlined at paragraph 6 of this report (Financial Procedure Rules, write off provisions);***
- (b) note that the Monitoring Officer will make any consequential amendments to the Constitution arising from the senior management review;***
- (c) note the changes already made to the Constitution by the Monitoring Officer under delegated powers since the last annual Constitution Review report to Council (as outlined in Annex 1 to the report).***

12. Response to the NHS Consultation on the Oxfordshire Transformation Programme (Pages 19 - 28)

Report from the County Leadership Team (CC12).

On 21 February the Cabinet considered a paper from the Council leadership team

setting out the officers' assessment of the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group's (OCCG) proposals for the future of health and care services in the County. They agreed the following recommendation, 'to welcome the opportunity to comment on this consultation, acknowledge the difficulties faced by NHS services locally as presented in the OCCGs case for change, but on balance not to support the proposals based on the lack of information on the impact on council services and that of the public.'

Cabinet's views on the proposals were presented to the Oxfordshire Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OJHOSC) on 7 March. The OJHOSC is the statutory consultee on substantial developments or variations in the provision of the health service. OJHOSC invited evidence from a wide range of organisations and will be responding to the OCCG consultation with comments and recommendations as well as meeting again to consider whether the OCCG has responded adequately to the issues it has raised.

Due to the scale, impact and interest of all members in the proposals to transform local health services Cabinet wants to give County Council the opportunity to consider the potential impact on council services and the public. These views will be collated and fed back to the OCCG as part of the consultation process.

A copy of the Consultation document can be found on the CCG web site: [The Oxfordshire Big Health & Care Consultation: Phase 1 - Consultation Document](#)

Council is RECOMMENDED to:

- (a) note the views expressed to HOSC by Cabinet on the proposals;**
- (b) identify any further concerns regarding the proposals;**
- (c) agree for Officers to summarise these further concerns to the OCCG as a response to the consultation;**
- (d) Share these concerns with HOSC to aid their further consideration of the OCCG proposals.**

MOTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

WOULD MEMBERS PLEASE NOTE THAT ANY AMENDMENTS TO MOTIONS WITH NOTICE MUST BE PRESENTED TO THE PROPER OFFICER IN WRITING BY 9.00 AM ON THE MONDAY BEFORE THE MEETING

13. Motion From Councillor Liz Brighouse

"Despite:

- paying higher per hour costs than most authorities to our Home Care Providers;
- investing a significant amount of time and resources in enhancing the status of Home Care workers; and
- having changed the contracting arrangements for Home Care;

there is still a perception that this is a low status profession with poor pay and conditions of service. There is now a severe crisis in recruitment of Home Care professionals which is a greater threat to services than the financial challenges.

Oxfordshire County Council therefore asks the Cabinet to start a process to:

- create a directly employed workforce with training, continuous professional development, fair pay and conditions of service at its core;
- provide training and education opportunities for young people in this area of employment and engage with young people in considering the caring professions as a future career path.”

14. Motion From Councillor Melinda Tilley

“This Council is concerned about the prevalence of prejudice-related bullying in schools and online, particularly the impact on vulnerable groups.

We are aware that cyber bullying is a growing issue and that some groups of children are more likely to experience and be affected by bullying. This Council, along with the Children’s Trust, and Corporate Parenting Panel, will do everything we can to raise awareness and try to halt this toxic bullying.”

15. Motion From Councillor Howson

“Across Oxfordshire small primary schools serve an important purpose in creating an education system where the school is firmly located within its community. Children can walk or cycle to school: these schools form a vital hub for many communities.

This Council wishes to express concern to the government at Westminster that the new funding formula for schools does not destroy schools with fewer than 250 pupils unintentionally, as a result of making them financially unviable.

Many of these schools have been part of the education scene in Oxfordshire for more than 150 years.

Around 100 primary schools in Oxfordshire lose money under the proposed new formula and schools set to receive extra funding will be capped below the amount they should receive.

This Council asks the Cabinet Member for Education to write to the Secretary of State for Education to express the concerns of this Council that the proposed new formula could lead to the wholesale closure of small schools, especially as any resulting increase in transport costs would fall on the council tax payers of Oxfordshire and additionally that some Oxfordshire schools will not receive the full funding identified as due to them under the new formula.”

16. Motion From Councillor Mark Cherry

“The Bankside Road is needed urgently if the town is to avoid total gridlock on its roads. Oxfordshire is a net contributor to the National Economy and the North of the County continues to grow with the construction of 8000 houses and the construction of HS2. Therefore more businesses and more vehicles are inevitable. This issue has been talked about for over 30 years and it is now time for action.

"This Council calls on the Leader of Oxfordshire County Council to give urgent consideration of the Bankside link Road and for this to be prioritised in the Banbury area strategy in LTP4."

17. Motion From Councillor David Williams

"In view of the continued opposition to the ONE Oxfordshire proposals this Council calls on Cabinet not to pursue the proposal at this stage and that spending to promote the concept ends. Further dialogue will now be entered into with the District and City authorities to seek a more consensual agreement as to what form of unitary local government is eventually presented to Central Government."

18. Motion From Councillor Richard Webber

"District Councils have responsibility for measuring and monitoring Air Quality and, where appropriate, putting in place Air Quality Management Areas and Action Plans. Unfortunately, most of the possible remedial actions to counteract worsening Air Quality are costly, involve Highway and traffic issues and fall on the cash-strapped County Council. This has led to, frustration from residents and a feeling that "nothing can be done".

Council believes that the growing national and government awareness of the health and economic implications of poor Air Quality, together with the opportunity offered by a Unitary Council to bring under one roof all Air Quality issues, Council therefore asks the Director for Environment & Economy to explore, as a matter of urgency, the feasibility and legality of demanding s106 contributions from *all* developments in Oxfordshire, with such contributions increasing from developments in or near established AQMAs. This would allow the sum of money accrued to be used on Air Quality alleviation measures."

19. Motion From Councillor Anne Purse

"Lorries parking for long periods of time in laybys on Oxford's Ring Road, and in particular the Eastern Bypass between Headington and Cowley, continue to bring a nuisance to local residents and other road users. Because the drivers stay for hours at a time, many overnight, where there are no toilets they habitually use the roadside verges instead. This is a serious matter which ought to be and can be resolved, but that does not mean just moving the problem to another area.

Council therefore requests that the Cabinet Member Environment holds talks urgently with those large local businesses likely to attract numerous vehicle deliveries regarding the provision of proper systems and facilities for parked lorry drivers, so reducing the unpleasantness and growing risk to public health being caused at present."

Pre-Meeting Briefing

There will be a pre-meeting briefing at County Hall on **Monday 20 March 2017 at 10.15 am** for the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Group Leaders and Deputy Group Leaders

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 1

OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting held on Tuesday, 14 February 2017 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 4.50 pm.

Present:

Councillor Michael Waine – in the Chair

Councillors:

Lynda Atkins	Janet Godden	James Mills
Jamila Azad	Mark Gray	David Nimmo Smith
David Bartholomew	Patrick Greene	Neil Owen
Mike Beal	Tim Hallchurch MBE	Zoé Patrick
Maurice Billington	Pete Handley	Glynis Phillips
Liz Brighthouse OBE	Jenny Hannaby	Susanna Pressel
Kevin Bulmer	Nick Hards	Laura Price
Nick Carter	Neville F. Harris	Anne Purse
Louise Chapman	Steve Harrod	Alison Rooke
Mark Cherry	Mrs Judith Heathcoat	Gillian Sanders
John Christie	Hilary Hibbert-Biles	John Sanders
Sam Coates	John Howson	Les Sibley
Yvonne Constance OBE	Ian Hudspeth	Roz Smith
Steve Curran	Bob Johnston	Lawrie Stratford
Surinder Dhesi	Stewart Lilly	John Tanner
Arash Fatemian	Lorraine Lindsay-Gale	Melinda Tilley
Neil Fawcett	Sandy Lovatt	Richard Webber
Jean Fooks	Mark Lygo	David Williams
Mrs C. Fulljames	Kieron Mallon	David Wilmshurst
Anthony Gearing	Charles Mathew	

The Council considered the matters, reports and recommendations contained or referred to in the agenda for the meeting and decided as set out below. Except insofar as otherwise specified, the reasons for the decisions are contained in the agenda and reports, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.

98/17 MINUTES

(Agenda Item 1)

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 13 December 2016 were approved and signed.

99/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

(Agenda Item 2)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Langridge, Reynolds and Rose.

100/17 OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS

(Agenda Item 4)

The Chairman reported as follows:

Council paid tribute to Chief Fire Officer Dave Etheridge OBE, who had announced his retirement after a distinguished 32 year career in the County Council's Fire and Rescue Service. He is also President of The Chief Fire Officers Association (CFOA). Dave Etheridge OBE would retire from his role on 31 March 2017, to coincide with his final day as the President of CFOA. Council sent best wishes for his future.

Council paid tribute to honour the memory of Former Alderman David Buckle, County Councillor who had sadly passed away over the weekend of 21st-22nd January 2017. The title of Honorary Alderman had been conferred upon the then former Councillor Buckle in May 2013, in recognition of his having made a significant contribution to the Oxfordshire County Council. Alderman Buckle had also a member of the Labour Group, representing the Wood Farm division from May 1989. He served as Chairman of the Council from July 1996 until 12th May 1998, continuing to serve as a member of Council until June 2001, when he stood down.

101/17 APPOINTMENTS

(Agenda Item 5)

Members noted that Councillor Hudspeth had given notice of the following change to portfolio responsibilities in accordance with Council Procedure Rules Part 4.2 Para 1.2.4, to take effect from Tuesday 10 January 2017:

The following addition to the portfolio responsibility of Councillor Judith Heathcoat, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care:

Champion for Mental Health.

This progressed the Council resolution in November to sign up to the Local Authorities' Mental Health Challenge which requires a lead member for mental health to be in place.

102/17 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda Item 6)

The Council received the following Public Address:

Rachael Scott-Hunter spoke against the proposals to stop financially supporting day support centres. She referred to her experience as a parent caring for a severely disabled adult daughter and the importance to her of Kidlington Day Centre which she had attended for the past 26 years and was a totally safe space and respected her physical and mental needs. Changes would bring about anxiety, stress and challenging behaviours. Her daughter would be separated from friends and would be sent to an inappropriate hub

with elderly patients. She believed the proposals were against basic human rights. She urged Council to put themselves into her daughter's shoes.

Ted Cooper resident of Witney expressed the disquiet of users of his local centre in Witney. He expressed his dismay that no one from the Council had visited the centre and that users had not been directly consulted. There were particular concerns around transport. He believed that some elderly people would not be able to manage the online registration process and that booking a seat a week in advance was not practicable and that the time allowed at the centre due to transport limited integration within the centre. He urged the Council to consider making some small changes, particularly around transport, to make the proposals workable.

Maggie Swain, Chair of the October Club Management Committee emphasised the value of the Wantage & Grove Independent Day Centre which provided support in a small local group particularly for those with Alzheimer's/dementia who would struggle with transport and responded better in a smaller less busy environment. The safe and stimulating environment was available to people 5 days a week for 6 hours and enabled people to remain at home longer and provided essential respite for careers. She believed that closing clubs such as this one would be at high cost to the Council and the NHS. She urged the Council to consider the detrimental effect of losing the support of volunteers and voluntary groups for the future.

103/17 PAY POLICY STATEMENT - REPORT OF THE REMUNERATION COMMITTEE

(Agenda Item 7)

The Council had before them the report of the Remuneration Committee (CC7) which updated the Council's Pay Policy Statement and set out future proposals of the Remuneration Committee in relation to this area.

RESOLVED: (on a Motion by Councillor Hudspeth, seconded by Councillor Webber and carried nem con) to:

- (a) receive the report of the Remuneration Committee;
- (b) approve the revised Pay Policy Statement at Annex 2 to this report.

104/17 APPOINTMENT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

(Agenda Item 8)

The Council had before them a report which following a senior management review and consultation with the Cabinet recommended the appointment of Peter Clerk to the post of Chief Executive of Oxfordshire County Council.

RESOLVED: (on a motion by Councillor Hudspeth, seconded by Councillor Heathcoat and carried nem con) to approve the appointment of Peter Clark to the post of Chief Executive with effect from 14 February 2017.

105/17 SERVICE & RESOURCE PLANNING 2017/18 - 2020/21

(Agenda Item 9)

The Council had before it a report (CC9) which outlined the service & resource planning process for 2107/18 to 2020/21, including the Leader of the Council's overview (section 1) the Council Vision (section 2) the Director of Finance's statutory report (section 3) and the Budget Strategy and Capital Programme (Section 4)

Under Section 25 of the Local government Act 2003, the Director of Finance was required to report on the robustness of the estimates made in determining the council tax requirement and on the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves. The assessment was set out in section 3 of the report. Council was required to have due regard to this report when making their decisions on the budget.

The Council also had before it budget proposals in the form of: Amendments by the Labour Group to the Cabinet's Revenue Budget (CC9 Labour), Amendments by the Liberal Democrat Group to the Cabinet's Revenue Budget (CC9 Lib Dem) and Amendments by the Green Group to the Cabinet's Revenue Budget (CC9 Green) (Additional Papers). and the schedule of Business, which contained an Erratum Pack and corrected Green Group Amendment. All papers could be found on the Council's Website.

With the consent of Council, Councillor Hudspeth moved an Alteration to the Cabinet Budget Proposals (CPR 17.5.1) as set out in the Schedule of Business. The Motion was put to the vote and was carried nem con.

Councillor Hudspeth then moved and Councillor Stratford seconded the Cabinet's recommendations on Service & Resource Planning 2017/18 – 2020/21. In moving the motion, Councillor Hudspeth paid tribute to Lorna Baxter and Katie Jurczynszyn for all their work in preparing the budget.

Councillor Brighthouse moved and Councillor Hards seconded an amendment to the Cabinet's budget as set out in the Additional Papers (CC9 Labour). Councillor Brighthouse thanked the Director of Finance and her team for their help and support.

Following debate, the amendment was put to the vote and was lost by 41 votes to 17.

Councillor Webber moved and Councillor Fawcett seconded an amendment to the Cabinet's budget as set out in the Additional Papers (CC9 Lib Dem). In moving his motion, Councillor Webber paid tribute to Lorna Baxter and her team for their help and support.

Following debate, the amendment was put to the vote and was lost by 44 votes to 12, with 3 abstentions.

With the consent of Council, Councillor Williams moved and Councillor Coates seconded an amended version of his amendment to the Cabinet's budget as set out in the Erratum to the Schedule of Business. Councillor Williams paid tribute to the Finance Team.

Following debate, the amendment was put to the vote and was lost by 56 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

Members of the Cabinet then gave an overview of the areas of the Budget falling under their responsibility.

Following a lengthy debate, the substantive motion was put to the vote and was carried by 31 votes to 29.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing

This page is intentionally left blank

Division(s): N/A

COUNTY COUNCIL – 21 MARCH 2017

REPORT OF THE CABINET

Cabinet Member: Leader

1. Senior Management Review

(Cabinet, 20 December 2016)

Cabinet had before them a report on the conclusions of the Senior Management Review and seeking approval of the proposed recommendations including a new structure. Cabinet also considered the views of members from an all Member Briefing, full Council and Audit & Governance Committee.

Cabinet endorsed the Senior Management Review recommendations and proposed structure; agreed in principle that the post of County Director should be made permanent and re-designated Chief Executive and pending a permanent appointment (decision taken at a meeting of full Council on 13 February 2017), Cabinet endorsed Peter Clark's re-designation from County Director to Interim Chief Executive.

2. Response to the NHS Consultation on the Oxfordshire Transformation Programme

(Cabinet, 21 February 2017)

The Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group had launched the first phase of its consultation on the future of Oxfordshire Health and Care Services on January 16th 2017. The County Council was a consultee in the process. Cabinet had before them a report providing an assessment by the Council Leadership Team on the potential impact the proposals and agreed that their views and the officer's assessment be reported to Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 7 March and that they be considered at this Council to gather further comment.

N.B. This matter is included on the full Council agenda for consideration.

Cabinet Member: Deputy Leader

3. Cabinet Business Monitoring Report for Quarter 2

(Cabinet, 24 January 2017)

Cabinet noted a report that provided details of performance for quarter two. 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.

4. Staffing Report, Quarter 3 2016/17

(Cabinet, 21 February 2017)

Cabinet agreed a report that gave an update on staffing numbers and related activity during the period 1 October 2016 to 31 December 2016.

Cabinet Member: Adult Social Care

5. Daytime Support Review

(Cabinet, 24 January 2017)

Cabinet considered a report that asked them to consider the results of the public consultation on the proposed model and options for daytime support in Oxfordshire, and the recommended way forward. Cabinet were asked to recommend the County Council's future funding of daytime support and approach to delivering this, for a final decision by Council on 14 February as part of the broader budget-setting process.

Cabinet agreed the proposals for community and voluntary support including the building based option for delivery of the Community Support Service. Cabinet further agreed charges for the Community Support Service and the method of charging.

6. Carers; Strategy and Carers' Personal Budgets.

(Cabinet, 24 January 2017)

In February 2016, the Council agreed savings against carers' services totalling £660,000. This included a suggestion that savings could be made by introducing charging for carers' services.

It was found following investigation that the introduction of charging for carers' services was not viable and would not produce the savings required. Proposals for releasing funding by redesigning carers' personal budgets were developed, and these proposals were the subject of a public consultation, alongside the refreshed and updated version of the Oxfordshire Carers' Strategy.

Cabinet considered a report on the outcome of the public consultation and seeking approval to the proposed way forward. Cabinet approved the revised carers' personal budget payment and to welcome the intention of Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group to fund an enhanced information and advice offer via direct GP referral in accordance with paragraphs 24 and 26 of the report.

7. Housing Related Support Pooled Budget Arrangements.

(Cabinet, 24 January 2017)

The County Council together with the five city/district councils and the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group has developed under the Health Improvement Board umbrella a new commissioning plan for housing related

support services in light of the County Council's £1.5m budget reduction by 2019/20.

Cabinet had before them a report seeking approval to enter into this new partnering agreement. Cabinet agreed to contribute to a pooled budget for housing related support, under the terms of the proposed partnering agreement.

Cabinet Member: Education

8. Financial and Resource Contribution Towards the Swan School Project in Oxford

(Cabinet, 21 February 2017)

The Department for Education has approved a proposal to create a new secondary school in Oxford (to be known as The Swan School) providing 900 places for 11 - 16 year olds plus sixth form. Subject to the necessary planning consents, The Swan School will be located on the Harlow Centre site in Marston which is owned by the Council and currently leased (125 years) to the Radcliffe Academy Trust. Cabinet gave approval for a financial and resource contribution towards the project.

Cabinet Member: Environment

9. Proposed Amendments to Traffic and Access Restrictions - Queen Street, Oxford

(Cabinet, 20 December 2016)

A report on proposals for changes to access for buses, taxis and cyclists in Queen Street was considered by the Cabinet Member for Environment on 24th November 2016, seeking a delegated decision of the Cabinet Member.

The Cabinet Member for Environment decided at that meeting to refer the matter to full Cabinet on 20 December. Cabinet had before them the original report to the cabinet Member for Environment together with a further report that highlighted a number of issues the Cabinet needed to be aware of in considering this matter.

Cabinet agreed to instruct officers to report to a future Cabinet meeting on a proposal for an experimental closure of Queen Street to buses and taxis which address the concerns about conditions in St Aldates and High Street raised during the recent consultation and which does not rely on the bus turning facility at Worcester Street. They further agreed that the report should include consideration of banning cyclists for the experimental period.

10. Oxfordshire Minerals & Waste Local Plan – Core Strategy

(Cabinet, 24 January 2017)

The County Council has a statutory duty to prepare a new Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan, to provide an effective planning strategy and policies for the supply of minerals and management of waste in the county, consistent with environmental, social and economic needs. The Oxfordshire

Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy (the Plan) was approved by the County Council in March 2015 and submitted for independent examination by a planning inspector in December 2015. Following a hearing held in September 2016, the Inspector has issued an Interim Report requiring further work. That work has been undertaken, and Cabinet considered a report seeking approval to publish for consultation proposed modifications to the Plan and the Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) of reasonable alternatives. Cabinet agreed the modifications for publication for public consultation.

Cabinet Member: Finance

11. 2016/17 Financial Monitoring & Business Strategy Report -

(Cabinet, 20 December 2016 and 21 February 2017)

Cabinet considered two financial monitoring reports for 2016/17 that focused on the delivery of the Directorate Business Strategies that were agreed as part of the Service and Resource Planning Process for 2016/17 – 2019/20.

In December Parts 1 and 2 included projections for revenue, reserves and balances as at the end of October 2016. Capital Programme monitoring was included at Part 3. In February the report included projections for revenue, reserves and balances as at the end of December 2016 and Capital Programme monitoring.

In December Cabinet approved a request for the creation of OXSIT traded service Reserve; approved debt write off; approved changes to the Capital Programme and noted the settlement of a debt and noted the Treasury Management lending list.

In February Cabinet approved virements, a supplementary estimate, debt write off, the creation of an Investment Reserve the use of the High Needs Strategic Planning grant and the increase to the Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) reserve for 2017/18. Cabinet also approved the release of £3.2m of development funding for the A40 Science Transit Scheme and the increase of £1.0m on the Milton Interchange scheme to enable the payment of the final account. Cabinet noted the Treasury management lending list and the changes to the Capital Programme.

12. Concluding Report of the Income Generation Cabinet Advisory Group

(Cabinet, 20 December 2016)

Cabinet considered and agreed a report seeking the conclusion of the work of the Income Generation Cabinet Advisory Group (CAG) which had explored options for income generation.

13. Transition Fund for Community Initiatives for Open Access Children's Services - February 2017

(Cabinet, 21 February 2017)

In February 2016 the Council had agreed to set aside £1m for creating a 'one off' fund to provide pump priming to support Children's Centres. It was agreed that a cross party group of county councillors would consider maximum benefit of this fund and bring proposals back to Cabinet for decision.

Cabinet approved the recommendations of the working group that had considered the applications under the first round of bids against the agreed criteria outlined in the guidance notes. Ten bids were agreed plus a further two interim awards at a total cost of £305,883. Cabinet further agreed to delegate authority to the Cabinet Member for Finance in consultation with the Director for Children's Services to approve bids following the transition fund meeting on 26 April 2017.

Cabinet Member: Property, Cultural and Community Services

14. Rents for Asset Transfer of Children's Centre

(Cabinet, 20 December 2016)

Cabinet had before them a report on the implications of the current asset transfer policy in supporting community groups to develop self-financing, sustainable proposals to take on responsibility for a children's centre. In particular it set out the financial implications of different possible approaches, and the additional support that could be offered to community groups in developing viable proposals.

Cabinet agreed: to extend additional support beyond 1st April to help community groups develop a viable business case fully; that a deadline is set for these cases to be brought forward to be considered at a 3rd and final round of the Transition Fund and to offer a defined, short-term rent-free period of up to a maximum of 12 months to support mobilisation, where the business case would otherwise not be viable with a review after 6 months to consider progress. After this initial period the rent would increase in line with the asset transfer policy, to 50% of the commercial rent level for the property.

IAN HUDSPETH

Leader of the Council

March 2017

This page is intentionally left blank

Division(s): N/A

COUNTY COUNCIL – 21 MARCH 2017

CONSTITUTION REVIEW

Report by the Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer

Introduction

1. Under the Constitution, the Monitoring Officer is required to monitor and review the operation of the Constitution to ensure that its aims, principles and requirements are given full effect. This includes making recommendations to Council on any necessary amendments. The Monitoring Officer is authorised to make any changes to the Constitution which are required to:
 - Comply with the law
 - Give effect to the decisions of Council (or Cabinet, Committees etc.)
 - Correct errors and otherwise for accuracy or rectification
2. Other changes will only be made by Full Council, following a recommendation of the Monitoring Officer.
3. This report therefore:
 - recommends certain changes for Council's *approval*; and
 - notes that the Monitoring Officer will make any consequential changes to the Constitution arising from the Senior Management Review;
 - lists certain changes made by the Monitoring Officer under his delegated powers, *for noting*.

Potential changes – Council approval needed

Write off of debts – Financial Procedure Rules

4. There is currently an inflexibility in the Financial Procedure Rules (Part 8.2 of the Constitution) where those procedures conflict somewhat with the Chief Legal Officer's delegated power (under Part 7.2) to "settle any legal proceedings...where the Chief Legal Officer considers that such action is necessary to protect the Council's interests.
5. The difficulty is that the current Financial Procedure Rules (paragraph 90) specifies that the delegated limit for officers to write off debts is £10,000 in any one case; otherwise "approval shall be required from the Cabinet". In some circumstances, the act of settling legal proceedings as envisaged in the scheme of delegation will necessarily involve detailed negotiations in order to reach a settlement in the public

interest; routinely to involve Cabinet in such circumstances is impractical and counterproductive.

6. It is therefore suggested that it would be appropriate to harmonise these requirements while retaining the necessary financial principles within the Procedure Rules. As such it is proposed that the write-off limits should continue to apply except in the cases where the Chief Legal Officer is involved legal proceedings where integral negotiations may require an effective write-off in the public interest. Any such write off would need to be discussed and agreed with the Chief Finance Officer before conclusion and Cabinet should be informed of the outcome. It is suggested that the amended text to paragraph 90 of the Financial Procedure Rules should be (new text in **bold**):

“For the purposes of the General Operational Powers of the County Director and Directors set out in Part 7.2 of the Constitution, the limit for the writing off of uncollectable debts (including bad debts) in any one case is £10,000. Over this limit, approval shall be required from the Cabinet **except in cases where the Chief Legal Officer is involved in the settlement of legal proceedings. In such cases, where an associated write off is involved, the write off will be approved in advance by the Chief Finance Officer. Cabinet will then be informed of the outcome. In any such circumstance, if the Chief Finance Officer considers that Cabinet’s approval for the write off should be sought in advance, this will be arranged.**”

7. The views of the Audit & Governance Committee were sought on this matter in January 2017 and the Committee was supportive of this change as an effective means of improving efficiency and good governance.

Amendments to be made as a consequence of the Senior Management Review – for noting

8. Any changes to the senior management structure arising from the Senior Management Review will require consequential amendments to the Constitution. The Monitoring Officer will make these changes under delegated powers. Mostly these will simply be changes to reflect new post titles. They are likely to require potential amendments mainly to the following:
- Article 13 – Officers: the description of the principal areas of responsibility for senior managers
 - Part 7.1 – Management Structure: an outline of the County Council Leadership Team
 - Part 8.4 – Officer Employment Procedure Rules: procedures for appointment to and dismissal from certain senior management posts

Amendments made during the year under delegated authority – for noting

9. Annex 1 to this report lists the changes made to the Constitution during the year by the Monitoring Officer under his powers. Each of these was either consequential on a decision of the Council, was required for legal reasons or was needed in order to bring greater clarity to the provisions in question.

Legal and procedural implications

10. There are no legal implications and the procedural implications relate to the respective provisions in the Council's Constitution which have been outlined in paragraphs 1, 2, 4, 6 and 8 in this report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

11. **Council is RECOMMENDED to:**
- (a) **agree the proposed change to the Council Procedure Rules outlined at paragraph 6 of this report (Financial Procedure Rules, write off provisions);**
 - (b) **note that the Monitoring Officer will make any consequential amendments to the Constitution arising from the senior management review;**
 - (c) **note the changes already made to the Constitution by the Monitoring Officer under delegated powers since the last annual Constitution Review report to Council (as outlined in Annex 1 to the report).**

NICK GRAHAM

Director of Law and Governance and Monitoring Officer

Contact Officer: Glenn Watson Tel: 07776 997946

March 2017

Constitution Review

Amendments made during the year under delegated authority

Amendments simply to reflect change of post title (to County Director)

Part 2, Article 10: Health and Wellbeing Board

Part 2, Article 13: Officers

Part 4.4: Delegated Decisions by individual cabinet members

Part 6.2: Overview and scrutiny procedure rules

Part 7.2: Scheme of Delegation

Part 8.2: Financial Procedure Rules

The above changes were consequential on the decision of Remuneration Committee on 6 April 2016 (Minute No12/16).

Part 3.1: Council Procedure Rules

Paragraph 13.5.1 (ii)(a) to reflect Council's decision to amplify the meaning of 'significant expenditure' in the context of treatment of motions. The definition of significant had been recognised as "expenditure of £10,000 or more".

The above change was approved by Full Council on 5 April 2016 – Minute No. 14/16.

The Council Procedure Rules govern how motions proposed at Full Council are handled. Rule 13.5.1 (ii)(a) sets out that in the case of a non-executive function, Full Council will (except at the February or budget-setting meeting) "debate and determine the motion" unless the motion if carried would lead to certain outcomes. One of these is that any such approved motion would "involve additional expenditure". It was considered by Full Council that this was too restrictive and the wording was therefore amended to give greater definition and flexibility.

Part 4.1: Membership of Cabinet and Shadow Cabinet

To reflect the change in Cabinet Membership (addition of Cllr Harrod) and the changes to the names of two portfolios (to Children's Services and Education respectively).

Part 8.3: Contract Procedure Rules (*Competitive Quotes and Tenders Section*)

Paragraphs 5.4 (i) and (ii): minor amendments to the threshold levels of required to meet changes to the EU directive thresholds applicable from 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2017.

Part 9.1, Annex 1: Members who are also members of a district council in Oxfordshire

List updated to reflect the outcome of the May 2016 city/district council elections.

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET – 21 FEBRUARY 2017

RESPONSE TO OXFORDSHIRE CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP'S CONSULTATION ON THE OXFORDSHIRE TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMME FOR NHS SERVICES

Report from the Council Leadership Team

Introduction

1. The Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group (OCCG) launched the first phase of its consultation on the future of Oxfordshire Health and Care Services on January 16th 2017. The consultation document and supporting pre-consultation business case can be found on the OCCG website <https://consult.oxfordshireccg.nhs.uk/consult.ti/BigconsultationPhase1/consultationHome>
2. Oxfordshire County Council is key stakeholder and a consultee in the process and has until 9th April to respond to the consultation- though the council may wish to respond in advance of the pre-election period.
3. This report has been prepared by the county council's leadership team and combines professional perspectives from across all our services including children's and adults' social care, highways, environment and economy, public health and fire and rescue services.
4. Officers have considered the proposals in the consultation document and present here their professional views on the possible impacts on our services and local people based on the information in the consultation document.
5. By way of context, it is important to acknowledge the challenges faced by the local NHS as set out in their case for change document. The NHS is a national organisation and the autonomy local authorities enjoy has not been extended in the same way to health services. This means that these proposals are influenced by national policy and are also overseen by NHS England and are inevitably a blend of local and national policy.
6. All county council services have been asked to consider the consultation proposals and the potential impact they may have on services and on the public. Some of the issues are generic and some are specific to particular service areas.

Consultation approach

7. We welcome the production of this consultation, but note that we had expected it to begin in October 2016 and to be structured as a single set of proposals with options. The consultation was then delayed and has now been produced as a partial consultation. It is unfortunate that there have been delays in getting the proposals out to public consultation and that this has resulted in two phases of consultation.

8. We acknowledge this phasing is due to a number of factors; a desire to debate existing temporary service closures as a matter of urgency, the sheer scale of the task involved in producing the proposals, and because of a requirement for NHS England to approve the proposals prior to consultation. The phasing clearly affects the coherence of the proposals making it difficult for partner organisations to assess their impact and to see a total vision for the future of health services in the county. It also makes the consultation feel less transparent to communities.
9. Our view is that the lack of options presented in the consultation document makes it difficult to consider different alternatives for future services. Options were presented earlier in the engagement phase leading up to the consultation, so it is unfortunate that they have not come through in these proposals.
10. We feel that the inception of Sustainability and Transformation Plans (STP) by the NHS at national level requiring clinical commissioning groups to work together across larger geographical 'footprints' (in our case the Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West- 'BOB') has not been helpful. These were created and imposed nationally by NHS England after the process of re-shaping Oxfordshire's services had begun. The interplay between a 'BOB STP' and an Oxfordshire consultation remains unclear and confusing both for professionals and for the public.
11. The consultation proposals as they stand are unlikely to satisfy the concerns of people in some parts of the county. People in the north of the county for example, are unlikely to find that the service changes described affecting the Horton Hospital offer a clear enough view of the future functioning of that hospital in its entirety.
12. Many of the proposals draw on specialist clinical evidence and opinion. The county council officers will not attempt to debate purely clinical judgements.

Vision for the future of the Horton Hospital

13. We understand that smaller hospitals across the country are facing similar pressures to those faced locally by the Horton Hospital. A clear vision for the future of such hospitals is urgently needed. However, because of the way the proposals are structured, and because there is no discussion of community and primary care services in this consultation, it is not possible to see an overall proposal for the detailed future composition and functions of the Horton Hospital in Banbury. However it is clear from the document that there is a future for the Horton as a health care facility with more diagnostic, outpatient and elective surgery appointments offered.
14. This is a vital issue for local people and is therefore a serious deficiency in the consultation document. Smaller hospitals are vulnerable to a 'domino effect', i.e. a diminution in one service tends to lead to a diminution in related services. In this case, changing maternity services, intensive care services and the bed-stock at the Horton may have knock-on effects on anaesthetics,

paediatrics and accident and emergency services. These possible impacts are not covered by this consultation.

Maternity services in North Oxfordshire

15. The consultation contains a clear proposal to make permanent the current temporary withdrawal of consultant obstetric services at the Horton Hospital. The Oxfordshire Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (HOSC) agreed to refer the temporary closure to the Secretary of State on 2nd February.
16. It should be noted that there are a number of difficulties with the way the information on maternity services is presented in the consultation:
 - a. Maternity services are not stand-alone as described above. The knock-on effects to other services and any additional community support are not covered. The impact on these services therefore cannot be assessed through these proposals and so a coherent assessment of the impact on local services in Banbury is not possible.
 - b. There is no clear information in the consultation about the extent to which the OCCG, the two major trusts, the ambulance service, Deaneries (which oversee the training and placement of junior doctors) and primary care organisations have come together with neighbouring services in Northamptonshire and Warwickshire to discuss wider solutions to maternity and related services for the people of Banbury and the surrounding area. This was a key recommendation of the Independent Review Panel in 2008 which did not support the then Oxford Radcliffe Hospitals NHS Trust's proposals to reconfigure services in paediatrics, obstetrics, gynaecology and the special care baby unit (SCBU) at the Horton Hospital.
 - c. The document also comments on the future of midwifery-led obstetric care in the north of the county, saying that a second consultation will discuss the future of midwifery-led obstetric units in Banbury and Chipping Norton. However these services are excluded from this consultation which makes coherent assessment of maternity services in the north of the county difficult.

Reducing hospital bed numbers across the County

17. The consultation document proposes to close, or make permanent existing closures of hospital bed stock. We understand that this is intended to help prevent admission and also to reduce potentially harmful long stays in hospital through the strengthening of community services. However, reducing bed-stock is a potentially significant issue, as there has been a national and local trend for some time to reduce hospital bed numbers. The UK already has lower numbers of beds than comparable European countries and the evidence is not yet available to conclude that this is an appropriate shift at the scale proposed.

18. Some reduction in bed numbers may be justified if suitable alternatives are put in place in the community in advance of the closures. Because the consultation does not touch on NHS services in the community and general practice, it is not possible to model the impact of this change.
19. At a time when pressures on emergency departments are rising and delayed transfers of care remain a cause for concern, it may be premature to make these changes. It may be more sensible for Oxfordshire to adopt a 'wait and see' policy on this issue until the impact of bed closures proposed in other parts of the country can be properly evaluated.

Stroke Services and Critical Care

20. The proposal to care for a modest number of patients per year in Oxford instead of Banbury (around 100 stroke cases per year and 41 critical care patients) on grounds of improved clinical quality is reasonable taken in isolation. However, again, the concern would be the 'domino-effect' on other services at the Horton, and these are not detailed in the consultation, making it difficult to comment on proposal in its totality.

Disadvantage and inequalities

21. There is little discussion of issues of disadvantage and inequalities in the consultation. Equality of access is touched on, but not inequality in terms of social disadvantage. The Health and Wellbeing Board's independent Commission on Health Inequalities has recently reported and points to high levels of social disadvantage, particularly in parts of Banbury and Oxford. The consultation does not set out how these proposals would be adjusted to reduce inequalities which is a core duty of the NHS.

Adult Social Care

22. The underlying principle in the proposals of care closer to home is an idea we support in principle. However, there are times in the acute phase of an illness or in cases requiring complex care or post-op care when a hospital bed may be the best place to be, followed by appropriate discharge to properly organised support as soon as practicable. Again, the proposals do not contain the detail we would need about community services for us to have a sensible understanding of their impact on adult social care.
23. We cannot model the impact on Adult Social Care without more information about patient flow, i.e. there is no modelling included that reflects the assumptions made about patients' expected length of stay or their acuity, so we cannot translate bed numbers into estimates of patient flow and the impact on adult social care.
24. *Workforce*
The proposals assume a free flow of health and social care staff and the proposals do not address clearly the significant and unique workforce challenges in Oxfordshire.

25. The Council estimates that the 15,000 strong adult social care workforce needs to grow by up to 750 jobs per year to 2025 just to keep pace with rising demand from our ageing population (this figure excludes workforce turnover which increases significantly the gap between workforce supply and demand). This growth rate is higher than the national average reflecting local demography, and is not helped by the county's very low unemployment rates and high average house prices. Increasing demands as assumed in the proposal, coupled by a shift of care into the community, are likely to significantly increase this figure but the lack of detail in the document means we cannot estimate the level of increase.
26. Whilst Adult Social Care has been a key partner in the development of the Discharge Liaison Hub and initiatives designed to 'rebalance the system' and reduce delayed transfers of care, these were predicated on the transfer of healthcare staff into the community which proved to be more difficult to achieve than originally envisaged. Should further proposals come forward to describe new ways of providing community support through NHS staff, it will be important to ensure in advance that staff are willing to work in community settings.
27. *Impact on carers*
The proposals make no reference to the impact of the proposals on family carers and this must be considered as a deficiency in the consultation.

Children's Services

28. The consultation proposes that the Horton Hospital will have the capacity to care for 200-500 women per year in labour in a midwife led unit. Compared with previous numbers of births at the Horton we can therefore anticipate that approximately 1000 additional births will occur in Oxford or out of county.
29. Not all of these mothers are Oxfordshire residents, but for those who are and are referred to our social care service, social workers in Oxfordshire's north assessment team would need to travel to assess mothers and/or conduct strategy meetings. In addition, the Oxford social care team may need to take on additional work. This is hard to quantify but may put further pressure on services already struggling to meet demand and lead to higher caseloads and impact on increasing social worker recruitment difficulties.
30. This means that if mothers use other hospitals across county boundaries there may be difficulties managing cases across these borders with processes being less well integrated.
31. In summary, due to the splitting of the consultation into two phases we do not currently have the full picture of future maternity and children's services in the county and cannot therefore fully assess the impact on the Council's children's services.

Planning and Infrastructure

32. 100,000 new homes are needed within Oxfordshire in the period 2011-31, of which around 85,000 remain to be built. The NHS's proposals need to be developed as an integral part of this growth to ensure that health provision is coordinated alongside areas/corridors of growth and infrastructure provision, particularly transport.
33. This should take full account of the scale and location of new housing being planned for in existing/emerging Local Plans and the locations of likely future growth. Consideration should then be given to how the resulting increase in population will impact on demands for health services. This will no doubt include the need for new facilities and a rationalisation of old ones. The phase one proposals do acknowledge this but it is unclear if the full potential impact has been taken fully into account.
34. The proposals will clearly lead to changes to travel patterns for patients, staff and visitors. Whilst some figures are provided on travel pattern changes, the total, combined effects of all the proposals are not quantified. Some of the proposals would reduce the number of patients, staff and visitors needing to travel to Oxford for healthcare services, whilst other proposals would appear to increase that number.
35. Car parking at the hospital sites is generally used to its full capacity already and the residential areas around the hospitals have controlled parking zones. Unless there were an increase in the amount of car parking provided, which county council officers would advise against, additional trips would have to be made by an alternative mode. The proposals make no reference to this.
36. The document proposes a significant move of outpatient and day case work to Banbury. This presents a challenge to the existing highway infrastructure as problems in the town would compromise access to the Horton were it to experience such an increase.
37. These proposals will have some impact on the overall NHS estate. As a community leader with a large property portfolio we are currently undertaking a series of 'place reviews' to identify opportunities to make better use of our assets and join up with other partners. We would encourage the NHS to actively join in this process to identify ways we can deliver services in a more joined up way.
38. We would propose to invite NHS partners to participate fully in detailed discussions about planned growth through the masterplanning exercises that we are undertaking. Given the lack of detail about implications on Oxford and Banbury in terms of increased/decreased journeys we would encourage the relevant organisations to engage with us as the highways authority over travel plans.

Summary

39. We welcome the opportunity to comment on this consultation document and to continue to work with NHS colleagues on shaping future services for the county. The NHS faces serious challenges and its services interlock with many services provided by the Council. It is therefore useful to have concrete proposals to debate through a full public consultation. In summary the views of council officers are:
- A. It is difficult to assess the proposals as we only have a partial picture of future services in this first phase. The lack of information about community services and general practice services means that the impact on council services cannot be accurately quantified. This applies to council services across the board from social care to highways.
 - B. It is not clear that the substantial growth forecast for the county has been fully considered in the development of these proposals and it is key concern of officers that the changes may lead to an inadequacy of provision in the future.
 - C. The proposals to reduce hospital bed numbers permanently at this scale seem premature without being specific about the strengthened community services which would be needed and it is suggested that a 'wait and see' policy is adopted pending national evaluation of similar schemes.
 - D. The document does not give a sufficiently comprehensive vision for the future of services at the Horton Hospital and in particular to maternity services in the north of Oxfordshire, and so, again, it is not possible to draw firm conclusions about the future overall 'shape' of the Horton or the impact on council services in the north of the county from the information presented.

Recommendation

40. The Cabinet is **RECOMMENDED** to
- Welcome the opportunity to comment on this consultation, acknowledge the difficulties faced by NHS services locally as presented in the OCCGs case for change, but on balance not to support the proposals based on the lack of information on the impact on council services.
 - Present its views and the officer's assessment to the Oxfordshire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting on 7 March 2017.
 - Present a report on its views to the County Council meeting on 21 March 2017 to gather further comment.

Report from the Council Leadership Team
Contact Officers: Senior Policy Officer, Claire Phillips
February 2017

This page is intentionally left blank

**County Hall
New Road
Oxfordshire County Council
OX1 1ND**

Members of Oxfordshire Joint Health
Overview and Scrutiny Committee

**Cllr Judith Heathcoat
Cabinet Member for Adult
Services**

21 February 2017

Dear Members of the Oxfordshire Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee,

Cabinet view of the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group's consultation on the Oxfordshire Transformation Programme for NHS services

We write on behalf of the county council's Cabinet who discussed this week the Clinical Commissioning Group's proposals for the future of health services in Oxfordshire.

Please find attached the report prepared by the council's leadership team which informed our discussion. The report provides a comprehensive assessment of the CCG's proposals and their potential impact on council services and the public. We think this will provide useful background information for you in your consideration of the proposals. Cabinet approved the recommendations in the report with a slight amendment (as set out below).

The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to

- Welcome the opportunity to comment on this consultation, acknowledge the difficulties faced by NHS services locally as presented in the OCCGs case for change, but on balance not to support the proposals based on the lack of information on the impact on council services **and that of the public**.
- Present its views and the officer's assessment to the Oxfordshire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting on 7th March.
- Present a report on its views to the County Council meeting on 21st March to gather further comment.

Our intention is that Cllr Heathcoat present the Cabinet's views at the HOSC meeting on March 7th for you to consider as part of your call for evidence.

Yours sincerely

Cllr Ian Hudspeth, Leader of the Council
Cllr Mrs Judith Heathcoat, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care

This page is intentionally left blank