



County Council

5 April 2022

Schedule of Business

Schedule of Business

OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL –5 APRIL 2022

SCHEDULE OF BUSINESS

Members are asked to note that timings are very approximate.

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE NO.	MAXIMUM DURATION	APPROX START TIME TIME LIMIT PER DEBATE	SUBJECT	PROPOSALS (M = Motion; SEC = Secorder; Am = Amendment S = Statement; Q = Question; REC = Recommendation to be determined)
1.	2	5 mins	10.30	Minutes	
2.	2	5 mins	10.35	Apologies for Absence	Cllr Paule and Cllr Rooke (Dispensations) Cllrs Hanna and Snowdon
3.	2			Declarations of Interest Withdrawal of motion – Item 17	
4.	2	15 mins	10.40	Official Communications	Tributes to former Cllr Gill Sanders Ukraine New High Sheriff Covid advice

AGENDA 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)
5.	2	5 mins	10.55	<p>Appointments</p> <p>Cllr Corkin to replace Cllr Murphy on Remuneration Committee</p> <p>Cllr from CIA group to replace Cllr Snowdon on Place Overview and Scrutiny Committee</p> <p>Notification of Shadow Cabinet changes</p> <p>Deputy Leader – Cllr Corkin to replace Cllr Murphy</p> <p>Children, Education and Young People’s Services – Cllr Simpson to replace Cllr Bloomfield</p> <p>Adult Social Care – Cllr Leverton to replace Cllr Murphy</p> <p>Public Health and Equalities – Cllr Mallon to replace Cllr Leverton</p> <p>Travel and Development Strategy – Cllr Snowdon to replace Cllr Bulmer</p>	

AGENDA 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)
6.	2	30 mins	11.00	Petitions and Public Address All public speakers have been given 3 minutes to speak.	Public Address Ian Hill – Charlotte Coxe Trust (via Teams) Anni Byard – Transgender motion (via Teams) Hannah Massie – Transgender motion Chrissie Chevasuut – Transgender motion Debbie Proctor – Streets and cycle ways motion (via Teams) Paul Boone – Chalgrove Airfield motion (via Teams) David Turner – Chalgrove Airfield Petition Linda Goodhead - Hinksey Hill, Boars Hill and Chilswell bus
7.	2		11.30	Questions with Notice from Members of the Public	None received

AGENDA 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)
8.	3	15 mins	11.30	Questions with Notice from Members of the Council 1. Constance to Bearder 2. Reeves to Leffman 3. Reeves to Leffman 4. Reeves to Leffman 5. Sibley to Enright 6. Waine to Enright 7. Mallon to Fawcett 8. Ford to Enright 9. Ford to Fawcett 10. Ford to Phillips 11. Field-Johnson to Bearder 12. Gawrysiak to Miller 13. Corkin to Lygo 14. Corkin to Brighthouse 15. Povolotsky to Brighthouse 16. Bennett to Bearder	See Annex 2
9.	3	5 mins	11.45	Dispensation from attending meetings	(M) Leffman (S) Brighthouse

AGENDA 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)
10.	3	30 mins	11.50	<p>Report of the Cabinet</p> <p>Leader of the Council (Cllr Leffman)</p> <p>Children, education and Young People's services (Cllr Brighthouse)</p> <p>Adult Social Care (Cllr Hannaby)</p> <p>Climate Change Delivery & Environment (Cllr Sudbury)</p> <p>Community Services & Safety (Cllr Fawcett)</p> <p>Corporate Services (Cllr Phillips)</p> <p>Finance (Cllr Miller)</p> <p>Highway Management (Cllr Bearder)</p> <p>Travel and Development Strategy (Cllr Enright)</p> <p>All Cabinet Members (Item 27)</p>	<p>Q Graham</p> <p>Q Middleton</p> <p>Q Levy</p> <p>Q Bennett Q Rouane Q Middleton</p>

AGENDA 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)
11.	3	5 mins	12.20	<p>Appointment of representative to BOB Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee</p> <p>Appointments:-</p> <p>Liberal Democrat / Green Alliance</p> <p>Cllr Hanna Cllr Ley Cllr van Mierlo</p> <p>Conservative / Independent Alliance</p> <p>Cllr Leverton Cllr Champken - Woods</p> <p>Labour and Cooperative</p> <p>Cllr Edosomwan Cllr Haywood</p> <p><i>Movers and seconders 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</i></p>	(M) Howson (SEC) Pressel (S)

AGENDA 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)
12.	3	15 mins	12.25	Code of Conduct <i>Movers and seconders 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</i>	(M) Phillips (SEC) Smith (S) Gregory
13.	4	15 mins	12.40	Future Management of the Charlotte Coxe Trust CIA Nominations Cllr Bloomfield Cllr Murphy <i>Movers and seconders 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</i>	(M) Leffman (SEC) van Mierlo (S)

AGENDA 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	45 mins	1.45	Trans-gender motion by Cllr Sally Povolotsky <i>Movers and seconders 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</i>	(M) Povolotsky (SEC) Haywood (AM) Reeves (SEC) Mallon (S) Sudbury (S) Lygo (S) Gregory (S) Hicks (S) Smith (S) Coles (S) Brighthouse
15.	5	30 mins	2.30	Safety on streets and cycle paths motion by Councillor Donna Ford <i>Movers and seconders 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</i>	M) Ford (SEC) Murphy (AM) Smith (SEC) Gant S Sudbury S Walker S Rouane S Levy

AGENDA 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.	6	30 mins	3.00	<p>Chalgrove Airfield motion by Councillor Freddie van Mierlo</p> <p><i>Movers and seconders 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</i></p>	<p>(M) van Mierlo (SEC) Sudbury (AM) Bennett (SEC) Povolotsky S Reeves</p>
17.	6			<p>Social media protocol motion by Councillor Kate Gregory</p> <p>To be withdrawn</p> <p><i>Movers and seconders 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</i></p>	<p>(M) Gregory (SEC) (AM) Reeves (SEC) Ford S</p>
18.	7	15 mins	3.30	<p>Nature conservation motion by Councillor Bob Johnston</p> <p><i>Movers and seconders 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</i></p>	<p>(M) Johnston (SEC) Sudbury S Povoltsky S Field-Johnson S Rouane</p>

AGENDA 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.	7			<p>Meat and dairy farmers motion by Councillor Eddie Reeves</p> <p>MO has accepted motion, CPR 16.2</p> <p><i>Movers and seconders 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</i></p>	<p>(M) Reeves (SEC) Bartholomew S Sudbury S Waive S Mallon S Fenton S Leffman S Leverton</p>
20.	7			<p>Sandy Lane rail crossing motion by Councillor Nigel Simpson</p> <p><i>Movers and seconders 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</i></p>	<p>(M) Simpson (SEC) Walker S Middleton</p>

AGENDA 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)
21.	8			<p>Response to questions motion by Councillor Ian Corkin</p> <p><i>Movers and seconders 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</i></p>	<p>(M) Corkin (SEC) Reeves</p>
22.	8			<p>Park and ride motion by Councillor Liam Walker</p> <p><i>Movers and seconders 5 mins and speaking in debate 3 minutes, CPR 15.4.2</i></p>	<p>(M) Walker (SEC) Reeves S Walker</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda item 14 – Motion by Councillor Sally Povolotsky – Amendment to be moved by Councillor Eddie Reeves

Transgender and non-binary people face significant disadvantage in society and can be, vulnerable to violence, isolation, homelessness, and lack of ~~access to~~ suitable healthcare provision.

Council believes that:

1. ~~All The UK law should clearly~~ leads the world in recognising that trans and other important minority rights are human rights.
2. Transgender and non-binary people deserve respect ~~and autonomy~~.
3. It ~~is therefore~~ our duty as community leaders ~~who seek to create an open and tolerant society~~ to speak out against transphobia, misogyny and all forms of discrimination in all its forms.

Council therefore resolves to:

1. Ensure that all Council services, ~~both directly provided and through partners,~~ are fully ~~accessible~~ compliant with the Equality Act 2010, regardless of ~~their sexuality or gender~~ residents' identity.
2. State publicly that trans and women's rights are human rights and affirm the legal rights of all protected groups under the ~~2010~~ Equality Act 2010.
3. To work with healthcare providers to remove barriers transgender and non-binary people face when accessing medical care.
4. Work to provide at least one gender inclusive and one women's only bathroom (~~accessible~~) where possible in every public building owned or operated by the Council.
5. Ensure that the Council's constitution, policies, forms, and all internal and external communications ~~are~~ seek to:
 - a. ~~Reducing~~ Reduce the amount of gender information collected unless absolutely necessary,
 - b. ~~Respecting~~ the pronouns individuals use for themselves without requiring that they be declared,
 - c. ~~Providing~~ Provide opportunities for self-identification beyond the binary "man" and "woman", whilst respecting those who prefer to do so.
6. Encourage and support a network of informal LGBTQIA+ allies across officers and councillors.

7. Support and embrace the development of a LGBTQIA+ guidance within OCC for employees and contractors.”

Agenda item 15 – Motion by Councillor Donna Ford – Amendment to be moved by Councillor Roz Smith

This council is committed to ensuring that active travel is fully inclusive all year round. ~~including during the Winter, and accepts its responsibility to ensure that all feel safe on our streets and cycle paths.~~

~~This council recognises the need to ensure the safety and security of our residents engaged in active travel and its responsibility in deterring crime and anti-social behaviour.~~

In accordance with its statutory responsibilities this council further commits to maintaining Oxfordshire’s publicly maintainable footpaths and cycle ways thereby making active travel safer and encouraging greater use. ~~to make using active travel routes safer and more secure and encourage use of them.~~

This council resolves to ensure that wherever possible all overgrowth is cleared from publicly maintainable rights of way including footpaths and cycleways. **When budgets allow this council resolves to installing additional suitable lighting along active travel routes where anti-social behaviour has been reported.** ~~without delay and ensure that any broken lighting along footpaths and cycle paths is resolved efficiently. Moreover, this council resolves to consider installing additional LED lighting in poorly lit areas and/or those along active travel routes where crime and anti-social behaviour are high or at risk of increasing.~~

This council agrees to engage more actively with stakeholders, including Network Rail, residents, landowners and businesses to ensure that they comply more fully with their obligations to clear vegetation on private land and keep public rights of way open. ~~This council commits to ensure all residents, but particularly disabled, elderly and vulnerable residents, are able to walk and cycle safely and securely.~~

Item 16 – Motion by Councillor Freddie van Mierlo – Amendment to be moved by Councillor Robin Bennett

In 2020, South Oxfordshire District Council was directed by the then Conservative Secretary of State for Housing, Robert Jenrick MP, to progress a local plan through examination and adoption that included Chalgrove Airfield as an allocated site. **At the time, it was argued that it should not be included due to its highly rural location and the distances required to travel by future residents to employment centres by private motor vehicle.**

In November 2021, Homes England restated its desire to develop Chalgrove Airfield with 3,000 new homes, despite having previously withdrawn its outline planning application, following significant concerns as to the suitability and safety of the site being raised by the Civil Aviation Authority.

~~The County Council notes that a massive and unprecedented package of infrastructure would be required to serve new dwellings in this remote and rural location, with no rail connection and uncertainty around viability of bus services. The construction of a large, car dependent community, distant from major employment centres and in a rural setting, runs contrary to the County Council's goals on climate emergency and biodiversity.~~

~~Without prejudice to the County Council's role as statutory consultee in the planning application process, the Council expresses reservations in the strongest terms as to the suitability of the site and its compatibility with climate change goals.~~

Various reports, most recently “Garden Villages and Garden Towns: Visions and Reality” by Transport for New Homes have repeatedly highlighted the failure nationally to prevent car-dependent developments, despite clear Government guidance on this topic.

This Council notes the parallel failure, nationally and locally to make any significant reduction in transport emissions over the past 20 years and that 90% of Oxfordshire’s road transport emissions come from rural transport

The Leader is requested to write to Homes England and the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) & the Department for Transport to question how this development aligns with the stated environmental aims of the government and inform the minister as to how as a county we are working towards sustainable communities and reduced, not increased, car dependency.

Agenda Item 17 – Motion by Councillor Kate Gregory – Amendment to be moved by Councillor Eddie Reeves

Oxfordshire County Council **recognises**

1. That Councillors have a duty to promote kind, respectful and honest discourse both on and offline.
2. Recognises that discussion, scrutiny and debate are important to a democracy but must be carried out without targeting, or abuse or factual errors being peddled for political gain.
3. That robust debate is a crucial part of the scrutiny process and should not be discouraged.
4. That social media is an increasingly aggressive space where abuse is normalised, and inaccuracies propagated.

5. That misinformation is often the trigger for such abusive ~~ive~~ behaviour.
6. That public figures are often the target for abusive behaviour and that it inevitably has a significant detrimental impact on their mental health and wellbeing, and those of their families.

Oxfordshire County Council Proposes to lead the way in:

7. ~~Introduce~~ Establish a councillor social media protocol and digital citizenship guide for social media, made applicable also where possible to candidates standing for election, that has an emphasis on seeks to promoting accurate discourse and encourages councillors and candidates not to ~~not~~ write or share posts that contain ~~obvious~~ inaccuracies or aggression against colleagues across the council or rival candidates.
- ~~8. Create a digital citizenship guide for all elected members and staff.~~
9. Introduce social media training in all ~~new~~ councillor inductions and offer a refresher for elected members ~~on~~, focusing on harm of misinformation, copyright, rumours and slander and defamation.
- 10 Ask Councillors to declare the social media handle of any public accounts in their name, as an elected member in the community or related to party political activity.
- 11 Ask Councillors to declare whether they receive third party assistance in the management of their own social media channels.

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.

Questions	Answers
<p>1. COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE</p> <p>Noting Council approval of £8million borrowing for possible spend on county-wide 20mph programme, it is disappointing that OCC intends to take 3 years to roll out this programme. Villages in my Division are keen to install as soon as possible, so I ask again why must it take so long? If Council were to approve 20 mph speed limit for all built up areas, that would avoid the expensive speed survey and consultation and enable Towns/Parishes to decide to change signing and lining at their own expense for the immediate advantage of slower safer speeds. Most Parishes do not require engineering works to change from 30 mph to 20 mph: how can they be permitted to install 20 mph as soon as possible?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR TIM BEARDER, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT</p> <p>On a point of factual correctness, Cabinet approved the funding of the 20mph programme from Council reserves not borrowing, and for clarify I can confirm that the recently adopted 20mph policy removes the need for a speed survey to be undertaken and permits sign only schemes to be implemented regardless of current speed. All built up areas would meet the criteria for a 20mph limit under the new adopted policy.</p> <p>In terms of timeframe to implement, whilst I appreciate it would be great if we could implement 20mph quicker and in one go, there are a variety of considerations which make rolling out a programme over three years more appropriate.</p> <p>These can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Engagement with local councils to agree what works best for them (by way of 20mph and any other associated speed limit changes) takes time and we don't have the resources to carry out such engagement in bulk. In addition, the local councils are all at different stages in respect of discussing with their communities. There may also be some local councils who wish to fund traffic management measures as part of their 20mph scheme which will need to be incorporated.

Questions	Answers
	<p>b) Experience has been that speed limit proposals can generate a significant amount of feedback, and that in order to give appropriately detailed consideration to this as part of the decision - making process, in particular at the Cabinet Member Decision or Cabinet meetings, it is much more manageable to do so as individual, or more likely, small groups of schemes, rather than as a very large package of work. It is also worth being aware that the Speed Orders across the county are at a Parish / Town not County level.</p> <p>c) Although the signing works required for speed limits are, when compared to many other types of scheme, relatively modest, a countywide project delivered in one go would be significant and would take several months to plan and prepare for before any implementation could start.</p> <p>In light of this, we chose to undertake the process as a rolling programme on a parish or town basis, with further grouping were appropriate. The team that are undertaking the consultations are working hard with the 20mph programme team to ensure that we have a streamlined process.</p> <p>Officers are currently working with some 70 town and parish councils as part of what we are referring to as Tranche 1. Tranche 1 applications were those received (via the web application process) from interested parties between October 2021 to the end of January 2022. Applications received between February 2022 to July 2022 will be developed as part of tranche 2. The team are currently expecting to deliver in the region of 100 schemes this financial year.</p> <p>Each scheme that is received via web application is assessed on site and then designed and programmed in by officers. Experience from the 5 pilot</p>

Questions	Answers
	sites has shown that each scheme is different, and in some instances, work is required to amend adjacent speed limits to ensure that the deacceleration of vehicles is appropriate for entering a 20mph restriction.
<p>2. COUNCILLOR EDDIE REEVES</p> <p>How many complaints have been received by the Council against the Cabinet member for Highways Management, whether under the Councillors' Code of Conduct specifically or otherwise, since the formation of the Fair Deal Alliance?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LIZ LEFFMAN, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>There have been four Code of Conduct Complaints against the Cabinet member for Highways Management all emanating from the same facts to which an apology was issued in each case.</p>
<p>3. COUNCILLOR EDDIE REEVES</p> <p>What is the Leader's view on the most appropriate structure of local government for Oxfordshire, given the levels of devolution offered and the corresponding structures presented in the Government's Levelling Up White Paper?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LIZ LEFFMAN, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>Thank you for your question Cllr Reeves. I think this follows a similar pattern to the question asked regarding devolution at the meeting of Council in November 2021. As such I will refer to the position I set out then, recognising that it is not up to this Council or the Cabinet to unilaterally to pursue a deal or put in a bid in response to the levelling up white paper regarding the future structure of local government in Oxfordshire. The consideration of any such deal would seek early engagement with the Districts and the City as well as other stakeholders.</p> <p>However, you ask for my views with regards to appropriate structures and I would offer the following reflections. As an administration we recognise that effective delivery for the people of Oxfordshire requires strong partnerships across organisations, these partnerships are formed on effective working relationships and can be achieved with or without the type of structural reform set out in the levelling up white paper. As such, deepening our partnerships</p>

Questions	Answers																														
	remains a priority and focus of mine. I am also clear that whilst the levelling up white paper has prioritised some county deals, Oxfordshire is not within this first tranche, therefore we have time in the coming months as a system to discuss and explore the options available to us.																														
<p>4. COUNCILLOR EDDIE REEVES</p> <p>On 18 September 2021, the Leader's party conference adopted a national policy calling for 380,000 more homes to be built every year. Does she agree with this policy and, if so, how many extra homes would she like to see built annually in Oxfordshire?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LIZ LEFFMAN, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>The number of new homes to be built in Oxfordshire are identified in the table below.</p> <p>The Oxfordshire Plan 2050 will allocate the number of new homes to be built in the county, and their location.</p> <p>Housing commitments in adopted Local Plan in Oxfordshire</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="936 727 2033 1129"> <thead> <tr> <th>District</th> <th>Adoption</th> <th>Local Plan Period</th> <th>Housing Commitment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Cherwell District Council</td> <td>July 2015</td> <td>2011-2031</td> <td>22,800</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Part 1 Partial Review: Oxford's Unmet Housing Need – September 2020</td> <td>2011-2031</td> <td>4,400</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Oxford City Council</td> <td>June 2020</td> <td>2016/2036</td> <td>10,884</td> </tr> <tr> <td>South Oxfordshire District Council</td> <td>December 2020</td> <td>2011-2035</td> <td>23,550 (4,950 of which is Oxford's unmet need).</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Vale of White Horse District Council</td> <td>Pt 1 - December 2016</td> <td>2011-2031</td> <td>20,560</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pt 2 – October 2019</td> <td>2011-2031</td> <td>2,200 (Oxford's unmet need)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>West Oxfordshire District Council</td> <td>September 2018</td> <td>2011-2031</td> <td>15,950 (2,750 of which is Oxford's unmet need).</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	District	Adoption	Local Plan Period	Housing Commitment	Cherwell District Council	July 2015	2011-2031	22,800	Part 1 Partial Review: Oxford's Unmet Housing Need – September 2020	2011-2031	4,400	Oxford City Council	June 2020	2016/2036	10,884	South Oxfordshire District Council	December 2020	2011-2035	23,550 (4,950 of which is Oxford's unmet need).	Vale of White Horse District Council	Pt 1 - December 2016	2011-2031	20,560	Pt 2 – October 2019	2011-2031	2,200 (Oxford's unmet need)	West Oxfordshire District Council	September 2018	2011-2031	15,950 (2,750 of which is Oxford's unmet need).
District	Adoption	Local Plan Period	Housing Commitment																												
Cherwell District Council	July 2015	2011-2031	22,800																												
	Part 1 Partial Review: Oxford's Unmet Housing Need – September 2020	2011-2031	4,400																												
Oxford City Council	June 2020	2016/2036	10,884																												
South Oxfordshire District Council	December 2020	2011-2035	23,550 (4,950 of which is Oxford's unmet need).																												
Vale of White Horse District Council	Pt 1 - December 2016	2011-2031	20,560																												
	Pt 2 – October 2019	2011-2031	2,200 (Oxford's unmet need)																												
West Oxfordshire District Council	September 2018	2011-2031	15,950 (2,750 of which is Oxford's unmet need).																												
<p>5. COUNCILLOR LES SIBLEY</p> <p>It has been over 3 months since the OCC Cabinet at its meeting on the 21st of December 2021 endorsed and agreed to remove the already allocated funds of £15.75m from the A4095</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR DUNCAN ENRIGHT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</p> <p>I have visited Howes Lane twice in recent weeks, including as you know meeting with residents nearby. Engagement with developers regarding delivery options are ongoing. A workshop is taking place with developers</p>																														

Questions	Answers
<p>realignment of Howes Lane and divert the funds to other schemes in the south of the county such as the A34 Lodge Hill Interchange and the Milton Heights Bridge. Can the Cabinet member provide any update or news on possible alternative funding options, timelines, or meeting dates regarding the A4095 Howes Lane realignment project?</p>	<p>early April being led by Cherwell District Council and supported by Oxfordshire County Council officers. Cherwell District Council are in discussions with Homes England about further support to get the infrastructure in place. County Council members will be informed of timescales and outcomes once they are further developed</p>
<p>6. COUNCILLOR MICHAEL WAYNE</p> <p>What confidence can Bicester residents have in the County Council Administration to deliver the very necessary South-East Link Road, which would take A41 and traffic from the east out of our fast growing town, given their removal of Growth Funding for the Howes Lane (A4095) re-aligned road?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR DUNCAN ENRIGHT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</p> <p>The South East Link Road is a policy within the LTP4 area transport strategy and a number of developments in the area have paid or are committed to paying s106 contributions towards the scheme. However, new road building has implications for Government and Oxfordshire Zero Carbon targets. All strategies are due to undergo a review in the next year as part of the LTCP Part 2 and the Bicester area strategy will need to demonstrate how it is to meet these climate change targets.</p> <p>Initial work on the A41 corridor has been setting out what the network could deliver both with and without the SEPR. This will need to be discussed and progressed within the area strategy work. We are proud to be supporting the CDC Garden Town and the strategy discussions will provide the opportunity to consider all options.</p> <p>The regional body, England's Economic Heartland are also considering this road link within their Oxford to Milton Keynes corridor study</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>7. COUNCILLOR KIERON MALLON</p> <p>Can the cabinet member for Fire and Rescue please confirm that the emergency planning and fire and rescue service staff were fully consulted before the implementation of the Oxford Zero Emission Zone and informed of the financial impact it will have on those members of staff and their ability to get to and from their place of work?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR NEIL FAWCETT, CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES AND SAFETY</p> <p>Senior officers have been consulted by their colleagues from Environment and Place regarding the Oxford Zero Emission Zone. The service has received assurances that the scheme will have appropriate exceptions for all emergency response activities including On Call firefighters. The Fire and Rescue service is working hard towards reducing its emissions and is moving all of its cars and vans across to zero emissions.</p> <p>The service will engage further with the Environment and Place to ensure that any impact on all fire and rescue staff is minimised and that they are not disadvantaged by serving at the city's essential central fire station</p>
<p>8. COUNCILLOR DONNA FORD</p> <p>Can the cabinet member for Travel & Development please confirm if there is any reason why despite 3 requests to officers, I have still not been sent the Business Case regarding the reallocation of funds originally intended for the realignment of Howes Lane?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR DUNCAN ENRIGHT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</p> <p>Individual project Business Cases were not created when the Housing & Growth Deal (H&GD) Funds were allocated in 2018/19.</p> <p>Instead, an assessment of (potentially) accelerated housing trajectories on various development sites across Oxfordshire was provided by each City & District council - along with the County Council identifying the infrastructure necessary to support this acceleration - and an overall allocation of the £150m '<i>Homes from Infrastructure</i>' funding was agreed by the Oxfordshire Growth Board (now Future Oxfordshire Partnership, F.O.P.)</p> <p>Cherwell District Council's original projection was for the delivery of over 1,000 accelerated homes on the identified sites in Bicester within the H&GD period – by March 2023 – and £15.75m was allocated to the Howes Lane re-alignment to support this.</p> <p>Over the 4 years (to date) of the Housing & Growth Deal there have been</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>continual reviews of both the accelerated housing numbers and infrastructure cost estimates.</p> <p>The accelerated housing projection for the identified sites in Bicester had consistently fallen, reaching 50 by mid-2021. This prompted a review of the on-going viability of this work under H&GD funding – especially as the work on the scheme to date (at that stage in Design phase) had also shown a significant risk of both cost and time overruns.</p> <p>A recommendation was tabled and endorsed at F.O.P on 30th November 2021 – including by CDC – that given the reduced number of houses being brought forward (which is the key metric for the overall H&GD Infrastructure programme) and also the anticipated cost and time pressures on the Infrastructure delivery, it was appropriate to re-allocate the remaining H&GD from Howes Lane to other schemes which more closely fall within H&GD parameters.</p> <p>The Howes Lane re-alignment remains a priority for OCC and we are working with developers and other interested parties to identify suitable funding to ensure that the scheme is delivered as quickly as possible.</p> <p>I'm sorry if there has been confusion around a specific Business Case but the decision to re-allocate funding was made in the same way as both the original allocations were in 2018 and the subsequent changes which have been made to the Homes from Infrastructure programme over the past 4 years.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>9. COUNCILLOR DONNA FORD</p> <p>Can the cabinet member for community services and safety please confirm that the staff at Westgate library were fully consulted before their change in working conditions following the relocation of Oxford City Council to the building?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR NEIL FAWCETT, CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES AND SAFETY</p> <p>The relocation of Oxford City customer contact staff is a pilot scheme which seeks to continue the development of a wider offer of services available to residents with Oxfordshire libraries, in line with the councils new library and heritage strategy.</p> <p>The location of the Oxford City staff doesn't change the working terms or conditions of OCC colleagues based in the library and I can confirm that the managers and staff in the library were engaged in the project and were supportive of the approach.</p>
<p>10. COUNCILLOR DONNA FORD</p> <p>Can the cabinet member for corporate services please confirm that the public's consultation views will not be overwritten by those of cabinet members?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR GLYNIS PHILLIPS, CABINET MEMBER FOR CORPORATE SERVICES</p> <p>As set out in the new consultation and engagement strategy this council is committed to public engagement and consultation, both for statutory and non-statutory processes. We will always seek to take on board and address consultation and engagement findings and set out where we have done so as part of our response. It should be recognised that consultation responses often reflect multiple positions and views and one of the challenges is to balance these competing views.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>11. COUNCILLOR NICK FIELD-JOHNSON</p> <p>Given the success of the Curbridge trial in 2019 and the use of GiPave which shows an improved lifespan of up to 70% of the road surface, why is it not being now rolled out generally. I note the Marsh Lane trial but, as it has now been tested and is successful, can we not roll-it out more generally and cut back on the constant pothole repairs?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR TIM BEARDER, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The Curbridge trial was the first site in the UK to use the GI Pave material. Initial tests have shown positive results and aligned to the expectations of the manufacturers. However, it was always the case that further testing would be needed at Curbridge to check performance after a period of time from the initial installation. These tests have been carried out and the designers are due to produce final reports later in the summer. Until we have definitive and long-term test results, it remains as a trial.</p> <p>We also need to test the material in different traffic conditions. The trail at Marsh Lane is to test the material in more of an urban area, with heavier traffic loading. Again, initial tests will be carried out along with later tests after a period of time to prove assumptions made.</p> <p>At this stage the material is not readily available for everyday use and special delivery for these trials have had to be arranged.</p> <p>It is hoped that as it proves itself in the future, and more locations across the UK make use of it, it will become more readily available and indeed used across more roads in Oxfordshire where appropriate.</p>
<p>12. COUNCILLOR STEFAN GAWRYSIAK</p> <p>For 6 years now the Chiltern care home has been left derelict and empty. It is in our Henley and Harpsden neighbourhood plan for housing. This is a lump of prime real estate that would provide much needed housing for Henley and provide</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR CALUM MILLER, CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE</p> <p>Chiltern's End is a former care home that has been vacant for several years and the lease was surrendered back to OCC in November 2019. The property has been stripped internally and had originally been earmarked for refurbishment through the capital programme.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>good workable capital for the county to provide other services. When is this site going to be developed or sold?</p>	<p>The site is recognised as offering a valuable opportunity to develop much needed services for people with ongoing care and support needs in the locality. We have held ongoing discussions with Adult Services who have identified a service need to deliver circa 60 Extra Care Housing Units for older persons and 8 specialist houses for adults with LD and Autism. In all such cases these plans are complex and do take time to develop. In the period since November 2019 the immediate focus of responding to the pandemic has inevitably been the priority for Adult Social Care. However, strategic planning for long term service requirements has continued.</p> <p>We are offering the services support of our planning consultant (Bluestone) to support progress as the plans develop and the Estates team are actively engaged with the service area to progress.</p> <p>The property team are in the process of reviewing the County's vacant properties as part of our single view of the asset project, and potential investment opportunity and or capital for reinvestment.</p>
<p>13. COUNCILLOR IAN CORKIN</p> <p>Professor Ian Givens, director of the Institute for Food, Nutrition & Health at Reading University, warned recently that half of females aged 11 and 18 were consuming below the minimum recommended level of iron and magnesium and that a quarter consumed too little iodine, calcium and zinc. He went on to explain that young women were more at risk than young men and</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR MARK LYGO, CABINET MEMBER FOR PUBLIC HEALTH AND EQUALITIES</p> <p>Dear Cllr Corkin,</p> <p>It is important to encourage a nutritionally balanced diet and our messaging related to climate change and food consumption should be in line with national dietary recommendations and encourage people to consume locally sourced food where possible. Recommendations include eating more fruit and vegetables (in line with the eating at least '5 a day' message) and</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>this could be because they were “more sensitive to the messages put out about how bad” meat and dairy products were for the environment, meaning more became vegetarian or vegan.</p> <p>Does the cabinet member for public health agree with me that our messaging on this should be balanced to ensure we are not fuelling the already high levels of eco-anxiety experienced particularly in young people, and that we should promote a broad based nutritionally balanced diet, which recognises the beneficial role of meat and dairy in healthy growth and development.</p>	<p>consuming less processed and red meat.</p> <p>Overall, any dietary messages should be in line with the Eatwell Guide which can be found here https://www.nhs.uk/live-well/eat-well/the-eatwell-guide. If you scroll down you will note there is a section on vegetarianism which highlights the importance of considering adequate vitamin and mineral intake if choosing this form of diet</p>
<p>14. COUNCILOR IAN CORKIN</p> <p>Kinship foster care, where family or friends are considered before placing children in standard foster care or children’s homes, can be invaluable when considering the future arrangements for children local authorities look after. However, recent figures show that in parts of England as few as 4 per cent of looked after children are in kinship foster care. In Derby, Peterborough and Norfolk the figure is reported as 5%, whilst in Leeds, Liverpool and Stockton-on-Tees the figure is more than 25%. Nationally,</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LIZ BRIGHOUSE, DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, EDUCATION AND YOUNG PEOPLE’S SERVICES</p> <p>We currently have 135 (16.5%) children in an approved Kinship Placement</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>the overall figure is 15 percent. This is well behind other developed nations- in New Zealand, it is 62 per cent; in Australia 54 per cent and in America, 31 per cent.</p> <p>Could the cabinet member for children, education and young people please confirm the kinship figure for Oxfordshire?</p>	
<p>15. COUNCILLOR SALLY POVOLOTSKY</p> <p>The pandemic has caused many complications for families but especially women, taking the burden of childcare, home education and working either full or part time jobs or even juggling self employment roles. In my division of Hendreds and Harwell we have experienced exponential housing growth but a lack of provision in early years care and options.</p> <p>The council's latest CIL statement is not realistic on the ground to address the immediacy or scale of the problem facing women returning to work - trying to find childcare.</p> <p>" 9.18 New housing developments impact on the availability of free early education and childcare places in the county, the county council therefore requires all new primary schools to include nursery provision. Where existing schools are being expanded additional early years places will be created through the expansion of nursery classes or the expansion of places in the private,</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LIZ BRIGHOUSE, DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, EDUCATION AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES</p> <p>Under Section 6 of the Childcare Act 2006, Oxfordshire County Council has a statutory duty to ensure that there is sufficient childcare available to enable families –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) to access the funded entitlements for their child b) to take up, or remain in work, or c) to undertake education or training which could reasonably lead to work. <p>Local authorities are required to carry out an assessment of the sufficiency of childcare across the county to ensure they are meeting their statutory duty.</p> <p>'Sufficient' childcare means securing the right type and volume of provision, so far as is reasonably practicable, for working parents or those undertaking training with the intention of returning to work, for children aged 0-14 (up to 18 for a disabled child). The aim is to ensure parents are supported to be economically active.</p> <p>Local authorities are not expected to deliver provision themselves but to work with providers to ensure that there is sufficient provision available to meet families' need. Oxfordshire Family Information Service is the method used by the council to collect information on unmet childcare needs. Given the size of the population in the county very little feedback is received from parents. The</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>voluntary and independent sector including day nurseries and pre-schools. The county council will also respond to changing government legislation which may impact on the delivery model in securing these additional places.”</p> <p>What will this council do to help families in need, and to promote equality in the workplace by building on existing provision but making spaces available on a local level for families, outside of the Family Information Service, because what’s needed is places, options and availability now, not two years wait lists and women, especially, disadvantaged due to the exponential growth in my division and surrounding area!</p>	<p>Local Authority has been able to find early years places for funded 2’s 3’s and 4’s across the county in the majority of cases. However, it is quite clear the Coronavirus Pandemic has presented additional problems around sufficiency.</p> <p>The Covid19 global pandemic had a significant impact on families lives and childcare providers throughout 2020 and 2021. During the lockdowns, childcare providers have had access to continued funding for the directly publicly funded hours they deliver, as well as programmes such as business rates holidays, the job retention scheme (furlough for employees) and the self-employment grants (for the self-employed). These schemes have now come to an end. The pattern of demand for provision has changed with working patterns related to more parents working from home resulting in less demand for wraparound hours and sessions additional to families’ free entitlements. This has affected the business model for many providers and some have regrettably closed. To support this sector generally the council has been in contact with the providers who have raised concerns over sustainability or feel they are at risk of permanent closure. Support has been given to providers and a Covid grant scheme to offer targeted short term help is still operational. This is an area of work in which officers have now received additional training to be able to better support our providers. Providers have highlighted major recruitment and retention issues in this sector and a major recruitment campaign to highlight the benefits of working in early years and childcare posts will shortly commence.</p> <p>From the Council’s own analysis of sufficiency we are aware of some areas where available provision is less likely to be meeting the needs of parents. In a few cases, parents have advised that they are unable to find childcare that matches their particular needs. We are not aware of a significant number of enquiries from parents in Hendreds and Harwell but do note that the number of early years children in Hendreds and Harwell has increased in recent years. GP data for the area shows that the peak year for this area relates to the children now aged 4 years. Demand for early years provision should be</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>expected to decrease again.</p> <p>The guidance you quote from is part of the council's Infrastructure Funding Statement 2019/20 (oxfordshire.gov.uk). This section talks about the council's priorities for use of developer funding, and identifies early years as one of those priorities, as part of the process of establishing this as a need for developer funding. Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding is used by the council for capital projects to expand early education provision; this is predominantly within new and expanded primary schools, but we also work with other early education providers where appropriate. Developer funding cannot be used to meet the revenue costs of education provision. This capital funding source will not meet all the needs of the sector and there is also an Early Years Capital Programme which is used to secure places in areas of greatest need. Recent schemes include a voluntary sector scheme in Carterton and a school extension in Grove.</p> <p>We do not underestimate the challenges that families face in finding childcare that best meets their needs and will continue to support the early years sector, both in development and expansion and in quality and viability.</p>
<p>16. COUNCILLOR ROBIN BENNETT</p> <p>Late last year, the X39/40 service from Reading/Wallingford to Oxford was re-routed via the Iffley Road instead of the Abingdon Road, and the X38 service was withdrawn. Although the reasons for this are clear, with Covid affecting passenger numbers and city congestion affecting punctuality, these changes have impacted both journey times and frequency on the vital A4074 corridor. Can you confirm whether this re-routing is permanent, and whether improvements can be made to the bus stop provision and signage on</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR TIM BEARDER, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS MANAGEMENT</p> <p>The decision to re-route services X39/40 via the Iffley Road was a commercial one taken by the bus operator, so that when combined with other services there would be a standard 7-8 minute frequency service on the corridor. This reduced the amount of duplication on the route, with buses running a few minutes apart and then longer gaps throughout the day.</p> <p>However, the decision to reduce the service frequency from every 20 to every 30 minutes on Monday to Saturday daytimes was taken in conjunction with the Council, as there was a contract in place for this increased provision. The reason this decision was made was because of the acute driver shortage</p>

Questions	Answers
Oxford High St for those heading back towards Wallingford?	<p>affecting the bus operator at that time; given the significantly lower passenger numbers on the services it was considered that running a more robust service at a lower frequency was preferable to having ad-hoc and potentially unadvertised cancellations on a higher frequency service. This would have been more disruptive to passengers.</p> <p>Officers have received feedback on the changed X39/X40 route, and whilst we cannot force a reversal this will be communicated to the bus operator. On the issue of the reduced frequency, the Council holds S106 funds from various developments on the corridor and will look to reinstate a higher frequency at an appropriate time, but likely not to be before September 2022.</p> <p>The Council will seek a view from the operator on whether a return to the former X39/X40 route is possible before considering whether any changes to bus stop provision on High Street is desirable. Bus operators are responsible for provision of information at bus stops and we will communicate your feedback to them.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank