

# **County Council**

**23 March 2021**

## **Schedule of Business**

This page is intentionally left blank

**OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL – 23 MARCH 2021**

**SCHEDULE OF BUSINESS**

**VIRTUAL MEETING**

<b>AGEND A ITEM</b>	<b>PAGE NO.</b>	<b>MAXIMUM DURATION</b>	<b>APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE</b>	<b>SUBJECT</b>	<b>PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Secunder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)</b>
1.	2		10.00	<p><b>Minutes</b></p> <p>Minutes of the Meeting held on 9 February 2021 (CC1).</p> <p>Members are asked to note the following correction to the Minutes:</p> <p>Minute 90/21 – Councillors voting for the Motion <del>(60)</del> <b>(48)</b>.</p>	
2.	2			<b>Apologies for Absence</b>	

AGEND A ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	<b>PROPOSALS</b> (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
3.	2			<b>Declarations of Interest</b>	
4.	2			<b>Official Communications</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thanks to Staff</li> <li>• Retiring Members</li> <li>• National Day of Reflection</li> </ul>	
5.	2			<b>Appointments</b>	

AGEND A ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	<b>PROPOSALS</b> <b>(M = Motion; SEC = Seconder;</b> <b>Am = Amendment</b> <b>S = Statement; Q = Question;</b> <b>REC = Recommendation to be</b> <b>determined)</b>
			10.30	<b>Petitions and Public Address</b>	<b>Petitions – 3 minutes each</b>  Ms Lidia Arciszewska in relation to reduction of traffic speed on Lower Road, Long Hanborough;  Mr Mark Hull, in relation to discharging untreated sewage into the river Thames;  Mr Ruff in relation to resident’s parking in Banbury;  Mr Charlie Maynard in relation to proposed railway line from Oxford, via Eynsham and Witney, to Carterton;

AGEND A ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	<b>PROPOSALS</b> <b>(M = Motion; SEC = Seconder;</b> <b>Am = Amendment</b> <b>S = Statement; Q = Question;</b> <b>REC = Recommendation to be</b> <b>determined)</b>
6.	2				<p><b>Public Address – 3 minutes each</b></p> <p>Mr Jamie Hartzell in relation to the Motion by Councillor Susanna Pressel</p> <p>Mr David Dickie in support of the Motion by Councillor Stefan Gawrysiak;</p> <p>Ms Amanda Chumas in support of the Motion by Councillor Stefan Gawrysiak;</p> <p>Mr Jamie Clarke, Parent at St Ebbes School, Oxford in support of the Motion by Councillor Damian Haywood</p> <p>Ms Rowan Ryrie, Parent at New Hinksey School in support of the Motion by Councillor Damian Haywood</p> <p>Ms April Jones, Parent at New Hinksey School in support of the Motion by Councillor Damian Haywood</p> <p>Mr Tony Fox, local resident in support of the Motion by Councillor Stefan Gawrysiak;</p>

AGEND A ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	<b>PROPOSALS</b> <b>(M = Motion; SEC = Seconder;</b> <b>Am = Amendment</b> <b>S = Statement; Q = Question;</b> <b>REC = Recommendation to be</b> <b>determined)</b>
7.	2			<b>Questions with Notice from</b> <b>Members of the Public</b>  <b>See Annex 3</b>	Mr Andrew Siantonas to Councillor Yvonne Constance;  Mr Gregory O'Broin to Councillor Yvonne Constance;

AGEND A ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Secunder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
8.	2	30 mins	11.30	<p><b>Questions with Notice from Members of the Council</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cherry to Reeves</li> <li>2. Mallon to Constance</li> <li>3. Afridi to Constance</li> <li>4. Cherry to Reeves</li> <li>5. Mallon to Reeves</li> <li>6. Hibbert-Biles to Constance</li> <li>7. Fenton to Lindsay-Gale</li> <li>8. Fitzgerald-O'Connor to Constance</li> <li>9. Handley to Stratford</li> <li>10. Fenton to Corkin</li> <li>11. Mallon to Reeves</li> <li>12. Bartington to Constance</li> <li>13. Bartington to Constance</li> <li>14. Bartington to Constance</li> <li>15. Mathew to Constance</li> <li>16. Handley to Stratford</li> <li>17. Carter to Corkin</li> <li>18. Waine to Lindsay-Gale</li> </ol>	- See Annex 2



AGEND A ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
				19. Fox-Davies to Constance 20. Walker to Stratford 21. Fatemian to Reeves 22. Fatemian to Hudspeth 23. R Smith to Hudspeth 24. Buckley to Hudspeth 25. Leffman to Bartholomew 26. Hanna to Lindsay-Gale 27. Phillips to Constance 28. Leffman to Reeves 29. Sudbury to Constance 30. Pressel to Constance 31. Pressel to Constance 32. Pressel to Bartholomew 33. Leffman to Constance 34. Hanna to Hudspeth 35. Hannaby to Stratford 36. Hanna to Harrod 37. Hannaby to Constance	

AGEND A ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
9.	2	20 mins  Approximate timing for 15 questions	12.00	<b>Report of the Cabinet</b>  <b>Deputy Leader (Judith Heathcoat)</b>  <b>Adult Social Care &amp; Public Health (Lawrie Stratford)</b>  <b>Education &amp; Cultural Services (Lorraine Lindsay-Gale)</b>  <b>Environment (Yvonne Constance)</b>  <b>Finance (David Bartholomew)</b>  <b>All Cabinet Members</b>	   Q. Hannaby, Afridi, Haywood (2)  Q. Waine, Webber, G Sanders (3)  Q. Webber, Roberts (4), Hannaby, Johnston (5), Pressel (7)  Q. Roberts, Hanna, Phillips (8)  Q. Phillips (9)
10.	3	20 mins	12.20	<b>Governance Review</b>  <b>5 minutes to move, 3 minutes for each speaker – Council Procedure Rule 15.4.2.</b>	(M) Carter (SEC) Ilot S Webber S Brighouse S Harris

<b>AGEND A ITEM</b>	<b>PAGE NO.</b>	<b>MAXIMUM DURATION</b>	<b>APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE</b>	<b>SUBJECT</b>	<b>PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)</b>
11.	3	15 mins	12.40	<b>Changes to the Constitution of the Pension Fund Committee</b>  <b>5 minutes to move, 3 minutes for each speaker – Council Procedure Rule 15.4.2.</b>	(M) Bulmer (SEC) Field-Johnson S Webber S R Smith S Lygo
12.	4	15 mins	12.55	<b>Health Scrutiny Arrangements for Oxfordshire</b>  <b>5 minutes to move, 3 minutes for each speaker – Council Procedure Rule 15.4.2.</b>	(M) Fatemian (SEC) Hudspeth S Rooke S Hanna S Hannaby
<b>Lunch</b>	<b>Approx.</b>	<b>start time</b>	<b>1.00 pm</b>		
13.	4	10 mins	1.30	<b>Interim Arrangements for taking Emergency Decisions</b>  <b>5 minutes to move, 3 minutes for each speaker – Council Procedure Rule 15.4.2.</b>	(M) Sibley (SEC) Howson S Harris

AGEND A ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
14.	4	10 mins	1.40	<b>Members Code of Conduct – Decision Notice</b>  <b>5 minutes to move, 3 minutes for each speaker – Council Procedure Rule 15.4.2.</b>	(M) Sibley (SEC) Howson S Leffman
15.	5	40 mins	1.50	<b>Motion by Councillor Deborah McIlveen</b>  <b>5 minutes to move, 3 minutes for each speaker – Council Procedure Rule 15.4.2.</b>	(M) McIlveen (SEC) Cherry S Griffiths S Billington S Reeves S Fenton S R Smith S Hanna S Afridi S Phillips S Turnbull S Brighthouse

AGEND A ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
16.	5	50 mins	2.30	<p><b>Motion by Richard Webber</b></p> <p><b>5 minutes to move, 3 minutes for each speaker – Council Procedure Rule 15.4.2.</b></p>	<p>(M) Webber (SEC) Buckley (AM) Webber (SEC) S Bartholomew S Leffman S Fawcett S R Smith S Sudbury S Bearder S Roberts S Rooke S Hannaby S Hanna S E Smith S Phillips</p>
17.	6	25 mins	3.10	<p><b>Motion by Councillor Eddie Reeves</b></p> <p><b>5 minutes to move, 5 mins to move amendment, 3 minutes for each speaker – Council Procedure Rule 15.4.2.</b></p>	<p>(M) Reeves (SEC) Mallon (AM) Cherry (SEC) Banfield S Reynolds S Hannaby S Hanna</p>

AGEND A ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
18.	6	35 mins		<p><b>Motion by Councillor Stefan Gawrysiak</b></p> <p><b>5 minutes to move, 3 minutes for each speaker – Council Procedure Rule 15.4.2.</b></p>	<p>(M) Gawrysiak (SEC) Webber (AM) Hilary (SEC) S Haywood S Matelot S Constance S Bartholomew S Reynolds S Gray S Corkin S Fenton S Bartington</p>
19.	7	20 mins		<p><b>Motion by Councillor Susanna Pressel</b></p> <p><b>*Please see Annex 4</b></p> <p><b>5 minutes to move, 3 minutes for each speaker – Council Procedure Rule 15.4.2.</b></p>	<p>(M) Pressel (SEC) J Sanders S R Smith S Haywood S Turnbull</p>

AGEND A ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Seconder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
20.	7	15 mins		<b>Motion by Councillor Damian Haywood</b>  <b>5 minutes to move, 3 minutes for each speaker – Council Procedure Rule 15.4.2.</b>	(M) Haywood (SEC) Lygo S R Smith S Sudbury S Bartington
21.	8	25 mins		<b>Motion by Councillor Arash Fatemian</b>  <b>5 minutes to move, 3 minutes for each speaker – Council Procedure Rule 15.4.2.</b>	(M) Fatemian (SEC) Fox-Davies S Field-Johnson S Heathcoat S Fawcett S Sudbury S E Smith

This page is intentionally left blank



**AMENDMENTS TO MOTIONS ON NOTICE****Agenda Item 16 – Motion by Councillor Richard Webber – Amendment to be moved by Councillor Richard Webber**

“The Council’s Procurement procedures have been the subject of concern for some time. At the latest Audit and Governance Committee meeting, the subject of a claim made over a breach of Procurement procedures by the Council was considered. This breach of procedure has cost the Council, and hence Oxfordshire taxpayers, £1.6 million in compensation and legal costs.

Council notes that the role of the Audit & Governance Committee is to ensure that the Council's procedures are robust, that taxpayer's money is controlled properly and that it is spent wisely.

The timeline provided to the Audit and Governance Committee meeting on this matter shows that the Portfolio Holder and the Chair of Audit and Governance were both aware of the breach and cost of **out of** court settlement in February 2020, but the Committee was only informed in January 2021. Council believes that by withholding this information from the Audit and Governance Committee for 11 months, the Executive failed to act in the interest of Oxfordshire taxpayers.

Council commits to ensuring that, in future, in the interests of transparency and good governance, any breaches of procedure are made known to members of the Audit and Governance Committee as soon as they are known to the Executive, and that committee members are allowed to see any reports relating to such breaches of procedure (redacted as necessary), following any reasonable request from members of that committee and assuming there is no legal reason why such documents should be with-held.

**Agenda Item 17 – Motion by Councillor Eddie Reeves – Amendment to be moved by Councillor Mark Cherry**

“This Council fully recognises the value of the much-loved Horton General Hospital to the residents of Banbury and its surrounding catchment area, which uniquely covers four counties.

Local efforts to retain acute services at the Horton have been welcomed by Councils at all tiers in recent months and by community groups and residents alike. This Council’s position has always been that the Horton’s future should be as a fully functioning General Hospital complementing the world-class services at both the John Radcliffe Hospital and Churchill Hospital so as to build on Oxfordshire’s enviable reputation – both nationally and internationally – as a centre for excellence in healthcare. That remains unequivocally the case today.

This Council is encouraged that Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (OUHFT) and the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group (OCCG) have listened to the strong representations of residents, Councillors and community groups (notably, Keep the Horton General) in recent years. ~~and those of Victoria Prentis MP and~~

~~This~~ Council welcomes steps taken by both OUHFT and OCCG to develop a masterplan for the Horton without delay.

~~For its part,~~ This Council resolves to do all it can to support the advancement of this vision and commits to reviewing options with Councils at other tiers with a view to supporting OUHFT and CCG-led redevelopment plans so as to deliver an improved facility on the hospital's existing site or at a new and improved one within the Banbury area that is accessible to residents across the Horton's unique four-county catchment area."

**Agenda Item 18 – Motion by Councillor Stefan Gawrysiak – Amendment to be moved by Councillor Hilary Hibbert-Biles**

"The County Council will consider environmental weight restrictions across the County, particularly areas which are subject to significant levels of HGV traffic, prioritising the towns of Burford, Chipping Norton and Henley-on-Thames. However, the county council is very unlikely to have any funding available for this in the coming years so any schemes would need to be funded through development and/or by local communities, businesses and town/parish councils.

This policy clearly states that Henley is subject to significantly high levels of HGV traffic. Henley is also an AQMA area which means we have significant pollution.

Council calls upon the Corporate Director for Environment and Place to complete the necessary studies ***for an environmental weight restriction for Henley***, in the event that funding to cover the whole cost is secured through development and/or by local communities, businesses and town/parish councils and would not fall on the OCC."

### QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

#### Question from Mr Andrew Siantonas to Councillor Yvonne Constance

Following the withdrawal of subsidy for the 17 bus in 2016, many people in the Wolvercote and Summertown division of Oxfordshire County Council have lost their ability to independently access facilities across the county. This is because these people find it difficult to walk from, for example, Kendall Crescent shops or Wren Road up to Banbury Road along which the buses run. They have to rely on relatives or friends or pay for expensive taxis. Even though we are looking forward to coming out of lockdown thanks to the success of the vaccination programme, these people will effectively remain in enforced lockdown because of their lack of access to public transport.

Given the recent government announcement of £3 billion to invest on buses in England, what plans does the County Council have to ensure these people again have access to public transport either by restoring the 17 bus or by providing other acceptable services.

#### Answer

The County Council welcomes the publication of the National Bus Strategy and its ambition in relation to providing high quality public transport for the whole community. However, we are at a very early stage in the process and nothing is yet clear, therefore no commitments can be made at this stage to any particular changes or improvements that may be made.

The Council is required to enter into a statutory Enhanced Partnership with bus operators, and to commit to do so by the end of June. This is followed by the production of a Bus Service Improvement Plan which must be finalised by the end of October. These are exceptionally challenging timescales for a comprehensive plan which covers a broad range of areas such as bus priority, vehicles, information, ticketing and branding as well as service provision.

Therefore, at this point the County Council cannot be specific about the improvements that could potentially be delivered by the strategy. We await further details about the £275m funds for the recovery period (covering the next financial year), during which period we expect there to be minimal changes made. Any changes arising from the Partnership and Improvement Plan are not likely to take place before April 2022.

Most people in the Jericho and Cutteslowe areas live within 800 metres of a bus stop served by an exceptionally high number of buses. For those who are unable to access these, community transport options which offer a more door-to-door service may be more suitable. The Comet community bus is available on weekdays between 10am and 2pm and can be used for a wide variety of purposes. Further details are available on the Council's website at [www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/comet](http://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/comet) or by telephoning 01865 323201 (9am – 12pm Monday to Friday).

## **Question from Mr Gregory O’Broin to Councillor Yvonne Constance**

When OCC Cabinet approved Scheme C (Didcot to Culham River crossing) in July 2020 was it aware of the following impediments to the road alignment: -

(a) The imminent proposed enlargement of the private Appleford rail sidings that would require a much larger & costlier road bridge to cross over the curving rail tracks?

(b) The absence of any investigation of the degree of damage to Appleford residents (& their wellbeing), from noise, air quality, & visual impact caused by elevating the road above adjacent roof levels?

(c) The absence of any detailed cost or feasibility studies of other technically viable road alignments within the same land corridor that would reduce the impact on the local community?

### **Answer**

(a) *The imminent proposed enlargement of the private Appleford rail sidings that would require a much larger & costlier road bridge to cross over the curving rail tracks?*

Hanson received planning permission for the two additional rail sidings on 27<sup>th</sup> October 2020. The Cabinet report detailed the alignments based on a feasibility design consulted on in March/April 2020. As preliminary designed has progressed, OCC has worked with stakeholders to further define design parameters across all four schemes, not just the Didcot to Culham River Crossing.

(b) *The absence of any investigation of the degree of damage to Appleford residents (& their wellbeing), from noise, air quality, & visual impact caused by elevating the road above adjacent roof levels?*

High level assessments are conducted to define the preferred options which consider a whole multitude of factors. The detailed assessment of noise, air quality and visual impact is undertaken as part of a planning application. It is not possible or feasible to conduct detailed analysis on all options considered. Detailed mitigation requirements, including noise and visual screening, are determined through the Environmental Impact Assessment process as part of the planning application.

(c) *The absence of any detailed cost or feasibility studies of other technically viable road alignments within the same land corridor that would reduce the impact on the local community?*

Early scheme sifting takes into account many constraints including Scheduled Ancient Monuments, environment, topography, land use etc. In response to the consultation in 2018, OCC realigned the Didcot to Culham River crossing route, north of Hanson’s private railway sidings, further away from Appleford. Officers do not believe that moving the alignment further west, south of the railway sidings, is possible due to the reasons already highlighted in the response to Appleford Parish Council on 4<sup>th</sup> March 2021.



This page is intentionally left blank

**QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL**

**ANNEX 2**

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

<b>Questions</b>	<b>Answers</b>
<p><b>1. COUNCILLOR MARK CHERRY</b></p> <p>I have usually reported streetlights faults inquiries in Banbury Ruscote via a FixMyStreet report, but in cases like Beaumaris Close and Lincoln Close, where Oxfordshire County Council, Cherwell District Council and then eventually Sanctuary Housing have taken ownership, will the Cabinet member for Highways Delivery look at totally overhauling the current adoption of streetlights system by Oxfordshire County Council? This is even more prevalent in wards like Banbury Ruscote with nearby housing developments like Banbury Rise Bloor homes housing developments.</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR EDDIE REEVES, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY DELIVERY</b></p> <p>If the member has specific suggestions for how the existing system can be improved, I would always welcome these. However, the highway adoptable street lighting cannot be separated from the rest of the highway assets and the adoption process must consider all aspect of the public highway i.e. Carriageway, footway, drainage, public utilities, landscaping and trees etc.</p> <p>The areas referred to are on existing or established roads, which have had private development built adjacent to them. The private development to which you refer are the responsibility of the landowner, developer or management company. The Developer or landowner must request the roads for adoption and the County Council must be satisfied that they can be adopted. (I am sure that all members would agree that we do not want to adopt highways that are of sub-standard quality where it is a developer's responsibility.) When adoption is processed, it is done so for the areas of highway in their entirety i.e. the footway, carriageway, drainage and street lighting.</p> <p>All Oxfordshire County Council streetlights have identification numbers and a County Council freephone sticker number attached. This helps to easily identify assets that are the County's responsibility. When reporting faults on FixMyStreet, these would be easily identifiable as all the streetlights, managed by Oxfordshire County Council, are on the mapping database.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p><b>2. COUNCILLOR KIERON MALLON</b></p> <p>Can the Leader of the Council tell me how many Liberal Democrat member's sit on the arc leadership executive?</p>	<p><b>COUCILLOR IAN HUDSPETH, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</b></p> <p>I can confirm that as of present there are four Liberal Democrat Leaders who are part of the Arc Leadership Group (remembering that not all councils are part of this group) and three of those are currently members of the Arc Leadership Group Executive.</p>
<p><b>3. COUNCILLOR SOBIA AFRIDI</b></p> <p>Following the recent serious flood incidents over Christmas and early February, residents across my division in South Oxford were adversely affected and are very anxious that the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme is started urgently. At present, commencement is dependent on the County Council completing work on the A423 Kennington Bridge. It was the survey of the bridge to accommodate the flood channel that uncovered the need for its replacement. The revised plan for a bridge with wider span between supports enables a better design for the culvert and, therefore, works are essential for the Flood Alleviations to be successful. Can the Cabinet tell me when this work on the bridge is going to start and provide assurance that they are doing all they can to ensure it does not slow progress on flood prevention in our area?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>The County Council is working closely with the Environment Agency due to the relationship between the Kennington Bridge works and the Oxford Flood Alleviation scheme. Both organisations are progressing the projects through the normal stages related to such large-scale infrastructure improvements. The County Council is nearing completion of the Preliminary Design Stage of the project. Detailed Design will follow this with construction expected early 2023 through to early 2026. The projects are both very complex and require a variety of steps and approvals along the way. The project teams are progressing the project as quickly as is sensible.</p>
<p><b>4. COUNCILLOR MARK CHERRY</b></p> <p>You will note the recent speed limit changes on</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR EDDIE REEVES, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY DELIVERY</b></p> <p>Thank you for the question and for bringing this to my attention. I</p>



Questions	Answers
<p>the A422 Stratford Road by the entrance to Bloor Homes housing developments from 40MPH to 30MPH. In essence, what the residents of trinity close need is a 20MPH speed limit and signage from the entrance to the traffic lights on Warwick Road. This would make it safer for North Oxfordshire Academy school and the environment. Can the Cabinet Member look into a timescale for facilitating a 20MPH speed limit including signage, noting that Banbury Ruscote lost out on Active Travel funding in 2020?</p>	<p>acknowledge the need for a reduction in speed on the A422 Stratford Road past the North Oxfordshire Academy School as well as a reduction in speed limits in certain areas in Banbury, including in my own division, and Cllr Mallon's, which have a high concentration of schools.</p> <p>As well as welcome additional investment in the Budget to progress 20 mph zones, individual schemes can progress more quickly if there is local funding for them, whether from Councillors' Priority Fund monies or other funding pots.</p> <p>In general, the following steps are required to be followed to progress a 20-mph scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Check that 20mph is acceptable from a transport planning / place perspective</li> <li>• Undertake speed surveys to understand compliance of existing speed limit and level of measures likely to be required for 20mph</li> <li>• Feasibility work to identify measures to ensure self-enforcement of 20mph</li> <li>• Local engagement, co-design and buy-in from the local community, including informal consultation</li> <li>• Formal consultation of TROs</li> <li>• Report and decision at Cabinet Member Decision meeting</li> <li>• Detailed design of measures if approved</li> <li>• Implementation of scheme</li> </ul> <p>A strategy for introducing 20mph across the county will be formulated as part of the Local Transport &amp; Connectivity Plan and officers from the Infrastructure Locality Team can help to investigate any opportunities for third party funding to progress a scheme on the A422 more quickly.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p><b>5. COUNCILLOR KIERON MALLON</b></p> <p>How many miles of road is this Council responsible for and how many potholes and defects were repaired across Oxfordshire last year?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR EDDIE REEVES, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY DELIVERY</b></p> <p>We are responsible for 4973km (3090m) of roads in the County. On top of this, we also maintain 2600km (1616m) of Public Rights of Way.</p> <p>Below is a breakdown of the potholes and overall defects repaired in the last Financial Year. As we are so close to year end – we’ve also included this years’ numbers for information.</p> <p>As we are near the end of the current financial year, I have included data for both the current and previous years.</p> <p>Last financial year (2019 Apr-2020 Mar) we repaired <b>42,198</b> safety defects of which <b>32,823</b> where carriageway pothole repairs  So far this year (2020 Apr -2021 Mar) we have repaired <b>41,704</b> safety defects of which <b>30,412</b> where carriageway pothole repairs.</p>
<p><b>6. COUNCILLOR HILARY HIBBERT-BILES</b></p> <p>Can the Cabinet member update the Council on the Park and Charge scheme generally and, more particularly, can she tell us how many EV charging points it will consist of and how many Council car parks will benefit from the scheme?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>The Park and Charge project is targeted at car parks where there is a need to support local residents who don’t have access to off-road parking and are unable to install their own charger. Working with district council colleagues, the sites have been selected that best meet where this need is highest. The chargers will be available for use by local residents overnight to provide a reliable and reasonably priced charging system as well as providing EV charging to the general car park user during the day. The project is funded by Innovate UK and we are working with a number of commercial partners to deliver this.</p> <p>The project is progressing well and the first (pilot) car park in Bicester is planned to open towards the end of April 2021. This will be a soft launch to start with a more formal, public launch to take place during May. After this the</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>remaining planned car parks are due for charge point installations between June and December this year.</p> <p>Overall, the plans are that 24 car parks across Oxfordshire will benefit from the installation of charge points with 140, twin socket charge points being installed in total (280 EV car parking spaces).</p>
<p><b>7. COUNCILLOR TED FENTON</b></p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member tell me how many parents and children were offered their first preference of a secondary school place for September 2021?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LINDSAY-GALE, CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION &amp; CULTURAL SERVICES</b></p> <p>I can confirm that 6,321 Oxfordshire children were offered a first preference school on 1 March 2021. This represents almost 9 in 10 of Oxfordshire children in secondary transfer.</p>
<p><b>8. COUNCILLOR ANDA FITZGERALD-O'CONNOR</b></p> <p>How does Oxfordshire perform in terms of recycling rates relative to other counties in England and what percentage of household waste was recycled in Oxfordshire last year?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) is a Waste Disposal Authority (WDA). The District and City councils are responsible for collection of household waste (Waste Collection Authorities WCA's) and the county is responsible for disposing of it. OCC are also responsible for the provision of Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs) across the county.</p> <p>As a WDA, we are responsible for the submission of data to the Environment Agency, and the recycling rates that we report are countywide figures, incorporating data from all the WCAs, as well as the HWRCs.</p> <p>OCC has had the highest County Council Waste Disposal Authority recycling</p>

Questions	Answers												
	<p>rate for 7 years running. In 2019/20 (the last full set of data available). Oxfordshire recycled 58.8% of household waste. The national average was 45.5%. The top 5 WDAs are detailed below.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="936 363 2022 863"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="936 363 1458 440">Waste Disposal Authority</th> <th data-bbox="1458 363 2022 440">Recycling, Composting and Reuse Rate 2019/20</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 440 1458 517">Oxfordshire County Council</td> <td data-bbox="1458 440 2022 517">58.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 517 1458 593">Devon County Council</td> <td data-bbox="1458 517 2022 593">56.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 593 1458 670">Surrey County Council</td> <td data-bbox="1458 593 2022 670">56.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 670 1458 780">Cambridgeshire County Council</td> <td data-bbox="1458 670 2022 780">55.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 780 1458 863">Buckinghamshire County Council</td> <td data-bbox="1458 780 2022 863">53.9%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>While we are pleased with these figures, we know we can do better. Around half the residual (general waste bin) could have been recycled using our current systems. If all this was recycled, we could have a recycling rate of around 80% and save around £2million/year. We are working with residents encourage them to recycle more of their waste and have developed the waste wizard to help them identify which bin to use, or where they can donate the item (<a href="http://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/wastewizard">www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/wastewizard</a>).</p> <p>As well as recycling a good proportion of our waste, residents are also very good at not producing it in the first place. For several years we have had amongst the lowest County Council kg/head household waste figures. (While we are ranked 8 amongst WDAs, we are not directly comparable with urban authorities – Oxfordshire’s rural nature means we have a lot of garden waste that adds to our figures, and therefore are 3rd when looking at County Council</p>	Waste Disposal Authority	Recycling, Composting and Reuse Rate 2019/20	Oxfordshire County Council	58.8%	Devon County Council	56.6%	Surrey County Council	56.0%	Cambridgeshire County Council	55.4%	Buckinghamshire County Council	53.9%
Waste Disposal Authority	Recycling, Composting and Reuse Rate 2019/20												
Oxfordshire County Council	58.8%												
Devon County Council	56.6%												
Surrey County Council	56.0%												
Cambridgeshire County Council	55.4%												
Buckinghamshire County Council	53.9%												

Questions	Answers																						
	<p>WDAs).</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="936 328 2020 1104"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="936 328 1402 408">Waste Disposal Authority</th> <th data-bbox="1402 328 2020 408">Household waste collection (kg/head) 2019/20</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 408 1402 488">Western Riverside Waste Authority</td> <td data-bbox="1402 408 2020 488">282.49</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 488 1402 568">North London Waste Authority</td> <td data-bbox="1402 488 2020 568">325.32</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 568 1402 647">West London Waste Authority</td> <td data-bbox="1402 568 2020 647">326.90</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 647 1402 727">East London Waste Authority</td> <td data-bbox="1402 647 2020 727">365.44</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 727 1402 807">Hertfordshire County Council</td> <td data-bbox="1402 727 2020 807">403.08</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 807 1402 887">Greater Manchester WDA (MBC)</td> <td data-bbox="1402 807 2020 887">405.81</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 887 1402 967">Buckinghamshire County Council</td> <td data-bbox="1402 887 2020 967">410.69</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 967 1402 1046">Oxfordshire County Council</td> <td data-bbox="1402 967 2020 1046">414.51</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 1046 1402 1126">Kent County Council</td> <td data-bbox="1402 1046 2020 1126">425.84</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="936 1126 1402 1177">Surrey County Council</td> <td data-bbox="1402 1126 2020 1177">426.24</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Waste Disposal Authority	Household waste collection (kg/head) 2019/20	Western Riverside Waste Authority	282.49	North London Waste Authority	325.32	West London Waste Authority	326.90	East London Waste Authority	365.44	Hertfordshire County Council	403.08	Greater Manchester WDA (MBC)	405.81	Buckinghamshire County Council	410.69	Oxfordshire County Council	414.51	Kent County Council	425.84	Surrey County Council	426.24
Waste Disposal Authority	Household waste collection (kg/head) 2019/20																						
Western Riverside Waste Authority	282.49																						
North London Waste Authority	325.32																						
West London Waste Authority	326.90																						
East London Waste Authority	365.44																						
Hertfordshire County Council	403.08																						
Greater Manchester WDA (MBC)	405.81																						
Buckinghamshire County Council	410.69																						
Oxfordshire County Council	414.51																						
Kent County Council	425.84																						
Surrey County Council	426.24																						
<p><b>9. COUNCILLOR PETE HANDLEY</b></p> <p>The Corporate Plan noted by members last month refers to there being, at least, 18,071 carers in Oxfordshire and there being difficulties in recruiting and retaining staff owing to the high</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR LAWRIE STRATFORD, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE &amp; PUBLIC HEALTH</b></p> <p>Thank you for the question, recruiting and retaining high quality staff is extremely important for us in Oxfordshire. We are doing some great work with OCPA in recruiting staff and I agree with you that increasing the number of key worker housing opportunities is part of the response. We are working</p>																						

Questions	Answers
<p>cost of living locally. Does the Cabinet member agree with me that there is a need to build good quality houses for key workers such as this at a price they can afford?</p>	<p>closely with planners and developers to maximise this.</p>
<p><b>10. COUNCILLOR TED FENTON</b></p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member update the Council on the innovative work in flight with iHub and its importance to our commitment to ensure a thriving local economy?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR IAN CORKIN, CABINET MEMBER FOR COUNCIL BUSINESS &amp; PARTNERSHIPS</b></p> <p>The iHub collaborates with industry and academia to develop, trial and evaluate cutting edge projects and plays a significant role in place-based innovation across the County and much wider which in turn contributes to the local economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To date the IHub has been part of over 70 projects that have totalled over £135million, this has been made up of private sector investment alongside public R&amp;D investment such as UK Research and Innovation (UKRI), or Horizon 2020 funding, with the majority of this funding focusing on projects applied in Oxfordshire.</li> </ul> <p>The work and approach have contributed to the support of local industry, for example via:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Creating opportunities for industry:</b> A lot of i-Hub partners have been local innovative companies, that wish to develop and test their technology in the real world. By partnering with the county council, these projects have created opportunities (including funding) for projects that align with our own strategic goals, such as inclusive safe and green mobility. Examples include the DRIVEN and Endeavour Connected &amp; Autonomous Vehicle (CAV) projects with Oxbotica, the Park &amp; Charge Electric Vehicles (EV) charging projects with Zeta and the OmniCAV and MultiCAV CAV Data and Modelling projects with Latent Logic (now part of Waymo) and Arrival.</li> </ul>

Questions	Answers
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Supporting new Sector growth</b> – IHub has been integral to supporting the development of the CAV sector in the County, there are now a number of companies and organisations that deliver services in this sector and employ hundreds of people, Oxfordshire is now the heart of this new sector in the UK and most likely Europe. Also in the energy sector IHub was integral, alongside Oxford University and Low Carbon Hub, in bringing together a collaboration and working through the bidding process for Local Energy Oxford, which enabled Oxfordshire to be home to a £40million Grand Challenge project that it is hoped will provide the benchmark for future energy systems and also enable both increased investment in zero carbon generation but also new opportunities and services.</li> <li>- <b>Investment</b> A number have companies have been able to generate significant investment, which has in part been generated after being able to prove their business models or products through these projects, for example Oxbotica recently raised a further £34 million to add to the £14 million from 2018 secured following the DRIVEN project and last year Arrival were invested in by Kia &amp; Daihatsu with \$100m to value them over £1bn and make them the county’s latest “Unicorn” company.</li> <li>- <b>Promoting inclusive innovation for the benefit of all:</b> Through the iHUB being integral to the Council it is aligned with the public benefit, and especially interested in supporting solutions that benefit the industry while catering for urgent population needs. Examples include Health &amp; Care innovation projects, working with carers, care homes, pharmacies and public care providers.</li> <li>- <b>Creating a fertile innovation space:</b> Through the work of iHUB, industry and academia have the opportunity to access data and insights to accelerate their development. This includes the safe and appropriate data sharing, creation of innovation spaces, dissemination events and creating opportunities for developing the Oxfordshire Living Lab Framework.</li> <li>- <b>Supporting the long term adoption:</b> iHUB has contributed in numerous policy and strategic documents, including local transport</li> </ul>

Questions	Answers																								
	<p>policy, design guides, area plans and digital infrastructure strategies, to ensure the futureproofing of solutions as to create an attractive environment for business and public, making the most of new technologies. This is also translated into practical solutions for the county, for example through the GovTech Challenge in securing external funding of a new proof of concept for the future of traffic management systems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Supporting international opportunities:</b> through collaboration with the Department of International Trade, other local authorities and trade organisations, iHub staff regularly represent the UK as best practice in innovation and have contributed in developing the reputation of Oxfordshire as a key destination for new technology developments and building partnerships across the globe, for example with the Barcelona Smart Cities and Data teams.</li> </ul> <p>This is only a summary of the projects being delivered and moving forward Llewelyn Morgan (Head of Innovation) and the team will provide more updates. In the meantime the Oxfordshire County Council Innovation HUB 2020 Brochure can be accessed here:  <a href="https://issuu.com/occihub/docs/occ_ihub_2020_q4">https://issuu.com/occihub/docs/occ_ihub_2020_q4</a></p>																								
<p><b>11. COUNCILLOR KIERON MALLON</b></p> <p>What is the average cost of a repair broken down by the various methods employed by the Council's contractor and how are we working with our contractor to drive down unit costs and improve the duration of each repair?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR EDDIE REEVES, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY DELIVERY</b></p> <p>The table below provides as summary of the average of the different defect repair costs.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="936 1217 2051 1414"> <thead> <tr> <th>Repair Types</th> <th>2019-20 No. Defect Repair (Actuals)</th> <th>% Defect Repair</th> <th>2019-20 Repair Cost (Actuals)</th> <th>% Repair Cost</th> <th>Average Cost per Defect</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Non-cut repair</td> <td>15,095</td> <td>30%</td> <td>£943,058</td> <td>25.4%</td> <td>£63</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Cut repair</td> <td>14,972</td> <td>30%</td> <td>£1,503,846</td> <td>40.5%</td> <td>£100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Dragon Patch</td> <td>20,081</td> <td>40%</td> <td>£1,266,802</td> <td>34.1%</td> <td>£63</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Repair Types	2019-20 No. Defect Repair (Actuals)	% Defect Repair	2019-20 Repair Cost (Actuals)	% Repair Cost	Average Cost per Defect	1. Non-cut repair	15,095	30%	£943,058	25.4%	£63	2. Cut repair	14,972	30%	£1,503,846	40.5%	£100	3. Dragon Patch	20,081	40%	£1,266,802	34.1%	£63
Repair Types	2019-20 No. Defect Repair (Actuals)	% Defect Repair	2019-20 Repair Cost (Actuals)	% Repair Cost	Average Cost per Defect																				
1. Non-cut repair	15,095	30%	£943,058	25.4%	£63																				
2. Cut repair	14,972	30%	£1,503,846	40.5%	£100																				
3. Dragon Patch	20,081	40%	£1,266,802	34.1%	£63																				



Questions	Answers
	<p style="text-align: right;"> <b>TOTALS    50,148                      £3,713,706                      £74.05</b> </p> <p>Each repair method has a slightly different application, and this is explained.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Non-cut Pothole Repair</b>  A Non-cut Pothole repair is the simplest pothole repair method. The affected area is swept clean and bonded before new material applied to the hole. If the extent of the deterioration is limited to within the pothole, and there are no underlying structural issues, this type of repair can last as long as any other.</li> <li>2. <b>Cut Repair</b>  A square/rectangle is saw cut around the pothole with the material excavated and removed. A full depth repair is then made. This is more durable than a non-cut repair, however, there is no advantage where the defect is limited to the surface layers only within a pothole.</li> <li>3. <b>Dragon Patch</b>  A Dragon Patch tends to be used on more rural parts of the network. It is used along a predetermined route to maximum output of the machine and deliver value for money. The Dragon Patcher not only repairs potholes and failed areas but is also applied to the areas around a pothole which are about to fail, or defects which are likely to form potholes (preventative maintenance as opposed to solely reactive).</li> </ol> <p>We are committed to driving down the costs of repairing defects and are currently undertaking a full defect review which considers policies, process, scheduling and repair methods. It is anticipated that this will not only reduce costs but will also increase efficiency and customer satisfaction.</p> <p>This year we have proactively increased the number of 'cut' defect repairs undertaken rather than defaulting to 'non-cut' and have already noticed a reduction complaints and concerns.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p><b>12. COUNCILLOR SUZANNE BARTINGTON</b></p> <p>At November 2018 Full Council, members voted unanimously in support of a cycling motion which included six strategic active travel commitments for Oxfordshire. Since that time national Govt has increased commitment to active travel spending, including most recently the Emergency Active Travel Schemes and achieving modal shift to active travel for short trips is a key Council policy priority. However recent capital schemes whilst welcome in principle have frequently failed to adhere to best practice design standards at implementation phase which risks negating the intended outcomes. Please could a progress update be provided specifically on point (v) of the relevant motion - 'Establish a framework to oversee quality control of all active travel infrastructure projects in accordance with the Oxford Cycling Design Standards, from inception through planning to implementation, ensuring all proposals are audited for safety and encouragement of active travel'.</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>The Active Travel Hub (ATH) was established in 2020 with the role of accelerating our promotion of active travel, developing and influencing policy, and bringing forward plans for projects that will see a step increase in the levels of walking and cycling. The Oxfordshire Streets Design Guide is nearing completion with the finalised version anticipated to be presented to Cabinet for approval in May 21. The ATH is currently developing an update of both the Oxfordshire Walking Design Standards (OWDS) and Oxfordshire Cycling Design Standards (OCDS) which is set out as an ATH priority for 2021/2. Within the review of current standards, we also intend to review current OCC processes and procedures to ensure that all new proposals meet OWDS and OCDS from first inception to delivery.</p> <p>Regarding our capital programme delivery, we acknowledge to date that we may not have met all of OCC's standards but are now addressing this through using the guidance/identified above and aligning our designs to the Government Circular LTN1/20 where possible. We are ensuring that our designers are trained in Oxfordshire Wide Walking and Cycling Standards.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p><b>13.COUNCILLOR SUZANNE BARTINGTON</b></p> <p>Investment in Emergency Active Travel schemes in Bicester and Witney are welcome, however the Witney scheme has multiple challenges arising from the deadline for expenditure of funds due to the OxLEP source which is a barrier to undergoing a full design process in accordance with LTN 120, including overcoming issues with land permissions and ensuring overall scheme quality. Please could the Cabinet Member clarify why DfT funding (with a longer timescale) was allocated to Oxford components only?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>The total value of the OCC DfT Active T2 submission was approximately £4.5m, the total amount awarded was £2.9m (125% of the original allocation). Prior to DfT award Officers were not confident that OCC would receive the full £4.5m and so sought to identify opportunities for additional funding to help close any shortfall. Consequently, officers were successful in realising an award of £1.4m capital funding from OXLEP on the premise that it would be spent/allocated fully by the end of March 21. The Bicester and Witney schemes were more advanced in their development and with greater assurances that they could be delivered within the financial envelope and required timescales, the decision was made that these should progress using the LEP funds.</p> <p>Subsequently, the £2.9m DfT funding was awarded and is being used to deliver both the Oxford Active Travel capital programme and complementary measures including cycling and activation programmes across Oxford, Bicester and Witney (in line with DfT requirements). It should be noted that the extended timescales for DfT funded schemes did not materialise until later due to recognition of delayed notification and the need for extensive consultation was identified.</p>
<p><b>14. COUNCILLOR SUZANNE BARTINGTON</b></p> <p>At November 2020 Full Council members unanimously agreed to a six-point plan for increasing tree cover in Oxfordshire. Please could an update be provided on progress towards delivering this motion, specifically whether a doubling of tree cover by 2045 has now been</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Recognise the critical role of existing tree preservation and planting for effective climate action and consider developing a Trees and Woodland Strategy.</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The current tree policy (attached) highlights how we manage the County Council's trees and how we try to preserve them. Options for developing a Tree and Woodland Strategy are currently being considered.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

Questions	Answers
<p>considered in terms of viability and whether progress has been made towards a Trees and Woodland Strategy?</p>	<p><b>2. Set a target for increased tree cover in Oxfordshire, and explore the viability of doubling coverage by 2045</b></p> <p>a. This has not been addressed because there is no specific funding to replace trees that have been removed. There are opportunities to increase canopy cover using planning policy on new developments and funding opportunities for private landowners to create new woodland. Planting trees on the OCC estate and highway networks does increase maintenance costs and therefore funding for tree planting must take into account future maintenance costs.</p> <p><b>3. Undertake a survey to identify existing tree cover and suitable sites for new trees (with consideration for habitat protection, land-use and biodiversity)</b></p> <p>a. We are working towards a large data capture exercise as part of our new four-year cyclical inspection programme for Highway trees. Combining our new tree management software with other data sets available to OCC should enable OCC to create a priority planting map to target areas of low canopy cover; air quality/pollution; social deprivation; schools; and population densities.</p> <p><b>4. Work collaboratively with District, Town and Parish Councils, civic and commercial partners to deliver tree planting initiatives, considering maintenance responsibilities.</b></p> <p>a. Not currently progressing this but may be able to in future relating to the new Local Authority Tree Planting Fund.</p> <p><b>5. Influence developer schemes to ensure tree planting is undertaken, supported by relevant planning agreement contributions.</b></p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>a. This is a focus for District Councils as the Local Planning Authority. More Oxfordshire County Council resources would be required, in terms of staff, in order to provide better early engagement to enable clear ambitions for developments and clear directions for developers who would like the County to adopt new tree lined roads.</p> <p><b>6. Write to the SoS for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs to request additional local authority funding to support tree-planting and maintenance.”</b></p> <p>a. See point 4.</p>
<p><b>15. COUNCILLOR CHARLES MATHEW</b></p> <p>OCC announced in 2018/19 its intention to introduce a zero-emission zone in Oxford City, which would be the first totally zero zone in <i>any</i> UK city: will the Cabinet Member report on any progress on this project which was stalled by lockdown in 2020?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>Proposals for a Zero Emission Zone (ZEE) in Oxford form part of the current Local Transport Plan. The ZEE is to be rolled out in phases, starting in August 2021 with the creation of a ZEE Pilot in a small area of Oxford city centre (previously referred to as the Red Zone). This would make Oxford one of the first places in Britain to introduce a ZEE. The intention is to then introduce the full Zero Emission Zone (previously referred to as the Green Zone) in spring 2022, subject to the outcomes of a separate consultation on the full zone.</p> <p>An informal consultation on the previous (Red Zone) proposals took place during January 2020 and a formal consultation had been planned for March 2020, but this was postponed due to Covid-19. It was picked up again at the end of last year when ZEE Pilot proposals were published as part of a period of formal consultation on the scheme between November 2020 and January 2021. The ZEE Pilot scheme was approved for implementation at the Cabinet meeting on 16 March 2021.</p> <p>The Pilot scheme will operate via a road charging scheme with a range of discounts proposed including for residents and businesses in the Pilot area,</p>

Questions	Answers
	Blue Badge holders, care and health workers' vehicles and for students arriving/leaving at the beginning and end of university term.
<p><b>16. COUNCILLOR PETE HANDLEY</b></p> <p>How many adults with learning difficulties and people aged 65+ are supported by adult social care and does the Cabinet member agree with me that we must do everything we can to make adult social care an attractive and sustainable long-term career?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR LAWRIE STRATFORD, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE &amp; PUBLIC HEALTH</b></p> <p>At the 1<sup>st</sup> March 2021 this council was supporting 1681 adults with a learning disability with on-going care and 3494 older people. We additionally support 909 people with a physical disability or mental health problem.</p> <p>Supporting our most vulnerable citizens is a primary responsibility of the council and its therefore imperative that we do everything to recognise and value the role staff providing the support ply. I would like to go on record in saying how grateful I am to all the staff working across Oxfordshire in Social Care, you do a wonderful job each and every day and we are extremely grateful.</p>
<p><b>17. COUNCILLOR NICK CARTER</b></p> <p>Can the cabinet member update on plans for achieving ultrafast full fibre broadband in our market towns?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR IAN CORKIN, CABINET MEMBER FOR COUNCIL BUSINESS &amp; PARTNERSHIPS</b></p> <p>As you may be aware, the current focus of government intervention schemes are the final 20% (F20) of premises in the hardest to reach rural areas. Our market towns do not fall into this definition and are therefore excluded from these schemes. This is generally because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The vast majority of residents already have superfast speeds available. As a consequence, current Department of Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) programme rules exclude them as they are not considered F20.</li> <li>• Their Postcodes do not sit in the Department for Environment, Food</li> </ul>

Questions	Answers
	<p>and Rural Affairs (DEfRA) rural categorisations of D1 E1 or F1 to which DCMS intervention programmes apply.</p> <p>This means that, according to the DCMS model, our market towns will be covered by commercial activity from suppliers based on demand and their own roll-out plans. As we know from experience, this is not necessarily the case for several reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Virgin Media has partial coverage in many market towns which, in effect, “sterilises” the rest of the town for other suppliers. Virgin Media have not indicated that they have plans to extend their network in these towns, leaving large parts with only a superfast offering.</li><li>• Openreach will eventually have plans for these towns as it is now their policy to begin retiring their copper network from 2025 but the roll out of this plan in Oxfordshire is as yet mostly undefined. We do, however, know Banbury will be provided with fibre by Openreach as this was announced last year.</li><li>• There is a perceived lack of customer demand from some suppliers (based on a belief that consumers are currently satisfied with their download speeds) and this would result in the cost of installing fibre not being covered by take up.</li><li>• Working in market towns is more difficult and expensive for operators. Much more traffic control is usually needed and disruption is sometimes quite considerable, often resulting in negative feedback and press for the supplier. This pushes them towards the back of the build queue.</li><li>• Whilst suppliers are being subsidised to connect the more difficult premises, they will be less concerned about the easier ones they have to provide fibre to, at their own expense.</li></ul>

Questions	Answers
	<p>The OCC Digital Infrastructure team in had already identified market towns as a potential problem area and is working on several fronts to try to resolve this issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• We are currently making a case into DCMS outlining that to provide better coverage in remote rural areas whilst leaving market towns behind to commercial roll-outs is a strategic error on their part and we are providing evidence to them from our own data to support this.</li><li>• The Rural Gigabit Connectivity Anchor Hub Site programme, for which we are about to issue a tender, will also address the needs of market towns by providing fibre connections to a range of public buildings in them – Council Offices, GP Surgeries, Fire Stations, Libraries, Museums and Schools – which suppliers can then build out from. OCC will be funding the work to those buildings that DCMS have declined to fund and this will be paid for from the gainshare payments being made to OCC by Openreach from the Better Broadband for Oxfordshire Programme.</li><li>• Working with suppliers and our district partners and county colleagues to assist in any way we can (planning, wayleaves, highways work, etc) with commercial plans that do include market towns. For example, Gigaclear have 47 planned builds approved by their commercial team for across West Oxfordshire, which includes towns such as Witney, Chipping Norton, Burford and Carterton.</li><li>• We are working with suppliers and communities using voucher schemes and Demand Led Projects (we are currently providing top-up funding to double the value of a voucher).</li></ul> <p>We will continue to push the case for our market towns with DCMS and suppliers and also to ensure every opportunity to apply for funding to bring</p>



Questions	Answers
	fibre to them is pursued.
<p><b>18. COUNCILLOR MICHAEL WAINE</b></p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member tell me what support/advice was given to schools for their return on 8<sup>th</sup> March with regard to COVID testing and the wearing of masks?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LINDSAY-GALE, CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION &amp; CULTURAL SERVICES</b></p> <p>Advice and support given to schools regarding 8<sup>th</sup> March’s wider opening of schools is in line with DfE guidance.</p> <p>Throughout the pandemic the LA Education Covid Cell has shared the DfE guidance with all schools via emails, briefings and through Schools News. A weekly frequently asked Questions (FAQ) is published. Governors/Trustees, in addition, receive pertinent communications via ‘Governor Hub’.</p> <p>The Education Covid Cell has been available to schools for advice and support 7 days a week since 1<sup>st</sup> September closing only on Christmas Day and News Years Day. Heads can contact the team for bespoke support and advice regarding all Covid matters including isolation periods, infection control and testing. Each week the Team deliver 4 HT briefings for primary, special, secondary and independent schools. Monthly meetings for EY and Governors are also held.</p> <p>Testing has been the focus of additional briefings weekly for 6 weeks for schools. During this time secondary schools’ staff have moved from ‘one site’ testing (in secondary) to ‘home testing’. Home testing for primary staff has been in place throughout the Spring term. Students in secondary move as of the 15<sup>th</sup> March to ‘Home Testing’. Household bubbles can now access home testing.</p> <p>School leaders have prepared thoroughly for the wider return of pupils to school and their dedication is to be commended.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p><b>19. COUNCILLOR MICHAEL FOX-DAVIES</b></p> <p>Will the Cabinet Member please report on achievements by this Council towards meeting its target of net zero carbon in our own estate by 2030?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>OCC's own estate net-zero carbon target includes emissions from highway assets (streetlighting and traffic signals), fleet (approximately 500 vehicles), staff travel, and approximately 120 corporate buildings' heating and electricity. The full scope of our target can be found in our <a href="#">Greenhouse Gas reporting</a>.</p> <p>Corporate emissions have declined 50.8% between the baseline year of 2010/11 and 2019/20, from 26,510t CO<sub>2</sub>e to 13,051t CO<sub>2</sub>e. From 2018/19 to 2019/20, corporate emissions decreased 8%, exceeding our current annual target of 6%.</p> <p>In 2019/20, emissions from fleet reduced 7% and from staff travel reduced 16%. Emissions from highway assets reduced by 11%. Emissions from buildings' electricity dropped 11%, while emissions from heating increased by 11% (this was lower than the 17% increase that would have been expected due to cold weather in this year).</p> <p>The 2019/20 figures cover the period to the end of March 2020, so they do not reflect reductions due to COVID-related changes, which are now being incorporated into our work practices. Emissions from this period will be reported in our next round of emissions reporting this summer. Digital by default meetings and service digitalisation contribute not only to a reduction in staff travel but also help partner organizations and residents curb emissions.</p> <p>The council's LED conversion programme has now converted 31.5% of streetlights, contributing to nearly 813t CO<sub>2</sub>e and 245,000 kWh savings last year. The programme aims to have all 59,631 lanterns fitted with LED equipment by 2025/26.</p> <p>The council has secured £2.13m from Public Sector Decarbonisation Fund for heat decarbonisation and energy efficiency measures across 7 council buildings and 4 maintained schools. This Programme will be delivered across 2021. These measures will translate into 200t CO<sub>2</sub>e savings realisable from</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>beginning 2022. Other measures carried out to reduce estate emissions include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Heating control project at Speedwell House</li> <li>b. 42 PV panels installed in Ron Groves House in Kidlington</li> <li>c. Benson Library off the gas grid with solar panels, battery storage and heat pump</li> </ol> <p>OCC has an 'electric by default' fleet replacement policy. The fleet now has 21 EVs, served by a network of 44 EV charging points at 17 council sites. The goal is to replace all cars with EVs by 2024 and all vans by 2028.</p> <p>We are looking at opportunities to use our own estate to trial innovative technologies such as building energy flexibility through Project LEO (Local Energy Oxfordshire) and Vehicle to Grid charging.</p> <p>Since October 2020, the council is buying certified green grid electricity for council buildings and maintained schools.</p> <p>Alongside our commitment to reduce own estate emissions, we are working to lead the way to a zero-carbon county. We are undertaking a wide programme of work including our zero-carbon-focussed travel strategies – such as the review of the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan, the Oxford Zero Emissions Zone, and Connecting Oxford – and our work on electric vehicle charging strategy and commitment to active travel. We are working in partnership to support planning for zero-carbon development and infrastructure through a new approach to the Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy and Oxfordshire Plan 2050, and to champion the environmental principles of the Arc. We are now in our twentieth year as lead funder of the Community Action Group project supporting Oxfordshire voluntary groups taking action to tackle climate change.</p> <p>We are partnering in a range of innovation programmes to ensure Oxfordshire can benefit from new technologies and approaches to decarbonisation. Examples include:</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>a. Project LEO (Local Energy Oxfordshire), the national demonstrators trialling smart grid and flexibility;</p> <p>b. Park n Charge, which is trialling new business models to accelerate the roll out of Electric Vehicle charging for residents without access to off-street charging.</p> <p>Further details of our commitment and plans for Countywide emissions can be found in our Climate Action Framework <a href="https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/2020-climate-action-framework">2020 Climate Action Framework (oxfordshire.gov.uk)</a></p>
<p><b>20. COUNCILLOR LIAM WALKER</b></p> <p>Are the public health team in Oxfordshire aware of any venues that are offering a private vaccine service and if so, what action is being taken to stop them?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR LAWRIE STRATFORD, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE &amp; PUBLIC HEALTH</b></p> <p>The COVID-19 vaccination is only available through the NHS to eligible groups and it is a free vaccination.</p> <p>We are not aware of any venues offering a private service.</p>
<p><b>21. COUNCILLOR ARASH FATEMIAN</b></p> <p>Can the Cabinet member for Highways advise when the long overdue - and very welcome - improvements to Bankside will be made, benefitting both residents in my division and those across Banbury?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR EDDIE REEVES, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY DELIVERY</b></p> <p>I can confirm that the scheme is due to commence on 10 May. Residents will, I hope, be pleased with the result and I thank him and Councillor Mallon for helping push these important works along over several years.</p>
<p><b>22. COUNCILLOR ARASH FATEMIAN</b></p> <p>After reading the budget in detail, I welcome the investment in Oxfordshire for the next four years and am glad that was passed in Council with a</p>	<p><b>COUCILLOR IAN HUDSPETH, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</b></p> <p>The budget setting process gives all parties the opportunity to put forward proposals highlighting their priorities are for the future year especially ahead of an election. The lack of any alternative proposals normally show that the</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>majority of councillors across all parties. Does the Leader agree with me that the lack of any budget amendments from the Liberal Democrat party, is a) neither liberal, being in fact regressive and b) not democratic, by not allowing the residents of Oxfordshire to hear policy ideas debated, tested, and possibly adopted, as in previous years, in a debate. Especially as during the budget debate a number of councillors from that party seemed to indicate they are in favor of a larger (4.99%) increase in council tax, than that passed (2.99%), yet refused to formally table this. Does the leader also agree that as such, this is a gross dereliction of public responsibility and hopes that the public will hold them accountable at the ballot box on May 6th?</p>	<p>proposed budget by the Conservative Independent Alliance is approved by the Liberal Democrat group. This did not happen at this year's budget as they voted against the budget that contained</p> <p>£200,000 for the roll out of 20 mph speed limits  £200,000 for additional drainage and vegetation clearance  £4 million for social services  £1 million for youth services  £150,000 for apprenticeships.</p> <p>By voting against I can only conclude that the Liberal Democrats do not support these key policies for Oxfordshire's residents.</p> <p>I am sure that The Liberal Democrat's election leaflets will contain references to voting against these important proposals.</p>
<p><b>23. COUNCILLOR ROZ SMITH</b></p> <p>Concerning the County's loss of £1.6m in the Parking Procurement case. Did the terms of reference of the Independent Review include examining the effectiveness of Portfolio Holders in their role?</p>	<p><b>COUCILLOR IAN HUDSPETH, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</b></p> <p>As was set out by the Corporate Director for Customers, Organisational Development and Resources at the Audit and Governance Committee on 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2021, the terms of reference for the review were broad in scope. They included the full remit of all relevant and related activity, decision making, process design, control and compliance, management and leadership, communications, any constitutional or procedural issues, judgement and decision making.</p> <p>These terms were not limited to one service area or element of the process. Likewise, the terms were not limited to the role of officers and portfolio holders participated in the investigation.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p><b>24. COUNCILLOR PAUL BUCKLEY</b></p> <p>As a member of Audit and Governance Committee which considered the issue of the County's loss of £1.6m in the parking procurement case, please would the leader explain to Council which councillors have had access to the report of the Independent Review?</p>	<p><b>COUCILLOR IAN HUDSPETH, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</b></p> <p>The report of the Independent Review is a confidential document. It has been fully reviewed by the council's monitoring officer, the commissioning officer (Corporate Director of Customers, Organisational Development and Resources), the Director of Human Resources and the Corporate Director, Commercial Development, Assets and Investment. Cabinet, and the portfolio holders, have accepted in full the thematic findings, recommendations and the action plan arising from the report.</p> <p>The report has not been released more widely (to officers other than those listed, or to members) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was of critical importance that the Council's investigation was as wide ranging and comprehensive as possible in order to properly identify and understand where there were failings, and who or what was responsible for those failings. In order to ensure that this was the case, witnesses (who were not legally obliged to provide evidence to the investigation) were given appropriate assurances that their evidence would be treated confidentially.</li> <li>• The evidence gathered from those witnesses is set out in detail within the report that has been withheld from disclosure. That evidence is clearly attributable and includes the personal data not only of the witnesses, but of various other third parties. The information provided sets out the key themes from the investigation to allow the Council to address these failings moving forward. These have been clearly set out in a report to Audit and Governance Committee and are supported with a comprehensive action plan.</li> <li>• It is accepted that the Audit and Governance Committee needs to have access to certain information for them to undertake their functions and the monitoring officer is satisfied that the information being provided to</li> </ul>

Questions	Answers
	<p>the Committee is adequate to meet that requirement. The information provided to the Audit and Governance Committee (and put into the public domain) draws out the key themes and findings from the investigation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a clear public interest in information gathered by the investigation, as well as in ensuring that the Council properly and fully addresses any failings identified so as to avoid further issues occurring moving forward. This is why the Council has already disclosed information into the public domain, including the information that is contained in the public papers of the Audit and Governance Committee. It is the view of the monitoring officer that this disclosure meets the public interest.</li> </ul>
<p><b>25. COUNCILLOR LIZ LEFFMAN</b></p> <p>On what date were you first informed of the compensation claim from Marston Holdings, what advice did you give officers at that point, what actions did you take when you were informed?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR DAVID BARTHOLOMEW, CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE</b></p> <p>I was first informed of the claim and settlement on Thursday 30<sup>th</sup> January 2020. After expressing my surprise that such a settlement could be reached without reference to the relevant Cabinet Member (Cllr Constance), or myself as Cabinet Member for Finance, I stated that a full investigation should be undertaken.</p> <p>I emailed the Chief Executive (copying the Leader) on Friday 31st January 2020, making clear my great concern. She replied stating the need to understand how a fundamental service failure had occurred and what needed to be done to prevent it occurring again.</p> <p>I raised the issue with senior officers and all Cabinet colleagues at Informal Cabinet on Tuesday 4th February 2020, repeating my request for a full investigation. The Chief Executive recognised the seriousness of the issue and confirmed this would happen. An independent investigation was</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>commissioned and commenced in March 2020.</p> <p>I informed the Chairman of Audit &amp; Governance about the issue at the earliest opportunity on Thursday 20th February 2020. Officers advised me that no public comments should be made until the independent report had been finalised, lest such comments jeopardise the report. I pressed officers on progress of the report on a regular basis. The investigation was expected to take a period of months due to its complexity and the task of tracking down previous employees to contribute. Delivery of the report was also delayed by complications arising from the pandemic.</p> <p>(Note that the publicly available February Cabinet report included an update on the budget position relating to the monthly position in December 2019. This report (annex C) set out a net £0.4m overspend in community operations with a £1.8m pressure on the parking account due to the ‘combination of an historical downturn in parking income, increased running cost and parking enforcement procurement costs’).</p>
<p><b>26. COUNCILLOR JANE HANNA</b></p> <p>Please could the Cabinet Member list the dates between April 2017 and March 2020 of each request for a school place made by officers of this authority that was not met by a school or academy and the date when the matter was escalated to the Secretary of State with a request for an Order to be made?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LINDSAY-GALE, CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION &amp; CULTURAL SERVICES</b></p> <p>Where a local authority considers that an Academy will best meet the needs of any child, it can ask the Academy to admit that child, but it has no power to direct it to do so. There is an expectation in the School Admissions Code 2014 that a local authority and an academy will usually come to an agreement, but if there is a refusal to admit a child, the relevant local authority can ask the Secretary of State to intervene. The Secretary of State has the power under an Academy’s Funding Agreement to direct the Academy to admit a child and the ESFA (Education and Skills Funding Agency) acts on behalf of the Secretary of State in these matters. If after considering the case, the ESFA decides that it would be reasonable to issue a direction, a “minded to direct” letter is sent to the relevant school. Schools normally admit</p>



Questions	Answers
	<p>a child on receiving such a letter and it is rare for the ESFA to issue a formal direction. No formal directions were issued between April 2017 and March 2020. On each occasion that a case was referred to the Secretary of State by Oxfordshire County Council, the ESFA decided that it would be appropriate to issue a “minded to direct” letter in order to ensure that a place was offered at the relevant school.</p> <p>Between April 2017 and March 2020, there were 12 requests to the Secretary of State/ESFA to direct the admission of students who had been referred for action under the Fair Access Protocol. Of these requests 2 were rejected by the ESFA and 1 was discontinued because of the issuing of an EHCP (Education Health and Care Plan). The date of each referral and its outcome will be made available confidentially to the Cllr Hanna as they contain individual pupil level information.</p> <p>The referrals to the EFSA were all made following an initial unsuccessful referral to a Fair Access Panel. Each secondary phase Fair Access Panel meets 8 times per academic year and the Primary Fair Access Panel meets as necessary during the academic year.</p>
<p><b>27. COUNCILLOR GLYNIS PHILLIPS</b></p> <p>Can I please have an update on progress with implementing a safe pedestrian and cycle crossing at the end of Collinwood Road in Risinghurst? Can the Cabinet member confirm that officers are actively seeking s106 funding from the Thornhill Park development to fund this much needed and long overdue safe crossing?’</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>A feasibility study for a new toucan crossing of the A40 at Collinwood Rd has been completed by the county. As previously stated, there is currently no further funding to deliver the measure, however county officers will actively pursue suitable opportunities to secure funding for its delivery including through development contributions. This includes ongoing discussions regarding the Thornhill Park site.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p><b>28. COUNCILLOR LIZ LEFFMAN</b></p> <p>In November it was announced that a new Speeding Task Force was to be set up in partnership with Thames Valley Police. Can the Cabinet member for Highways please provide us with a progress report?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR EDDIE REEVES, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY DELIVERY</b></p> <p>We can confirm that senior level meetings between Thames Valley Police (TVP) and the County Council are taking place to ensure a strong partnership in relation to speeding across the county. A key initiative that TVP are undertaking is a revamp and enhancement of the community SpeedWatch programme. This is looking at new systems and improved ways of working with the community. A trial was planned for last autumn but has been delayed due to COVID but will be progressed as soon as is possible.</p>
<p><b>29. COUNCILLOR PETE SUDBURY</b></p> <p>There is increasing evidence that mandatory cycle lanes demarcated only by painted lines do not increase safety, and that advisory lanes, (those marked by dashed lines) actually increase risk to cyclists compared to no lanes at all. In contrast, protected lanes, demarcated by a kerbs or with the lane stepped up, very significantly reduce risks of injury, with the latter being the safest.</p> <p>These differences are not trivial: a study by TfL, examining 2,876 cyclist injuries found protected lanes reduced the chance of injury by 40-65%, whereas advisory lanes increased it by 34% and mandatory "line only" lanes made no difference, even when episodic protection (e.g. regularly spaced blocks or posts) was in place. In the light of this, would the Cabinet Member think it appropriate to consider such measures as</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>Advisory cycle lanes have been used for many decades within Oxford (with the first lanes in the city being installed in 1982) and elsewhere in the county, with mandatory lanes also provided in a smaller number of locations, and have typically been well received by the public, and in particular by cyclists. While it is true that before and after studies carried out by the County Council showed little if any change in the number of reported cycle accidents where either advisory or mandatory lanes have been provided, equally there has been no local evidence of cycle safety being compromised by their provision. The recently updated Department for Transport guidance (Local Transport Note 1/20) acknowledges the limitations of advisory and mandatory cycle lanes but recognises there are locations where other options are not viable. Our aspiration (as set out in our Cycling Design Standards, 2017) is to provide stronger segregation for cyclists where funding and site constraints permit, but where this is not currently possible, existing advisory and mandatory lanes will be retained and new ones provided, noting that the ongoing monitoring of reports of cycle accidents throughout the county shows no basis for removing either advisory and mandatory cycle lanes, a measure that would likely be highly unpopular with cyclists.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>awareness campaigns for cyclists and motorists around the risks of non-protected lanes, changing its policy on new cycle lanes to include only protected lanes and removing or upgrading all unprotected lanes?</p>	
<p><b>30. COUNCILLOR SUSANNA PRESSEL</b></p> <p>We were promised a low-traffic neighbourhood in Walton Street. We bid for and got government money to promote active travel in Jericho. Why is the County Council now proposing measures which bear no resemblance whatsoever to a low-traffic neighbourhood and which will not encourage more walking and cycling?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>The consultation proposals have been developed following engagement and feedback from those in the local community. The proposed measures, put to consultation, allow only pedestrians and cyclists to making certain movements and are specifically intended to restrict through traffic from motor vehicles passing through the area. We therefore disagree that the proposals would not create an environment that encourages walking and cycling. Should the measures be implemented, this would be done as a trial with surveys being undertaken to assess the schemes performance.</p>
<p><b>31. COUNCILLOR SUSANNA PRESSEL</b></p> <p>The City Council is planning to make all its vehicles electric by 2030. A quarter of them will be electric by 2023. How does this compare with the County Council?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>The County Council has a strong track record on carbon emissions reduction. We are committed to moving to electric vehicles, in tandem with reducing overall car travel, in the County and on our own estate. In our own fleet, we are working to phase out petrol and diesel vehicles, ensuring, where feasible, all new vehicle acquisitions are zero tailpipe emission by default on renewal. In 2019 we agreed an Ultra-Low Emission Vehicles Policy statement 2019 setting our commitments for the council's owned or leased fleet:  Transition out cars starting immediately, aiming for the majority of vehicles to be zero emission by 2024.  Begin to transition out vans, starting immediately, whilst recognising the market is less developed, aiming for transition of the majority of vehicles to be</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>complete by 2028. Actively explore alternatives, and innovative solutions (electric, hydrogen etc.) to reduce emissions from heavy good vehicles and specialist vehicles (fire engines, mini buses), bringing forward business cases as they become financially and operationally viable.</p> <p>We are currently operating 21 Electric Vehicles including 9 cars, 9 vans, and 3 minibuses / Multi-purpose Vehicles. These EVs have been added to fleet over the past 24 months. We have installed 44 EV chargepoints across 19 council buildings to support charging of existing EVs and enable uptake of further EVs in our fleet. We are also engaging with new technologies such as vehicle to grid charging. The council has just agreed a new strategic management approach to fleet, which will further support emissions reduction from fleet by transition to electric and offer opportunities to look at shared fleet.</p>
<p><b>32. COUNCILLOR SUSANNA PRESSEL</b></p> <p>We were promised that when we left the EU an extra £350m a week would be available for public services like the NHS. How much of this do we expect to come to Oxfordshire?</p>	<p><b>COUNILLOR DAVID BARTHOLOMEW, CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE</b></p> <p>Queries relating to central government decisions on NHS funding are outside the remit of this Council.</p>
<p><b>33. COUNCILLOR LIZ LEFFMAN</b></p> <p>The current Eynsham Park &amp; Ride plans do not take account of a future Witney to Oxford railway line and paragraph 63 of the planning application explicitly states that longer term measures such as re-opening the Witney to Oxford railway line have been discounted. Now that the leader has</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>I'm sure that Cllr Leffman will agree with me that its vital we improve public transport and cycling facilities along the A40 corridor to give the residents of West Oxfordshire the opportunity to get out of their cars. This is exactly why we are investing £175 million to provide improved public transport and cycling facilities on the A40. We have based this on many reports dating back to the turn of the century when all options including a rail link has been considered.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>given his support in a letter to the Witney to Oxford Transport Group for their application to the Department for Transport for funding for a feasibility study, will he now confirm that if the application is successful, the line will no longer be discounted?</p>	<p>Oxfordshire County council is part of the North Cotswold Line Task Force working with 4 other County councils, Network rail and Great Western Railway to deliver 4 trains per hour to Hanborough station providing another public transport option. I've supported the feasibility study on the understanding that it will not delay or detract from the groups work as its vital we deliver improved services on the North Cotswold line.</p> <p>If the bid for funding is successful and a feasibility study produced then it will be taken into consideration in the future, but any rail line would be a very long term project and I cannot delay these vital projects that will give the residents of West Oxfordshire real travel options within the next few years.</p>
<p><b>34. COUNCILLOR JANE HANNA</b></p> <p>Can the leader provide an update on action since the County Council unanimous support for the December 8<sup>th</sup> Motion on OX12 including what he has done to influence a positive commitment within BOB to acceptable health and social care provision for the residents at the heart of the OX12 population pilot and whether he can make public his correspondence to the Prime Minister, the Select Committees for Health and Social Care, Housing, Communities and Local Government to urge the vital importance of safeguarding local democracy and scrutiny as non-elected decision-makers implement policy across Oxfordshire.</p>	<p><b>COUCILLOR IAN HUDSPETH, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</b></p> <p>Since the December meeting I have been only able to attend 1 meeting of the Chairman's group when I raised the issue of how best we can influence local decision making for areas such as the OX12 group. The input was welcomed as it highlights the fact that future decisions regarding healthcare within the ICS framework should always be made at the appropriate level based upon the overall strategy for the ICS. We have also seen the publication of the NHS white paper which helps further clarify the expectations of the relationships between the NHS and local government.</p> <p>HWB Board recently have received a presentation on the work we are going to do across NHS and local authorities focused on the life stage of Ageing Well to develop a truly integrated community service strategy to ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increasing independence and health and wellbeing outcomes for our population;</li> <li>• Working with our population to make best use of our people, our systems and our assets.</li> </ul>

Questions	Answers
	This piece of work will include defining and agreeing the role of community-based beds in this.
<p><b>35. COUNCILLOR JENNY HANNABY</b></p> <p>Can the cabinet member provide information on when they were first aware that Oxfordshire County Council's care home in Kidlington, run by the Order of St John, was in crisis and at risk of closure, and the earliest date that the 28 residents and their families were consulted about the closure of the home and what good practice was followed, given many would have been shocked and their well-being at risk with expectations that they would have been able to stay in their home. Can the cabinet member give reassurances that the decision on the closure of the care home in Kidlington will now go to property for consideration of the use of Oxfordshire County Council's asset and best value for Oxfordshire's residents?</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR LAWRIE STRATFORD, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE &amp; PUBLIC HEALTH</b></p> <p>Thank you for your question. The council along with our partner 'The Order of St Johns Trust' work closely to ensure that our services are modern, fit for purpose and delivering value for money. The Glebe residential home built in the 1970s has struggled to deliver a service that is attractive to people in 2020 due to limitations of the building and the reducing number of people needing this type of support. Less people need this support due to the increased alternatives available to help people remain in their own homes or through alternative accommodation support such as Extra Care Housing, live in support etc.</p> <p>We fully recognise the anxiety that any change can cause individuals and their families and we have worked closely with families and OSJT to make the transition as smooth as possible. I'm pleased to say that all individuals have now moved safely to their new homes the majority to other OSJT homes.</p> <p>Finally, the decision about the future use of the Glebe will be made following usual procedures led by the council's property department.</p>
<p><b>36. COUNCILLOR JANE HANNA</b></p> <p>Given the BBC Today extremely troubling coverage on 12<sup>th</sup> March about the placement market for children in care, how many of Oxfordshire's children have experienced multiple moves and/ or moves out of Oxfordshire in the last twelve months; what is the highest weekly</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR STEVE HARROD, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN &amp; FAMILY SERVICES</b></p> <p>In 2019-20:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 11% of children we care for experienced 3 or more placement moves in the year.</li> <li>- 36% of children we care for were placed out of county and more than 20 miles from their coming into care address. We recognise that this is not good</li> </ul>

Questions	Answers
<p>cost that the Council has paid; and what are Oxfordshire County Council's average costs for a placement for a vulnerable child and how far have these increased since 2013?</p>	<p>enough and our placement sufficiency strategy addresses the need to create more local placements, reflected in the council's investment in in-house foster care; the re-provision of Maltfield through a new build and the commissioning of more local residential placements.</p> <p>The highest weekly cost for a placement this financial year was a bridging placement at £10,000 per week. The young person later moved to a longer-term placement which cost £5532 per week.</p> <p>In 2019/20 – the average cost of a placement for children we care for was approx. £1,050.</p> <p>In 2013/14 – the average cost of a placement for children we care for was approx. £850.</p> <p>This is an increase of 23.5% over 6 years, an average of 3.9% per annum. The increase is due to a mix of price inflation and the changing placement mix (e.g. more IFA and residential placements than in 2013).</p>
<p><b>37. COUNCILLOR JENNY HANNABY</b></p> <p>Given restoring Grove Station has been an aspiration of Oxfordshire County Council since 1979 and since requests for funding or calls for action by all of Wantage Constituency MPs since then, most recently the bid for £50,000 during 2020, have all been unsuccessful, what reassurances can be given to the expanding populations in the Grove and Wantage settlements and wider area that the small sum needed of £85,000 to guarantee that the 'determine' stage will at least start during 2021</p>	<p><b>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</b></p> <p>A funding bid has been submitted to the Government's 'Restoring Your Railways' Ideas Fund for Grove Station, backed by David Johnston MP. We expect to hear the outcome of this bid in May – our ability to progress the scheme at this time is dependent on that bid being successful.</p>

<b>Questions</b>	<b>Answers</b>
has been or will be found?	



## Annex 4

It was drawn to our attention at the Group Leader's Briefing that the Motion by Councillor Susanna Pressel was over the 250-word limit (Council Procedure Rule 13.3). We can confirm that the original Motion sent in by Councillor Pressel was 250 words, but that in the amending of the Motion to make it acceptable for inclusion on the Agenda the Motion is now over the 250 words. We apologise for this omission and the correct version removing words to take it below the word count of 250 is set out below. The version appearing on the website has also been updated.

"Officers are ~~currently~~ developing a small scheme for a workplace parking levy (WPL) across one section of East Oxford. If that scheme is approved, the revenue it generates ~~d~~ will be spent on just one new bus route to serve only those commuters who would otherwise drive to work in that "eastern arc".

This is a step in the right direction, but we need to be far more ambitious. A larger scheme would do far more to help us achieve our climate action goals; ~~it would do far more~~ **and** to reduce congestion and improve air quality. ~~and~~ **Crucially** it would generate far more ring-fenced revenue to spend on better public transport to benefit all our residents as well as just a few commuters.

The WPL in Nottingham has so far raised more than £75 million (at least £10m each year), which the council has spent on public transport, including an electric bus network.

The Transport Act 2000 says that the regulations for WPLs are designed to be flexible. The only restriction on WPLs is that "a scheme may only be made if it facilitates the policies set out in the Local Transport Plan (LTP)". As a Standard Note from the House of Commons Library puts it: the regulations "aim to create maximum flexibility as to how and where the money raised is spent".

~~This~~ Council requests that the Corporate Director Environment & Place ~~give consideration to~~ **considers** expanding the WPL scheme through ~~the development of~~ **and developing** a business case for Connecting Oxford that covers a much wider area and not just the "eastern arc".

This page is intentionally left blank