

# Public Document Pack

To: Members of the Cabinet

## ***Notice of a Meeting of the Cabinet***

**Tuesday, 15 November 2011 at 2.00 pm**

**County Hall, Oxford, OX1 1ND**



Joanna Simons  
Chief Executive

November 2011

Contact Officer: **Sue Whitehead**  
Tel: (01865) 810262; E-Mail: [sue.whitehead@oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:sue.whitehead@oxfordshire.gov.uk)

---

<i>Councillors</i>	<b>Membership</b>
Keith R. Mitchell CBE	- <i>Leader of the Council</i>
David Robertson	- <i>Deputy Leader of the Council</i>
Arash Fatemian	- <i>Cabinet Member for Adult Services</i>
Louise Chapman	- <i>Cabinet Member for Children, Education &amp; Families</i>
Jim Couchman	- <i>Cabinet Member for Finance &amp; Property</i>
Lorraine Lindsay-Gale	- <i>Cabinet Member for Growth &amp; Infrastructure</i>
Kieron Mallon	- <i>Cabinet Member for Police &amp; Policy Co-ordination</i>
Mrs J. Heathcoat	- <i>Cabinet Member for Safer &amp; Stronger Communities</i>
Melinda Tilley	- <i>Cabinet Member for Schools Improvement</i>
Rodney Rose	- <i>Cabinet Member for Transport</i>

*The Agenda is attached. Decisions taken at the meeting will become effective at the end of the working day on 23 November 2010 unless called in by that date for review by the appropriate Scrutiny Committee. Copies of this Notice, Agenda and supporting papers are circulated to all Members of the County Council.*

*Date of next meeting: 12 December 2011*

## **Declarations of Interest**

This note briefly summarises the position on interests which you must declare at the meeting. Please refer to the Members' Code of Conduct in Part 9.1 of the Constitution for a fuller description.

### **The duty to declare ...**

You must always declare any "personal interest" in a matter under consideration, i.e. where the matter affects (either positively or negatively):

- (i) any of the financial and other interests which you are required to notify for inclusion in the statutory Register of Members' Interests; or
- (ii) your own well-being or financial position or that of any member of your family or any person with whom you have a close association more than it would affect other people in the County.

### **Whose interests are included ...**

"Member of your family" in (ii) above includes spouses and partners and other relatives' spouses and partners, and extends to the employment and investment interests of relatives and friends and their involvement in other bodies of various descriptions. For a full list of what "relative" covers, please see the Code of Conduct.

### **When and what to declare ...**

The best time to make any declaration is under the agenda item "Declarations of Interest". Under the Code you must declare not later than at the start of the item concerned or (if different) as soon as the interest "becomes apparent".

In making a declaration you must state the nature of the interest.

### **Taking part if you have an interest ...**

Having made a declaration you may still take part in the debate and vote on the matter unless your personal interest is also a "prejudicial" interest.

### **"Prejudicial" interests ...**

A prejudicial interest is one which a member of the public knowing the relevant facts would think so significant as to be likely to affect your judgment of the public interest.

### **What to do if your interest is prejudicial ...**

If you have a prejudicial interest in any matter under consideration, you may remain in the room but only for the purpose of making representations, answering questions or giving evidence relating to the matter under consideration, provided that the public are also allowed to attend the meeting for the same purpose, whether under a statutory right or otherwise.

### **Exceptions ...**

There are a few circumstances where you may regard yourself as not having a prejudicial interest or may participate even though you may have one. These, together with other rules about participation in the case of a prejudicial interest, are set out in paragraphs 10 – 12 of the Code.

### **Seeking Advice ...**

It is your responsibility to decide whether any of these provisions apply to you in particular circumstances, but you may wish to seek the advice of the Monitoring Officer before the meeting.

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

# AGENDA

## 1. Apologies for Absence

## 2. Declarations of Interest

- guidance note opposite

## 3. Minutes (Pages 1 - 12)

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 18 October 2011 (**CA3**) and to receive information arising from them.

## 4. Questions from County Councillors

Any county councillor may, by giving notice to the Proper Officer by 9 am two working days before the meeting, ask a question on any matter in respect of the Cabinet's delegated powers.

The number of questions which may be asked by any councillor at any one meeting is limited to two (or one question with notice and a supplementary question at the meeting) and the time for questions will be limited to 30 minutes in total. As with questions at Council, any questions which remain unanswered at the end of this item will receive a written response.

Questions submitted prior to the agenda being despatched are shown below and will be the subject of a response from the appropriate Cabinet Member or such other councillor or officer as is determined by the Cabinet Member, and shall not be the subject of further debate at this meeting. Questions received after the despatch of the agenda, but before the deadline, will be shown on the Schedule of Addenda circulated at the meeting, together with any written response which is available at that time.

## 5. Petitions and Public Address

## 6. 2011/12 Financial Monitoring & Business Strategy Delivery Report - September 2011 (Pages 13 - 52)

*Cabinet Member:* Finance & Property

*Forward Plan Ref:* 2011/128

*Contact:* Kathy Wilcox, Principal Financial Manager Tel: (01865) 323981

Report by Assistant Chief Executive & Chief Finance Officer (**CA6**).

This report focuses on the delivery of the Directorate Business Strategies which were

agreed as part of the Service and Resource Planning Process for 2011/12 – 2015/16. These form part of the forecast position for each Directorate. Parts 1 and 2 include projections for revenue, reserves and balances as at the end of September 2011. The Capital monitoring is included at Part 3. Fees and Charges are included in Part 4.

***The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to:***

- (a) ***note the report and approve the virements as set out in Annex 2a;***
- (b) ***approve the change to the Capital Programme as set out in annex 9c;***
- (c) ***agree the bad debt write off as set out in paragraph 40; and***
- (d) ***approve the proposed charge of £10 for the issuing of each Disabled Parking Permit as set out in Part 4 to be effective from 1 January 2012.***

## **7. Treasury Management Mid Term Review (Pages 53 - 64)**

*Cabinet Member:* Finance & Property

*Forward Plan Ref:* 2011/133

*Contact:* Matthew Barlow, Financial Manager – Treasury Management Tel: (01865) 323988

Report by Assistant Chief Executive & Chief Finance Officer (**CA7**).

The report sets out the Treasury Management activity undertaken in the first half of the financial year in compliance with the CIPFA Code of Practice. The report includes Debt and Investment activity, an update on Prudential Indicators, changes in Strategy, any Breaches of approved Strategy and a forecast of interest receivable and payable in the financial year.

***The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to note the report, and to RECOMMEND Council to note the Council's Mid Term Treasury Management Review 2011/12.***

## **8. Oxfordshire Concessionary Fares Scheme (Pages 65 - 72)**

*Cabinet Member:* Transport

*Forward Plan Ref:* 2011/183

*Contact:* John Disley, Strategic Manager, Policy & Strategy Tel: (01865) 810460

Report by Deputy Director for Environment & Economy – Highways & Transport (**CA8**).

On 1 April 2011 Oxfordshire County Council had taken on the responsibility for administering the National Concessionary Fares scheme from the five Oxfordshire District Councils.

In January 2011 Cabinet had agreed the proposals for the 2011/2012 financial year and asked that a further report was submitted in time for decisions to be made for the 2012/2013 financial year and to report back on experience in running the scheme in the current year.

This report deals with the reimbursement of bus companies and the formal conditions of concessionary pass usage from the start of the 2012/2013 financial year.

**Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to:**

- (a) **retain the 09.00 start time for the use of Concessionary Passes on Monday to Friday.**
- (b) **introduce a later cut off time of 24.00 Monday to Friday for the acceptance of Concessionary Passes.**
- (c) **retain the use of Concessionary Passes on Dial-a-Ride services for 2012/13, for review once the new Community Transport Strategy has been adopted.**
- (d) **give the Deputy Director, Highways and Transport, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport, delegated authority to:**
  - i negotiate the most cost effective reimbursement scheme with the operators of commercial bus services;*
  - ii negotiate the most appropriate solution for reimbursement with operators of subsidised services, including Dial-a-Ride and Community Transport services, including considering the effect of the Council issuing tenders for subsidised bus services without any separate concessionary fare reimbursement*

## **9. Progress Report on CLA and Leaving Care (Pages 73 - 82)**

*Cabinet Member:* Children, Education & Families

*Forward Plan Ref:* 2011/112

*Contact:* Fran Fonseca, Strategic Lead CLA Tel: (01865) 323098

Report by Director for Children, Education & Families (**CA9**).

The report is one of a number of regular reports on the progress and challenges facing the Council's Looked After Children and Care Leavers and the services involved in supporting them.

***The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to continue to support the Corporate Parenting Strategy and to work to the current objectives of the strategy.***

## **10. Woodstock Primary School (Pages 83 - 116)**

*Cabinet Member:* Schools Improvement

*Forward Plan Ref:* 2011/118

*Contact:* Barbara Chillman, Principal Officer – School Organisation and Planning Tel: (01865) 816459

Report by Director for Children, Education & Families (**CA10**).

Until recently Woodstock CE Primary School had planned to admit 30 children each year. Due to growth in the local population of young children, in recent years the school has received more applications from within the Woodstock catchment area than it has been able to accommodate.

Population data shows that this level of demand can be expected to continue. In addition, nearly 100 new homes are being, or have recently been built, close to the school, and this can be expected to increase demand for pupil places.

The proposal is to increase the school admission number (at F1 entry) from 30 to 45. Because the published admission number for 2011 and 2012 has already been decided, the school's admission number can only now formally change from 2013. However, the school would like to accept over its official admission number in 2011 and 2012 to allow all in-catchment children to attend. The plan is therefore to accept up to 45 children into Reception (F1) from September 2011.

To accommodate this growth in pupil numbers, there will be some extension of the school's buildings, and a feasibility study is underway to investigate how this can best be provided. Some minor enabling works have been completed already during the summer holiday 2011 at the school to extend the current Foundation Stage room to ensure that the agreed 45 pupils could be accommodated from September 2011, as stated above.

***The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to:***

- (a) ***consider the representations made in response to the statutory closure notice with particular reference to the issues detailed in paragraphs 12-20 and the Statutory Guidance; and***
- (b) ***approve the permanent expansion of Woodstock CE Primary School with effect from 1 September 2013.***

## **11. Establishment Review - November 2011 (Pages 117 - 120)**

*Cabinet Member:* Deputy Leader

*Forward Plan Ref:* 2011/130

*Contact:* Sue Corrigan, Strategic HR Manager Tel: (01865) 810280

Report by Head of Human Resources (**CA11**).

This report gives an update on activity since 31 March 2011. It gives details of the agreed establishment figure at 30 September 2011 in terms of Full Time Equivalents, together with the staffing position at 30 September 2011. These are also shown by directorate in Appendix 1. In addition, the report provides information on vacancies and the cost of posts being covered by agency staff.

The report also tracks progress on staffing numbers since 1 April 2010 as we implement our Business Strategy.

***The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to:***

- (a) *note the report;*
- (b) *confirm that the Establishment Review continues to meet requirements in reporting and managing staffing numbers.*

## **12. Forward Plan and Future Business (Pages 121 - 122)**

*Cabinet Member: All*

*Contact Officer: Sue Whitehead, Committee Services Manager (01865 810262)*

The Cabinet Procedure Rules provide that the business of each meeting at the Cabinet is to include “updating of the Forward Plan and proposals for business to be conducted at the following meeting”. Items from the Forward Plan for the immediately forthcoming meetings of the Cabinet appear in the Schedule at **CA12**. This includes any updated information relating to the business for those meetings that has already been identified for inclusion in the next Forward Plan update.

The Schedule is for noting, but Cabinet Members may also wish to take this opportunity to identify any further changes they would wish to be incorporated in the next Forward Plan update.

***The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to note the items currently identified for forthcoming meetings.***

---

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 3

## CABINET

**MINUTES** of the meeting held on Tuesday, 18 October 2011 commencing at 2.00 pm and finishing at 4.25 pm.

### Present:

**Voting Members:** Councillor Keith R. Mitchell CBE – in the Chair  
Councillor David Robertson (Deputy Chairman)  
Councillor Arash Fatemian  
Councillor Louise Chapman  
Councillor Jim Couchman  
Councillor Lorraine Lindsay-Gale  
Councillor Kieron Mallon  
Councillor Mrs J. Heathcoat  
Councillor Melinda Tilley  
Councillor Rodney Rose

**Other Members in Attendance:** Councillor Alan Armitage (Agenda Items 6 & 11)  
Councillor Lynda Atkins (Agenda Item 7)  
Councillor Janet Godden (Agenda Item 7)  
Councillor Charles Mathew (Agenda Item 7)  
Councillor Anne Purse (Agenda items 7 and 9)  
Councillor Charles Shouler (Agenda Item 9)  
Councillor David Turner (Agenda Item 7)  
Councillor Carol Viney (Agenda Item 7)

### Officers:

Whole of meeting Joanna Simons (Chief Executive); Sue Whitehead(Chief Executive's Office)

Part of meeting Item	Officer
6	Kathy Wilcox (Corporate Finance)
7	Alexandra Bailey (Performance Review)
8	Lorna Baxter (Corporate Finance)
9	Martin Tugwell, Deputy Director (Growth & Infrastructure)
10	Sara Livadeas (Joint Commissioning); Martin Bradshaw (Transforming Social Care)
11	Huw Jones, Director of Growth & Infrastructure; Martin Tugwell, Deputy Director (Growth & Infrastructure)

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

### **113/11 MINUTES**

(Agenda Item. 3)

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 September 2011 were approved and signed.

### **114/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

(Agenda Item. 2)

Councillor Judith Heathcoat declared a prejudicial non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 7, Big Society Fund – Allocation of Wave 2 Funding by reason of the bid for funding from 1<sup>st</sup> Faringdon Scouts.

### **115/11 QUESTIONS FROM COUNTY COUNCILLORS**

(Agenda Item. 4)

Councillor Jean Fooks had given notice of the following question to the Cabinet Member for Transport:

“There seems to have been a moratorium on the progressing of traffic regulation orders over the last twelve months or so. Small but important schemes in Oxford, agreed for safety reasons, have not been implemented, such as a review of parking near a new nursery school in Rawlinson Road and a time limit on parking on Aristotle Lane near St Philip and St James primary school. Taxi spaces in Oakthorpe Road have been redundant for many years and were promised to be converted to much-needed disabled parking spaces early this year. Is this a county-wide problem? Why have staff not been given the time needed to progress them to implementation?”

Councillor Rose replied:

“Councillor Fooks will be aware that in response to the substantial reduction in funding from central Government, attributable to the high level of debt inherited from the previous national administration, this Council has had to significantly reduce the staffing resource available to respond to general traffic management issues, which includes the processing of traffic regulation orders. Priority has been given to matters such as the restrictions to facilitate the reintroduction of forces’ repatriations at RAF Brize Norton and to temporary orders related to the major increase in capital maintenance schemes across the County. However as there is developer funding available to carry out works at the specific locations mentioned by Councillor Fooks I am hopeful that these will be addressed over the coming months.”

Supplementary: Councillor Fooks sought reassurance that some of the delay in responding to general traffic management issues had not been due to abortive work by officers on the Park & Ride scheme. Councillor Rose replied that there was no effect as different officers were involved in each area of work.

Councillor Roz Smith had given notice of the following question to the Cabinet Member for Finance & Property

“How many buildings owned by the County Council, are unoccupied or partly occupied for more than one year, and what is the cost of security contractors for these buildings?”

Councillor Couchman replied:

“12 buildings are unoccupied for more than one year. The total cost of security contractors for these buildings is £9,050 p.a. It is not possible to give the number of partly occupied property as the situation constantly changes.”

## **116/11 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS**

(Agenda Item. 5)

The following requests to address the meeting had been agreed:

Item 6 - Councillor Alan Armitage, Shadow Cabinet Member

Item 7 - Councillor Lynda Atkins,

Councillor Janet Godden,

Councillor David Turner,

Councillor Anne Purse.

Councillor Carol Viney,

Mrs Rosemary Edgington,

Councillor Charles Mathew, Mr Leggatt, member of the public,

Item 9 - Councillor Anne Purse, Shadow Cabinet Member;

Councillor Charles Shouler

Item 11 - Councillor Alan Armitage, Shadow Cabinet Member

Mrs Ruth Lyster, member of the public

Councillor Charles Mathew spoke in support of the recommendation not to agree the bid in relation to West Oxfordshire Cycle Track as he agreed that it did not fit the criteria for funding. He questioned the numbers that would use the Cycle Track and referred to other alternative options.

Mr Leggatt spoke in support of the West Oxfordshire Cycle Track. He explained that only a very small part of the Cycle Track was in Eynsham. He understood that the Funs was not about filling in gaps but was rather about innovative new ways of working. He felt that the project did meet the criteria as it was innovative, value for money, was devolved working and brought local benefits. There was local support from the wider community and not merely from cyclists.

## **117/11 2011/12 FINANCIAL MONITORING & BUSINESS STRATEGY DELIVERY REPORT - AUGUST 2011**

(Agenda Item. 6)

Councillor Alan Armitage, Shadow Cabinet Member for Finance & Property welcomed the good news at paragraph 28 on the underspend in the concessionary fares scheme. He highlighted activity levels on recycling and composting and referred to the lowering effect on the County average of the

City Council levels and hoped that this could be drawn to their attention. In the context of reduced levels of waste he questioned whether the EfW plant at Ardley was over specified.

The Cabinet Member for Finance & Property summarised the contents of the report highlighting that there was not a great deal of change from the previous month and that the figures were close to the expected budget. He congratulated all involved particularly in the light of the large savings to be made.

**RESOLVED:** to:

- (a) note the report and approve the virements as set out in Annex 2a;
- (b) agree the bad debt write off as set out in paragraph 41;
- (c) approve the changes to the Capital Programme as set out in Annex 9c;
- (d) approve the updated Capital Programme included at Annex 10; and
- (e) approve the proposed fees and charges for the Oxfordshire History Centre as set out in Part 4 and Annex 11 to be effective from 1 November 2011.

## **118/11 BIG SOCIETY FUND - ALLOCATION OF WAVE 2 FUNDING**

(Agenda Item. 7)

Cabinet considered bids to the Big Society Fund from the second wave of Applications.

### *Annex 1 bids*

Councillor Anne Purse, local member, spoke in support of the Wheatley Youth Club bid. She commented that the Parish Council had made an ongoing pledge of funding and there would be local fund raising.

Councillor David Turner, spoke in support of the bid by Chalgrove Parish Council for youth worker recruitment. The Parish Council had built their own youth centre and doubled the size of the skate park. The Parish Council had already committed to funding the post in the future and the bid was to cover the immediate period and to purchase new equipment. Responding to a question about the precept needed to fund the post Councillor Turner gave details and commented that there were no complaints about it.

Councillor Atkins, as a member of Wallingford Town Council, hoped that the Cabinet would be able to endorse the bid for Wigod Centre. She also referred to the bid by the Pheonix Centre which had strong links to Wallingford.

### *Annex 2 bids*

Councillor Heathcoat commented that she was supportive of the 1<sup>st</sup> Faringdon Scouts having a permanent base. Although the bid did not quite meet the criteria she hoped that work could continue so that a future bid could be successful.

Having spoken Councillor Heathcoat withdrew from the meeting and took no part in the discussion and decision on the 1<sup>st</sup> Faringdon Scouts bid. Following discussion it was agreed that the bid not be moved from category 2 (bids that presently do not fully meet the assessment criteria but may with further development) but that officers including property management continue to work with other parties.

Councillor Heathcoat returned to the meeting.

Councillor Carol Viney, spoke in support of the Edge Youth Club bid. She referred to the lack of easy transport links to places such as Henley or elsewhere and the universal support for the project. She referred to the lack of activities for young people that could lead to problems. The Parish Council were supportive and she referred to letters of support. The building required a new kitchen as the existing kitchen had been condemned by the County Council's health & safety. A new kitchen could provide hot food and drinks. The bid had been cut down to one youth worker in line with the Fund requirements and new figures had been provided.

Mrs Edgington, Vice-Chairman, The Sonning Common Community Youth Club Management Committee spoke in support of the Edge Youth Club bid. She detailed the work undertaken in support of the bid and referred to 5 letters of support from local businesses. Responding to a question from Councillor Chapman, she detailed the new bid figures.

### *Annex 3*

Councillor Janet Godden, strongly supported the West Oxfordshire Cycle Track bid. She was disappointed that she had not been involved in the process due to the mix up in determining the correct division. She noted that many bids had received officer support in their development and she had been unaware that this was available. The Deputy Leader suggested that the bid was something that the Area Steward Scheme could support. This view was supported by Councillor Rose.

Councillor Mallon apologised that the Scheme had been put under the wrong Division but emphasised that it did not meet the criteria as the Fund did not cover feasibility studies. He suggested that in the light of all the comments that the bid be moved to Category 2 (bids that presently do not fully meet the assessment criteria but may with further development).

Following further discussion of the bids Councillor Mallon suggested that the Edge Youth Club bid be moved into Category 1 of accepted bids. In noting

that an amended bid had been submitted for less funding he indicated that he felt that there were elements of the scheme that could be included, such as pump priming, that meant that it was appropriate to agree the original bid funding. He asked officers to work with the bidders to reprofile the various elements of the bid. Councillor Robertson whilst supporting the proposed move commented on the funding secured elsewhere of £10,000 for two years and expressed interest in seeing in the next few months how they would continue to fund the project after this time.

**RESOLVED:** to:

- (a) approve the Wood Farm youth centre request to amend the use of their Big Society grant;
- (b) approve those bids which meet the assessment criteria as set out in Annex ; in addition to approve the bid by the Edge Youth Centre, with officers to work with the bidder to reprofile the individual elements of the bid
- (c) in accordance with the Asset Transfer Policy to agree the transfer of buildings to the school on the following sites;
  - 1) Lord Williams' School, Thame
  - 2) Chiltern Edge School, Sonning Common
- (d) move the West Oxfordshire Cycle Track project being moved from Category 3 to Category 2 (bids that presently do not fully meet the assessment criteria but may with further development).

## **119/11 LOCAL GOVERNMENT RESOURCE REVIEW - RESPONSE**

(Agenda Item. 8)

Cabinet considered a report setting out a response to the Local Government Resource Review together with a report from the Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance and Property giving an overarching response.

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Property introduced the contents of the reports, indicating that the Scheme being suggested in the consultation was flawed but was a step in the right direction. He did support the overarching proposal put forward in the consultation but had massive reservations. He thanked David Illingworth for his work in putting together answers to the detailed questions in the consultation.

Cabinet noted the major issues, as set out in the reports. Councillor Mitchell commented that the proposals reflected a small change as when there was growth in the local economy they could keep a tiny part of that increase. It did not free local government to any great extent.

**RESOLVED:** to agree to the response to consultation about the Local Government Resource Review which is set out in Annex 1 and to agree the overarching response as set out in the addenda.

## **120/11 NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK - RESPONSE**

(Agenda Item. 9)

The Cabinet considered a report explaining some of the issues which have caught public attention and the issues raised for upper-tier authorities of the Draft National Planning Policy Framework.

Councillor Anne Purse, Cabinet Member for Growth & Infrastructure, commented that she was particularly supportive of the penultimate paragraph. She regretted that the framework did not reflect the views of organisations supporting our countryside and referred to expert views that the green belt was put at risk. She felt that the County Council response should have urged caution to ensure that there was as much protection as previously. She asked that the Council consider adding a paragraph into the report about the protection of the countryside. Responding to a question from the Leader, Councillor Purse explained that it was not what was said in the framework that weakened that protection but a matter of the interpretation that could be drawn.

Councillor Shouler raised concerns about the impact on the countryside generally as he believed that a free for all could be created without sufficient thought being given to the cumulative effect. Sustainability needed a better definition to avoid exploitation of the open countryside. Planning Authorities needed to be given the time to develop Plans and should have the ability to defer planning applications as premature. Councillor Shouler, responding to questions from the Leader, explained how he thought that the term sustainable could be used by developers to support development that would not otherwise be acceptable.

The Cabinet Member for Growth & Infrastructure introducing the report thanked the Councillors for their comments which reflected concern that was there. There was a perceived loophole, but she felt that fears were unfounded. Sustainable development was about positive growth and she supported plans to simplify and speed up the process which many found incomprehensible. Much of the anxiety was because many local Councils did not have Plans in place and although she agreed there would be a time lag the final Plans would be better and provide more certainty. She urged District Councils to get their Plans in place. She highlighted the paragraphs in the report referring particularly to the impact on upper tier Councils and stressed the need to work with District Councils.

During discussion the link to the previous report on the Local Government Resource Review was highlighted. The County Council had a key role in providing services to support growth. It was important that the County had an opportunity to bring together issues of concern to the County. Local

distinctiveness was an important aspect and District Councils did need time to get their Plans in place.

**RESOLVED:** to ratify the consultation response at Annex 1.

## **121/11 LEARNING DISABILITY - SUPPORTED LIVING AND DAYTIME SUPPORT SERVICES - OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION**

(Agenda Item. 10)

Cabinet considered a report that set out the outcome of recent consultation on major changes to the delivery of services to people with learning disability.

Councillor Fatemian introduced the report and paid tribute to staff for the professionalism and care they had shown in their responses. As a result of the consultation a number of changes were suggested to the original proposals. Firstly there was active consideration being given to social enterprise options; secondly they were ensuring that users were embedded in the choices to be made; and finally people with learning disabilities were to be included in the monitoring process. In moving the recommendations he highlighted the risks set out in the report and the mitigation of those risks.

**RESOLVED:** to

(a) note the outcome of consultation with Service Users, carers and other stakeholders; and

(b) agree to the outsourcing of Independent Living Services by April 2013.

## **122/11 PROPERTY & FACILITIES PROCUREMENT - SCOPE OF CONTRACT - FOOD WITH THOUGHT/QUEST CLEANING SERVICE STRATEGY PAPER**

(Agenda Item. 11)

Cabinet considered a report informing the decision on the inclusion of the cleaning and catering services provided by Quest Cleaning Services (QCS) and Food with Thought (FwT) within the scope of the proposed integrated Property & Facilities external services contract. The contract will provide a Total Facilities Management service including the delivery of hard and soft FM services, as well as professional and construction services.

Councillor Alan Armitage, Shadow Cabinet Member for Finance & Property indicated that he had asked to speak as the Liberal Democrat Group was not convinced by the arguments. He did not agree that bigger is better and felt that with one contract there was more risk. Neither did he see that it saved money. The Atkins contract was not without problems and the model should not be expanded until it was proven to work fully. Referring to the benefits of inclusion in the contract set out on pages 164 and 165 Councillor Armitage commented that with regard to replacing new equipment this could be done anyway. He queried the outcome once the customer care line was

outsourced. FwT was popular with schools so why change it. He did not believe that the contract would maintain and improve service and quality and queried how take up would be improved.

Councillor Armitage responding to a question from Councillor Robertson stated that the contract did not state that there would be outsourcing but that he believed this was implied in the process.

Mrs Ruth Lyster, spoke against the recommendation. She was a school cook with 5 ½ years experience. In recent years the quality of schools meals had improved vastly with increased take-up. Over the last two years a profit had been generated. Most kitchens had been refurbished; training levels and health and safety standards were high. Mrs Lyster noted that her school had the highest take-up of meals at 67%. She believed that the service provided was of very good value at a low risk. Current involvement of school cooks made plans more practical and progress was jeopardised by plans to include in the contract. She believed it was the odd one out and that the goals set out in the report were either already achieved or could be achieved under the existing system. She believed that the main reason for inclusion was to make the contract more attractive. She was concerned as a mother that the welfare of her children would be affected by the deterioration of the food. As a cook she was concerned that portions would shrink and that the achievements so far would be jeopardised and that inclusion was not necessary or desirable.

Responding to questions from Cabinet Members as to what proof there was that there would be less money for food, portions would shrink, and whether the new contract could bring in some efficiencies, Mrs Lyster replied that the only way to increase profit was to reduce costs. The service had already done everything it could do in terms of efficiencies and she could not comment on any other company.

Councillor Couchman introduced the report setting out the background to the need for a new contract and the move to bring in a total facilities management service. He acknowledged that FwT had made a great deal of progress since 2005 but pointed out that there had been the benefit of a grant for school meals. The service was not fully self operating as it did not pay towards energy or back office charges. He supported inclusion in order to test the market.

Martin Tugwell referred to the detail of the report noting that the inclusion of Quest brought efficiencies as part of a comprehensive service. With regard to FwT there had been considerable relative success but looking forward there were risks associated with the service. There was a grant; a small number of schools (10) generated the majority of the surplus and he questioned whether this was resilient. The success to date did make it attractive. All bidders saw scope to grow the market and to maintain and build on standards. They were able to provide levels of investment greater than Oxfordshire County Council had been able to make. The model that would be tested would see the Council keep control of key aspects of the contract such as price and quality.

Councillor Robertson stressed that this was not the final decision. FWT had made remarkable progress: the service should be in the contract but if it did not meet his expectations he would expect the Council to renegotiate with it excluded. There was support expressed for this view. Councillor Tilley stated that the crux was to see the specification and to ensure that everything was the same or better and to carefully monitor.

Cllr Chapman in sympathising with the speaker commented that previously the decision had been taken that if FWT met its business case the service should continue. The food and value provided was very good and exceeding minimum specifications. She highlighted the need for Cabinet Members to be kept informed on matters such as who would put specifications together; on local sourcing of food; on how scrutiny would be provided and on the future of current workers. She queried whether there would be a need for rebranding and commented that FWT was not broken and did not require fixing. She was uneasy and queried whether if profit was made it would be fed back into the school meals service.

Following a vote by a show of hands it was:

**RESOLVED:** (by 9 votes to 0, with 1 abstention) to include the current catering and cleaning services provided by Food with Thought and QCS within the scope of the Property and Facilities Contract.

## **123/11 COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP STRATEGIES**

(Agenda Item. 12)

Cabinet considered the Community Safety Strategies.

Councillor Mallon in moving the recommendation drew attention to the comments of the Scrutiny Committee. And the responses to those comments set out in the report.

**RESOLVED:** to note the views from Members generally and the Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny Committee in particular, and to **RECOMMEND** the Council to approve the Community Safety Strategies for Oxfordshire 2011-14.

## **124/11 DELEGATED POWERS OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE - OCTOBER 2011**

(Agenda Item. 13)

Cabinet noted the schedule of executive decisions taken by the Chief Executive under the specific powers and functions delegated to her under the terms of Part 7.4 of the Council's Constitution – Paragraph 1(A)(c)(i) in the period January to March 2011.

**125/11 FORWARD PLAN AND FUTURE BUSINESS**

(Agenda Item. 14)

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

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

..... in the Chair

Date of signing ..... 2011

This page is intentionally left blank

## CABINET – 15 NOVEMBER 2011

### 2011/12 FINANCIAL MONITORING & BUSINESS STRATEGY DELIVERY REPORT

**Report by Assistant Chief Executive & Chief Finance Officer**

#### Introduction

1. This report focuses on the delivery of the Directorate Business Strategies which were agreed as part of the Service and Resource Planning Process for 2011/12 – 2015/16. These form part of the forecast position for each Directorate. Parts 1 and 2 include projections for revenue, reserves and balances as at the end of September 2011. The Capital monitoring is included at Part 3. Fees and Charges are included in Part 4.
2. Around 70% of the 2011/12 savings totalling £54.6m have already been achieved or are forecast to be achieved.

#### Summary Position

3. The current in – year Directorate forecast including the Council elements of the Pooled Budgets is a variation of –£1.000m or -0.23% against a budget of £426.347m as shown in the table below.

Original Budget 2011/12  £m		Latest Budget 2011/12  £m	Forecast Outturn 2011/12  £m	Variance Forecast September 2011  £m	Variance Forecast September 2011  %
112.817	Children, Education & Families (CE&F)	113.595	111.764	-1.831	-1.61
219.442	Social & Community Services (S&CS)	220.931	221.415	+0.484	+0.22
75.561	Environment & Economy	82.808	81.517	-1.291	-1.56
7.751	Chief Executive's Office	9.013	9.084	+0.071	+0.79
415.571	In year Directorate total	426.347	423.780	-2.567	-0.60
	Add: Overspend on Council Elements of Pooled Budgets			+1.567	
	<b>Total Variation including Council Elements of Pooled Budgets</b>			<b>-1.000</b>	<b>-0.23</b>
	Plus: Underspend on Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG)			-0.038	
	<b>Total Variation</b>			<b>-1.038</b>	<b>-0.24</b>

4. The following annexes are attached:

Annex 1	Original and Latest Estimates for 2011/12
Annex 2	Virements & Supplementary Estimates
Annex 3	Redundancy Costs
Annex 4	Forecast Earmarked Reserves
Annex 5	Forecast General Balances
Annex 6	Older People & Physical Disabilities and Learning Disabilities Pooled Budgets
Annex 7	Government Grants 2011/12
Annex 8	Treasury Management Lending List
Annex 9	Capital Programme Monitoring and changes

## **Part 1 - Revenue Budget & Business Strategy Savings**

5. The forecast revenue outturn by Directorate based on the position to the end of September 2011 is set out below. Carry forwards from 2010/11 dependent on virements larger than £0.5m, and which constituted a policy change, were agreed by Council on 13 September 2011 and are included in this report.

### **Children, Education & Families: -£1.831m in year directorate variation**

6. Children, Education & Families are forecasting an in-year variation of -£1.831m (-£1.869m total variation including a -£0.038m underspend on services funded from DSG). The Directorate is committed to achieving -£10.2m of savings in 2011/12. These rise to -£19.8m by 2014/15 and the Directorate's Transformation Board is meeting regularly to review progress.

### Admissions & Transport

7. Home to School Transport is forecasting an underspend of -£0.762m, a change of -£0.281m since the last report. The position has been updated to reflect the changes to routes for the new academic year. The variation may change as the routes may need to be altered during the remainder of the year. The underspend reflects the early delivery of savings required in future years as set out in the Medium Term Financial Plan.

### Placements

8. An underspend of -£0.230m is currently forecast for Placements. There continues to be an upward trend in agency residential placements and the position reported allows for £0.584m to be spent on new placements during the remainder of 2011/12 should they be absolutely necessary. The service continues to work toward minimising the use of out of area placements, although some children have significant complex needs that require specialist or secure placements. This service area is subject to significant fluctuations depending on demand.

### Asylum

9. Asylum is forecasting an underspend of -£0.901m an increase of -£0.238m since the last report. Of this -£0.328m relates to additional grant income being received. A virement is requested to increase the income budget from £1.000m to £1.328m. The additional funding of £0.328m is made available to be allocated by Cabinet. Also an additional £0.100m grant has been received

relating to 2010/11. The remaining variation relates to reduced costs due to a reduction in clients. This area is extremely volatile so the position is likely to change by the end of year as it is difficult to forecast the number of new clients entering the service.

#### Quality and Compliance

10. The consultation process for the Joint Commissioning structure with Social and Community Services will begin at the end of October 2011. Due to the delay in implementing the new structure an overspend of +£0.225m is now forecast. The service is expected to achieve savings of £0.400m by 2012/13 and has achieved £0.175m through retirements and services ceasing.

#### DSG Funded Services

11. An underspend of -£0.038m is forecast on services funded by DSG. The change relates to Out of County Placements now forecasting an underspend as contributions from the Primary Care Trust have been confirmed along with a change relating to hospital recoupment. The directorate has yet to allocate £2.445m of the non-schools contingency. Schools Forum need to be consulted before the allocations can be finalised. Details on how this is planned to be spent will be included in future reports, but is committed to be used fully in 2011/12.

#### **Social & Community Services: +£0.484m in year directorate variation**

12. Social & Community Services are forecasting an overspend of +£0.484m. There is also a forecast overspend of +£1.567m on the Council elements of the Pooled Budgets (mainly on adults with physical disabilities). The directorate is aiming to make savings totalling -£19.6m in 2011/12. These rise to -£42.0m by 2014/15 and their delivery is being overseen by the Directorate's Change Management Board.

#### Adult Social Care

13. An overspend of £0.431m is forecast on Social Work (Locality Teams), a decrease of -£0.047m since the last report. The change relates to the inclusion of HIV/AIDS funding. As noted in the last report following a restructure of the service the saving relating to the reduction in staff will not be fully achieved. This will be considered as part of the Service and Resource Planning process for 2012/13 and also as part of other reorganisation proposals.
14. Savings of £0.298m will not be achieved by Internal Learning Disabilities in 2011/12. These savings are partly dependent on restructuring Day Services and Supported Living and partly on the implications of the proposed transfer of the services to external providers. It is expected that the full year effect of the savings will be realised within the service and resource planning period.
15. Income relating to Older People and Physical Disabilities is forecast to be overachieved by -£0.068m, an improvement of £0.209m since the last report. Fairer Charging income is forecasting an underachievement of +£0.648m this is due to a lower number of clients being liable for the full cost of their care. This is offset by an overachievement on residential and nursing care of -£0.716m as a result of additional clients. This is a volatile area so the position will continue to change throughout the year.

16. The position includes an overspend of +£0.238m on Acquired Brain Injury which is due to an increase in the number of clients. The position also includes an underspend of -£0.213m on Asylum Seekers against a budget of £0.220m based on current client activity.

Community Safety (including Fire & Rescue)

17. Fire and Rescue are forecasting an underspend of -£0.260m. This mainly relates to an underspend of -£0.200m on wholetime firefighters pay due to part year vacancies and changes to the number of firefighters on development and competent pay rates. There is also an underspend on -£0.100m on the retained duty system (RDS) which includes the current estimated cost of the changes to Grey Book following the implementation of the Part Time Workers (Prevention of less favourable treatment) Regulations 2000. The firefighter ill health retirement budget is also forecasting an overspend of +£0.040m. Any variance on the RDS and Firefighter ill health retirements will be returned to balances.
18. Increased rental income and savings on pay and repair and maintenance mean the Gypsy and Traveller Service is forecasting an underspend of -£0.100m.

Quality & Compliance (Strategy & Transformation)

19. The consultation process for the Joint Commissioning structure with Children, Education and Families will begin at the end of October 2011 and the intention is to implement the new structure later in the year. Due to the delay in starting the consultation process savings of £0.350m are not expected to be achieved this year. The service is however is expected to achieve savings of £0.450m in 2012/13.

**Pooled Budgets**

**Older People, Physical Disabilities and Equipment Pool**

20. As shown in Annex 6 the Older People's and Physical Disabilities Pooled Budget is forecast to overspend by +£2.858m, +£1.490m on the Council's element and +£1.368m on the Primary Care Trust's (PCT).
21. The forecast includes use of the additional 2011/12 funding of £6.196m for Adult Social Care being provided via the NHS of which the majority has been allocated to the Older People's Pooled Budget.

Older People

22. The County Council's element of the pool is forecast to be underspent by -£0.478m. This is due to underspends on the External Home Support budget and due to the closure of the Internal Home Support service generating a larger underspend than expected as clients transition to the external service. The budget for the Internal Day Centre service, which was forecasting an underspend, has been moved to Prevention & Early Support outside of the pool as agreed by Joint Management Group.

Physical Disabilities

23. The County Council's element is projected to be overspent by +£1.733m. This reflects an increase in the number of people needing care over the last two years. Work is underway to understand the causes of this increased demand and the options for reducing the level of spending. This will be considered further as part of the Directorate's service and resource planning work.

Equipment

24. Additional resources amounting to £0.342m have been contributed to this budget from the extra money for adult social care from the NHS. This reflects the fact that the provision of equipment can often be a very effective way of helping ensure that the individual does not require more intensive (and expensive) methods of care (whether health or social care). Despite this there is still a pressure of £0.224m on the budget. Work is underway to understand why these pressures are arising and what should be done in response.

Learning Disabilities Pool

25. As set out in Annex 6 the Learning Disabilities Pooled Budget continues to forecast an overspend of +£0.091m. The Council element is overspending by +£0.077m. The forecast overspend relates to the reduction in funding for Supporting People which was agreed by the Joint Management Group in July 2011. This has not yet been included in the Efficiency Savings Plan so is shown as a potential overspend at this time. It is hoped that alternative savings can be identified to offset this.
26. An Efficiency Savings Plan for 2011/12 is in place and is being monitored closely by the Joint Management Group. It is expected to deliver efficiency savings in excess of £4m during the year. This will cover the overspend brought forward from 2010/11, the savings included in the Directorate's Business Strategy and a number of other pressures. A significant proportion of the savings target has already been achieved as a result of work carried out in 2010/11.

**Environment & Economy: -£1.291m in year directorate variation**

27. Environment & Economy are forecasting an underspend of -£1.291m. The directorate's Business Strategy includes savings of -£13.2m rising to -£31.8m by 2014/15. The delivery of the savings is being monitored by the Directorate's Business Strategy Delivery Board but it is anticipated that the agreed levels of service will be delivered within the budget set.

Highways & Transport

28. The service is forecasting an underspend of -£0.523m an increase of -£0.068m since the last report. This comprises of underspends of -£0.200m on Concessionary Fares and -£0.223m relating to slippage in use of Community Transport Grant along with previously reported underspends on Public Transport and the Integrated Transport Unit.

Growth & Infrastructure

29. The service is forecasting an underspend of -£0.633m, an increase of -£0.461m since the last report. This change relates an underspend of -£0.500m forecast for Waste Management. Current activity levels for recycling/composting are showing 62-64% recycling/composting. This is better position than forecast with less landfill tonnage being the main contributing factor to the increased performance. Work is continuing on the financial position based on the tonnage data and will be included in the next report.

Property and Facilities

30. The service is forecasting a variation of +£0.057m a decrease of +£0.218m since the last report. This relates to an increase in the forecast spend on repairs and maintenance and the additional costs of the contract procurement.
31. Food with Thought are forecasting a trading surplus of £0.400m. This reflects a 5.7% increase in the uptake of meals at the end of June 2011 compared to the same period last year. The intention is that this surplus, plus any remaining School Lunch Grant will be reinvested in the service in agreement with Schools. QCS Cleaning is forecasting a break-even position.

Oxfordshire Customer Services

32. Oxfordshire Customer Services (OCS) is forecasting an underspend of -£0.267m an increase of -£0.134m since the last report. The change relates to small underspends being reported across the service. Adult Learning are still reporting an underspend of -£0.133m and as part of the agreed four-year recovery plan will be used to pay back part of the £0.181m supplementary estimate with the balance repaid in 2012/13. However written confirmation has been received from the Skills Funding Agency (SFA) that some targets were not achieved during the academic year 2010/11. This may result in a clawback for funding, with a maximum liability of £0.400m.

**Chief Executive's Office: +£0.071m in year directorate variation**

33. The Chief Executive's Office (CEO) is forecasting a variation of +£0.071m. The Business Strategy savings for CEO (£1.3m) are generally low risk and on target to be delivered in 2011/12.
34. An overspend of +£0.270m is forecast for Legal Services an increase of +£0.100m since the last report.
35. Cabinet approved the first wave of bids for the Big Society fund totalling £0.282m on 19 July 2011. The second wave of bids totalling £0.153m were agreed by Cabinet on 18 October 2011. Further bids for the remaining £0.165m of funding will be allocated later in 2011/12.

**Redundancy Costs**

36. As noted in the Annex 3, £6.705m estimated redundancy costs expected in 2011/12 or later years were accounted for in 2010/11. Actual 2011/12 payments made to the end of September 2011 are £2.728m and will continue to be monitored and reported throughout the year.

**Virements and Supplementary Estimates**

37. The virements requested this month are set out in Annex 2a and temporary virements to note in Annex 2d. Previously approved virements in Annex 2b and 2c are available on the Council's website and in the Member's Resource Centre. Virements requested this month include the transfer of Business and Skills from CEF to E&E which does not reflect a change in policy.

**Grants Monitoring**

38. Annex 7 sets out government grants that are being received in 2011/12. Ringfenced grants totalling £429.499m (including £388.925m of Dedicated Schools Grant) are included in Directorate budgets. Changes this month

## CA6

include an additional grant of £0.340m for Phonics, Physical Education, Maths and Science Teachers (MAST) and New Opportunities from the Department for Education which will be passported to Schools as set out in the terms and conditions of the grant. The grant that the Council receives from the Home Office for costs relating to Asylum Seekers has also increased by £0.328m to £1.328m as set out in paragraph 9.

### **Bad Debt Write Offs**

39. There were 30 general write offs to the end of September 2011 totalling £14,285. In addition Client Finance has written off 49 debts totalling £32,490.
40. A debt of £12,490 is recommended to be written off and the amount charged against the provision for bad debts. This debt relates to a client assessed under the Charging for Residential Accommodation Guide (CRAG) scheme as contributing towards residential care services from 2008 until the end of their placement in 2010. Income and Care Management have been heavily involved with the client and over the years and have made attempts to try and work with the family to resolve issues. Legal Services have explored all avenues available, however, following the enforcement of a court judgement received in 2010 it was identified that the client had no assets available to settle this debt.
41. The outstanding debt balances are currently being reviewed, further requests for bad debt write offs may be included in future reports.

### **Treasury Management**

#### Lending List Changes

42. The Treasury Management Lending List is included at Annex 8. On 22 September 2011 the Treasury Management strategy team made a decision to increase the lending limit with Svenska Handelsbanken and Rabobank Group from one to six months. This decision was taken due to the high credit quality of both banks, as indicated by their strong credit ratings, stable Credit Default Swap (CDS) rates and minimal exposure to Greek and Italian sovereign debt. On 7 October 2011 Lloyds TSB Bank Plc., Santander UK Plc., Bank of Scotland Plc., and Nationwide Building Society were suspended from the lending list due to the downgrading of the long term ratings of these banks by the ratings agency Moody's. On 13 October 2011 Barclays Bank Plc. was suspended from the lending list due the long term rating being placed on negative watch by Fitch. On the same day the lending limit with Royal Bank of Scotland was reduced to £5m due to the long term rating being downgraded by Fitch.
43. The average cash balance during September was £ 271.948m and the average rate of return was 1.12%. The budgeted return for interest receivable on balances invested internally is £2.234m for 2011/12. It is expected that this will be achieved.

### **Part 2 – Balance Sheet**

#### Reserves

44. Annex 4 sets out earmarked reserves brought forward from 2010/11 and the forecast position as at 31 March 2012. Forecast reserves are £76.254m a decrease of -£6.407 since the last report. The change reflects the carry forward

requests that were agreed by Council on 13 September 2011 transferring from the Carry Forward Reserve, and being added to revenue budgets on a one-off basis.

### Balances

45. Annex 5 sets out the current position for general balances taking into account known changes. Balances are currently £15.666m.
46. Supplementary estimates were agreed by Cabinet on 20 September 2011 to release the revenue element of PRG from balances for use by the Council or to be passed to partners and are reflected in this report.

## **Part 3 – Capital Monitoring and Programme Update**

### **Capital Monitoring**

47. The capital monitoring position set out in Annex 9a, shows the forecast expenditure for 2011/12 is £67.7m (excluding schools local capital). This is £1.3m lower than the latest capital programme agreed by Cabinet on 18 October 2011.
48. The table below summarises the variations by directorate.

Directorate	Last Approved Programme *	Latest Forecast Expenditure	Variation
	£m	£m	£m
Children, Education & Families	30.7	30.7	0.0
Social & Community Services	9.9	9.9	0.0
Environment & Economy - Transport	23.6	22.9	-0.7
Environment & Economy - Other	4.7	4.1	-0.6
Chief Executive's Office	0.1	0.1	0.0
<b>Total Directorate Programmes</b>	<b>69.0</b>	<b>67.7</b>	<b>-1.3</b>
Schools Local Capital	7.8	7.8	0.0
<b>Total Capital Programme</b>	<b>76.8</b>	<b>75.5</b>	<b>-1.3</b>

\* Approved by Cabinet 18 October 2011

49. The major in-year spend forecast variations to note for each directorate programme are explained in the following paragraphs and other significant variations are listed in Annex 9b.
50. In the Transport programme, the A44 Crossing at Yarnton will not be completed in 2011/12 as originally anticipated as it will conflict with other work being carried out in the area. Therefore, £0.313m has been re-profiled to 2012/13.
51. Further delays in pre-construction work on the Didcot Station Forecourt scheme has led to further slippage of £0.315m into 2012/13.
52. In the Environment & Economy programme, the Kidlington Waste Recycling Centre project has been experiencing some delays since the beginning of the financial year as securing planning permission took longer than originally anticipated. The revised detailed planning application was approved on 12

## CA6

September 2011. Although this is a positive outcome in moving the project forward, the latest monitoring results show that project progress is still affected by complex land issues which slows down the leasehold acquisition for the new site. Given this position, the expenditure profile has been further revised to a minimal level of £0.150m in this financial year, a reduction of £0.600m from the latest capital programme. Further revisions will be made as part of the regular monitoring reflecting the progress on the ground.

### Actual & Committed Expenditure

53. As at the end of September actual capital expenditure for the year to date (excluding schools local spend) was £20.8m. This is 31% of the total forecast expenditure of £67.7m, which is around 2% below the expected position compared to the profile of expenditure in previous years. Actual and committed spend is 63% of the forecast.

### Five Year Capital Programme Update

54. The total forecast 5-year capital programme (2011/12 to 2016/17) is now £397.0m, an increase of £6.1m from the latest capital programme. The new schemes and project/programme budget changes requiring Cabinet approval are set out in Annex 9c. The table below summarises the variations by directorate and the main reasons for the increase in the size of the programme are explained in the following paragraphs.

Directorate	Last Approved Total Programme (2011/12 to 2015/16) *	Latest Forecast Total Programme (2011/12 to 2015/16)	Variation
	£m	£m	£m
Children, Education & Families	175.8	175.8	0.0
Social & Community Services	23.7	24.9	+1.2
Environment & Economy - Transport	104.4	104.4	0.0
Environment & Economy - Other	16.3	16.3	0.0
Chief Executive's Office	0.1	0.1	0.0
<b>Total Directorate Programmes</b>	<b>320.3</b>	<b>321.5</b>	<b>+1.2</b>
Schools Local Capital	19.1	19.1	0.0
Earmarked Reserves	57.6	57.6	0.0
<b>Total Capital Programme</b>	<b>397.0</b>	<b>398.2</b>	<b>+1.2</b>

\* Approved by Cabinet 18 October 2011

55. The relocation of Bicester Library has been included within the Social & Community Services programme. This was a scheme on hold that was re-considered by Capital Investment Board in August 2011. It will be a self-financed scheme up to a maximum contribution of £1.200m funded by secured Section 106 contributions and future capital receipt from the sale of the current library should this new scheme be part of the town centre redevelopment.

## Part 4 – Fees and Charges

56. Disabled Parking Permits (Blue Badges) entitle the holder to park for free in priority parking spaces and a number of locations on the highway. The permits are key in supporting disabled people to play an active role in community, work, life and leisure. In February 2011 the Government announced wide-ranging reforms to the Blue Badge scheme. From 1 January 2012 Local Authorities will continue to administer the applications and eligibility, but badge production will be fulfilled through a central national contract.
57. As part of the reforms Local Authorities may now increase the maximum charge for issued passes from £2 to £10. This is the first increase for 30 years and has been subject to consultation nationally. The increase, which is being taken up by most other authorities, is required to cover increased expenditure and administration resulting from the changes to the application process.
58. Cabinet are recommended to approve a charge of £10 for the issue of each Disabled Parking Permit administered by the Council to £10 from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2011.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

59. **The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to:**
- a) **note the report and approve the virements as set out in Annex 2a;**
  - b) **Approve the change to the Capital Programme as set out in annex 9c;**
  - c) **Agree the bad debt write off as set out in paragraph 40;**
  - d) **Approve the proposed charge of £10 for the issuing of each Disabled Parking Permit as set out in Part 4 to be effective from 1 January 2012.**

### SUE SCANE

#### Assistant Chief Executive & Chief Finance Officer

Background papers: Directorate Financial Monitoring Reports 30 September 2011

Contact Officers: Kathy Wilcox, Principal Financial Manager  
Tel: (01865) 323981

Lorna Baxter, Acting Head of Corporate Finance  
Tel: (01865) 323971

November 2011

September Financial Monitoring and Business Strategy Delivery Report  
 CABINET - 15 November 2011  
 Budget Monitoring

CA6

Annex 1

Ref	Directorate	BUDGET 2011/12					Outturn Forecast Year end Spend/Income	Projected Year end Variation	Profiled Budget (Net) September 2011	Actual Expenditure (Net) September 2011	Variation to Budget September 2011	Projected Year end Variance Traffic Light
		Original Budget	Brought Forward from 2010/11 Surplus + Deficit -	Virements to Date	Supplementary Estimates to Date	Latest Estimate						
(1)	(2)	£000 (3)	£000 (4)	£000 (5)	£000 (6)	£000 (7)	£000 (8)	underspend - overspend + £000 (9)	£000 (10)	£000 (11)	£000 (12)	(13)
CEF	<b>Children, Education &amp; Families</b>											
	Gross Expenditure	540,447	2,705	66,121	351	609,624	612,882	3,258	307,336	284,492	-22,844	G
	Gross Income	-427,630	0	-68,399	0	-496,029	-501,156	-5,127	-250,578	-239,289	11,289	G
		<b>112,817</b>	<b>2,705</b>	<b>-2,278</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>113,595</b>	<b>111,726</b>	<b>-1,869</b>	<b>56,758</b>	<b>45,203</b>	<b>-11,555</b>	G
SCS	<b>Social &amp; Community Services</b>											
	Gross Expenditure	260,177	418	-2,290	0	258,305	265,132	6,827	134,600	134,917	317	A
	Gross Income	-40,735	0	3,361	0	-37,374	-43,717	-6,343	-24,125	-20,407	3,718	R
		<b>219,442</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>1,071</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>220,931</b>	<b>221,415</b>	<b>484</b>	<b>110,475</b>	<b>114,510</b>	<b>4,035</b>	G
EE	<b>Environment &amp; Economy</b>											
	Gross Expenditure	149,136	5,586	769	116	155,607	162,525	6,918	81,976	70,311	-11,665	A
	Gross Income	-73,575	0	776	0	-72,799	-81,008	-8,209	-40,545	-49,212	-8,667	R
		<b>75,561</b>	<b>5,586</b>	<b>1,545</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>82,808</b>	<b>81,517</b>	<b>-1,291</b>	<b>41,431</b>	<b>21,099</b>	<b>-20,332</b>	G
	<b>Chief Executive's Office</b>											
	Gross Expenditure	16,341	912	-162	223	17,314	17,385	71	10,232	10,505	274	G
	Gross Income	-8,590	0	289	0	-8,301	-8,301	0	-5,728	-6,430	-702	G
		<b>7,751</b>	<b>912</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>9,013</b>	<b>9,084</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>4,503</b>	<b>4,076</b>	<b>-428</b>	G
	Less recharges within directorate	-27,270				-27,270	-7,591	0			0	G
		27,270				27,270	7,591	0			0	G
	<b>Directorate Expenditure Total</b>	<b>938,831</b>	<b>9,621</b>	<b>64,438</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>1,013,579</b>	<b>1,050,332</b>	<b>17,074</b>	<b>534,143</b>	<b>500,225</b>	<b>-33,918</b>	G
	<b>Directorate Income Total</b>	<b>-523,260</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-63,973</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-587,233</b>	<b>-626,590</b>	<b>-19,679</b>	<b>-320,976</b>	<b>-315,338</b>	<b>5,638</b>	A
	<b>Directorate Total Net</b>	<b>415,571</b>	<b>9,621</b>	<b>465</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>426,347</b>	<b>423,742</b>	<b>-2,605</b>	<b>213,168</b>	<b>184,887</b>	<b>-28,280</b>	G

Less: DSG funded services overspend (included above)	38
Add: Pooled Budget Overspend	1,567
In-Year Directorate Variation (excluding DSG)	-1,000

September Financial Monitoring and Business Strategy Delivery Report

CABINET - 15 November 2011

Budget Monitoring

CA6

Annex 1

Ref	Directorate	BUDGET 2011/12					Outturn Forecast Year end Spend/Income £000 (8)	Projected Year end Variation underspend - overspend + £000 (9)	Profiled Budget (Net) September 2011 £000 (10)	Actual Expenditure (Net) September 2011 £000 (11)	Variation to Budget September 2011 underspend - overspend + £000 (12)	Projected Year end Variance Traffic Light (13)
		Original Budget £000 (3)	Brought Forward from 2010/11 Surplus + Deficit - £000 (4)	Virements to Date £000 (5)	Supplementary Estimates to Date £000 (6)	Latest Estimate £000 (7)						
(1)	(2)											
	Contributions to (+)/from (-)reserves	1,872	-9,621	382		-7,367	-3,512	3,855				
	Contribution to (+)/from(-) balances	1,619			-690	929	929	0				
	Pensions - Past Service Deficit Funding	1,500				1,500	1,500	0				
	Capital Financing	38,400		-1,831		36,569	35,319	-1,250				
	Interest on Balances	-1,826				-1,826	-1,826	0				
	Additional funding to be allocated			2,207		2,207	2,207	0				
	<b>Strategic Measures Budget</b>	41,565	-9,621	758	-690	32,012	34,617	2,605				
	Government Grants	-48,520		-1,223		-49,743	-49,743	0				
	<b>Budget Requirement</b>	408,616	0	0	0	408,616	408,616	0				

**Total External Financing to meet Budget Requirement**

Revenue Support Grant	28,844				28,844	28,844	0
Business rates	93,316				93,316	93,316	0
Council Tax	286,456				286,456	286,456	0
Other grant income					0	0	0
<b>External Financing</b>	408,616	0	0	0	408,616	408,616	0

Page 24

**Consolidated revenue balances position**

Forecast County Fund Balance (Annex 5)	15,666
Variation of OCC elements of the OP&PD and LD Pooled Budgets	-1,413
In-year directorate variation to be met from (-) or transferred to (+) Carry Forward Reserve	2,605
	<b>16,858</b>

**KEY TO TRAFFIC LIGHTS**

**Balanced Scorecard Type of Indicator**

Budget	On track to be within +/- 2% of year end budget	G
	On track to be within +/- 5% of year end budget	A
	Estimated outturn showing variance in excess of +/- 5% of year end budget	R



September Financial Monitoring and Business Strategy Delivery Report: Children, Education & Families

CABINET - 15 November 2011

Budget Monitoring

CA6

Annex 1a

DEDICATED SCHOOLS GRANT - DSG Funded Expenditure (Gross)

Ref	Directorate	BUDGET 2011/12					Outturn Forecast Year end Spend/Income £000 (8)	Projected Year end Variation underspend - overspend + £000 (9)
		Original Budget £000 (3)	Brought Forward from 2010/11 Surplus + Deficit - £000 (4)	Virements to Date £000 (5)	Supplementary Estimates to Date £000 (6)	Latest Estimate £000 (7)		
CEF1	Education & Early Intervention	30,442		-8,190		22,252	22,214	-38
CEF2	Children's Social Care	1,771		64		1,835	1,835	0
CEF3	Quality & Compliance	6,500		-153		6,347	6,347	0
CEF4	Schools	348,090		11,883		359,973	359,973	0
	<b>Total Gross</b>	<b>386,803</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,604</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>390,407</b>	<b>390,369</b>	<b>-38</b>

KEY TO TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Balanced Scorecard Type of Indicator

Budget	On track to be within +/- 2% of year end budget	G
	On track to be within +/- 5% of year end budget	A
	Estimated outturn showing variance in excess of +/- 5% of year end budget	R

September Financial Monitoring and Business Strategy Delivery Report: Social & Community Services

CABINET - 15 November 2011

Budget Monitoring

CA6

Annex 1b

Ref	Directorate	BUDGET 2011/12					Outturn Forecast Year end Spend/Income	Projected Year end Variation	Profiled Budget (Net) <i>September</i> 2011	Actual Expenditure (Net) <i>September</i> 2011	Variation to Budget <i>September</i> 2011	Projected Year end Variance Traffic Light
		Original Budget	Brought Forward from 2010/11 Surplus + Deficit -	Virements to Date	Supplementary Estimates to Date	Latest Estimate						
(1)	(2)	£000 (3)	£000 (4)	£000 (5)	£000 (6)	£000 (7)	£000 (8)	£000 (9)	£000 (10)	£000 (11)	£000 (12)	(13)
SCS1	<b>Adult Social Care</b>											
	Gross Expenditure	195,429	-1,156	897	0	195,170	195,622	452	97,623	99,330	1,707	G
	Gross Income	-45,284	0	-27		-45,311	-45,311	0	-22,657	-18,668	3,989	G
		<b>150,145</b>	<b>-1,156</b>	<b>870</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>149,859</b>	<b>150,311</b>	<b>452</b>	<b>74,966</b>	<b>80,662</b>	<b>5,695</b>	G
SCS2	<b>Community Safety</b>											
	Gross Expenditure	29,313	364	245	0	29,922	29,552	-370	14,934	13,588	-1,345	G
	Gross Income	-1,477	0	-6		-1,483	-1,483	0	-742	-697	45	G
		<b>27,836</b>	<b>364</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>28,439</b>	<b>28,069</b>	<b>-370</b>	<b>14,192</b>	<b>12,892</b>	<b>-1,300</b>	G
SCS3	<b>Quality &amp; Compliance</b>											
	Gross Expenditure	34,511	1,029	-3,023	0	32,517	32,919	402	16,259	16,155	-104	G
	Gross Income	-3,754	0	3,434		-320	-320	0	-160	-319	-159	G
		<b>30,757</b>	<b>1,029</b>	<b>411</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>32,197</b>	<b>32,599</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>16,099</b>	<b>15,837</b>	<b>-263</b>	G
SCS4	<b>Community Services</b>											
	Gross Expenditure	11,797	181	-409	0	11,569	11,569	0	5,784	5,843	59	G
	Gross Income	-1,093	0	-40		-1,133	-1,133	0	-566	-724	-158	G
		<b>10,704</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>-449</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10,436</b>	<b>10,436</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,218</b>	<b>5,120</b>	<b>-98</b>	G
	Less recharges within directorate	-10,873	0			-10,873	-4,530	0			0	G
		10,873	0			10,873	4,530	0			0	G
	<b>Directorate Expenditure Total</b>	<b>260,177</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>-2,290</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>258,305</b>	<b>265,132</b>	<b>484</b>	<b>134,600</b>	<b>134,917</b>	<b>317</b>	G
	<b>Directorate Income Total</b>	<b>-40,735</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,361</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-37,374</b>	<b>-43,717</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-24,125</b>	<b>-20,407</b>	<b>3,718</b>	G
	<b>Directorate Total Net</b>	<b>219,442</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>1,071</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>220,931</b>	<b>221,415</b>	<b>484</b>	<b>110,475</b>	<b>114,510</b>	<b>4,035</b>	G

September Financial Monitoring and Business Strategy Delivery Report: Social & Community Services

CABINET - 15 November 2011

Budget Monitoring

CA6

Annex 1b

Pooled Budget Memorandum Accounts

	OCC Contribution	Health Contribution	Gross Budget	Brought Forward from 2009/10	Net Budget	Forecast Outturn	Projected year- end variation	Projected variation OCC	Projected variation PCT
Older People's Pooled Budgets	78,491	24,843	103,334	0	103,334	106,949	836	-478	1,314
Physical Disabilities Pooled Budget	6,736	6,273	13,009	0	13,009	14,588	1,659	1,733	-74
Equipment Pooled Budget	881	309	1,190	0	1,190	1,497	363	235	128
Older People's, Physical Disabilities and Equipment Pooled Budget	86,108	31,425	117,533	0	117,533	123,034	2,858	1,490	1,368
Learning Disabilities Pooled Budget	62,739	11,959	74,698	0	74,698	75,891	91	77	14

Note: Contributions to the pool are shown within gross expenditure figures above for the relevant division of service

KEY TO TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Balanced Scorecard Type of Indicator

Budget	On track to be within +/- 2% of year end budget	G
	On track to be within +/- 5% of year end budget	A
	Estimated outturn showing variance in excess of +/- 5% of year end budget	R

September Financial Monitoring and Business Strategy Delivery Report: Environment & Economy

CABINET - 15 November 2011

CA6

Annex 1c

Budget Monitoring

Ref	Directorate	BUDGET 2011/12					Outturn Forecast Year end Spend/Income	Projected Year end Variation	Profiled Budget (Net) September 2011	Actual Expenditure (Net) September 2011	Variation to Budget September 2011	Projected Year end Variance Traffic Light
		Original Budget	Brought Forward from 2010/11 Surplus + Deficit -	Virements to Date	Supplementary Estimates to Date	Latest Estimate						
(1)	(2)	£000 (3)	£000 (4)	£000 (5)	£000 (6)	£000 (7)	£000 (8)	underspend - overspend + £000 (9)	£000 (10)	£000 (11)	£000 (12)	(13)
EE1	<b>Highways &amp; Transport</b>											
	Gross Expenditure	54,889	3,832	-74	0	58,647	58,124	-523	29,324	21,269	-8,055	G
	Gross Income	-11,521	0	-27		-11,548	-11,548	0	-5,774	-4,716	1,058	G
		<b>43,368</b>	<b>3,832</b>	<b>-101</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>47,099</b>	<b>46,576</b>	<b>-523</b>	<b>23,550</b>	<b>16,553</b>	<b>-6,997</b>	G
EE2	<b>Sustainable Development</b>											
	Gross Expenditure	28,330	477	-365	116	28,558	27,925	-633	14,346	11,041	-3,305	A
	Gross Income	-1,518	0	222		-1,296	-1,296	0	-689	-1,023	-334	G
		<b>26,812</b>	<b>477</b>	<b>-143</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>27,261</b>	<b>26,628</b>	<b>-633</b>	<b>13,657</b>	<b>10,018</b>	<b>-3,639</b>	A
EE3	<b>Property Asset Management</b>											
	Gross Expenditure	18,651	55	8,876	0	27,582	27,639	57	13,791	14,225	434	G
	Gross Income	-19,953	0	-6,886		-26,839	-26,839	0	-13,419	-11,930	1,489	G
		<b>-1,302</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>1,990</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>743</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>372</b>	<b>2,295</b>	<b>1,923</b>	R
EE4	<b>Director's Office</b>											
	Gross Expenditure	6,292	10	-155	0	6,147	6,222	75	3,074	2,990	-83	G
	Gross Income	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	-27	-27	G
		<b>6,292</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>-155</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6,147</b>	<b>6,222</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>3,074</b>	<b>2,963</b>	<b>-110</b>	G
EE5	<b>Oxfordshire Customer Services</b>											
	Gross Expenditure	49,183	1,212	-7,513	0	42,882	42,615	-267	21,441	20,786	-655	G
	Gross Income	-48,792	0	7,467		-41,325	-41,325	0	-20,663	-31,516	-10,854	G
		<b>391</b>	<b>1,212</b>	<b>-46</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,557</b>	<b>1,290</b>	<b>-267</b>	<b>778</b>	<b>-10,730</b>	<b>-11,509</b>	R
	Less recharges within directorate	-8,209				-8,209	0	0			0	G
		8,209				8,209	0	0			0	G
	<b>Directorate Expenditure Total</b>	<b>149,136</b>	<b>5,586</b>	<b>769</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>155,607</b>	<b>162,525</b>	<b>-1,291</b>	<b>81,976</b>	<b>70,311</b>	<b>-11,665</b>	G
	<b>Directorate Income Total</b>	<b>-73,575</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>776</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-72,799</b>	<b>-81,008</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-40,545</b>	<b>-49,212</b>	<b>-8,667</b>	G
	<b>Directorate Total Net</b>	<b>75,561</b>	<b>5,586</b>	<b>1,545</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>82,808</b>	<b>81,517</b>	<b>-1,291</b>	<b>41,431</b>	<b>21,099</b>	<b>-20,332</b>	G

KEY TO TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Balanced Scorecard Type of Indicator

Budget	On track to be within +/- 2% of year end budget	G
	On track to be within +/- 5% of year end budget	A
	Estimated outturn showing variance in excess of +/- 5% of year end budget	R

September Financial Monitoring and Business Strategy Delivery Report: Chief Executive's Office

CABINET - 15 November 2011

Budget Monitoring

CA6

Annex 1d

Ref	Directorate	BUDGET 2011/12					Outturn Forecast Year end Spend/Income	Projected Year end Variation	Profiled Budget (Net) September 2011	Actual Expenditure (Net) September 2011	Variation to Budget September 2011	Projected Year end Variance Traffic Light
		Original Budget	Brought Forward from 2010/11 Surplus + Deficit -	Virements to Date	Supplementary Estimates to Date	Latest Estimate						
(1)	(2)	£000 (3)	£000 (4)	£000 (5)	£000 (6)	£000 (7)	£000 (8)	underspend - overspend + £000 (9)	£000 (10)	£000 (11)	£000 (12)	(13)
<b>CEO1</b>	<b>Chief Executive &amp; Business Support</b>											
	Gross Expenditure	1,837	130	-277	0	1,690	1,665	-25	846	741	-105	G
	Gross Income	-813	0	17		-796	-796	0	-398	-406	-8	G
		<b>1,024</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>-259</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>895</b>	<b>870</b>	<b>-25</b>	<b>447</b>	<b>335</b>	<b>-113</b>	<b>A</b>
<b>CEO2</b>	<b>Human Resources</b>											
	Gross Expenditure	1,661	303	177	0	2,141	2,141	0	1,070	891	-179	G
	Gross Income	-1,711	0	0		-1,711	-1,711	0	-855	-986	-131	G
		<b>-50</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>430</b>	<b>430</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>-95</b>	<b>-310</b>	<b>G</b>
<b>CEO3</b>	<b>Corporate Finance &amp; Internal Audit</b>											
	Gross Expenditure	2,359	40	244	0	2,643	2,604	-39	1,322	1,477	155	G
	Gross Income	-2,308	0	16		-2,292	-2,292	0	-1,146	-1,169	-23	G
		<b>51</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>-39</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>R</b>
<b>CEO4</b>	<b>Law &amp; Governance Services</b>											
	Gross Expenditure	6,735	307	-68	0	6,974	7,109	135	3,531	3,809	278	G
	Gross Income	-4,103	0	27		-4,076	-4,076	0	-2,085	-2,613	-528	G
		<b>2,632</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>-40</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,899</b>	<b>3,034</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>1,446</b>	<b>1,196</b>	<b>-250</b>	<b>A</b>
<b>CEO5</b>	<b>Strategy &amp; Communications</b>											
	Gross Expenditure	2,996	132	-6	223	3,345	3,345	0	1,672	1,829	157	G
	Gross Income	-2,488	0	0		-2,488	-2,488	0	-1,244	-1,256	-13	G
		<b>508</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>-6</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>857</b>	<b>857</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>572</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>G</b>
<b>CEO6</b>	<b>Corporate &amp; Democratic Core</b>											
	Gross Expenditure	3,814	0	-233	0	3,581	3,581	0	1,791	1,759	-32	G
	Gross Income	-228	0	228		0	0	0	0	0	0	G
		<b>3,586</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,581</b>	<b>3,581</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,791</b>	<b>1,759</b>	<b>-32</b>	<b>G</b>
	Less recharges within directorate	-3,061				-3,061	-3,061	0			0	G
		3,061				3,061	3,061	0			0	G
	<b>Directorate Expenditure Total</b>	<b>16,341</b>	<b>912</b>	<b>-162</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>17,314</b>	<b>17,385</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>10,232</b>	<b>10,505</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>G</b>
	<b>Directorate Income Total</b>	<b>-8,590</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-8,301</b>	<b>-8,301</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-5,728</b>	<b>-6,430</b>	<b>-702</b>	<b>G</b>
	<b>Directorate Total Net</b>	<b>7,751</b>	<b>912</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>9,013</b>	<b>9,084</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>4,503</b>	<b>4,076</b>	<b>-428</b>	<b>G</b>

KEY TO TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Balanced Scorecard Type of Indicator

Budget	On track to be within +/- 2% of year end budget
	On track to be within +/- 5% of year end budget
	Estimated outturn showing variance in excess of +/- 5% of year end budget

G
A
R

CABINET IS RECOMMENDED TO APPROVE THE VIREMENTS AS DETAILED BELOW:

Directorate	Month of Cabinet meeting	Narration	Budget book line	Service Area	Permanent / Temporary	Expenditure From / Decrease (-) £000	Expenditure To / Increase (+) £000	Income From / Decrease (+) £000	Income To / Increase (-) £000
Page 31	Nov	Additional Grant funding	CEF1-41	Educational Transformation & Effectiveness	T	0.0	339.9	0.0	-339.9
		Reallocation of carry forward	CEF1-21	Special Educational Needs (SEN)	T	0.0	36.0	0.0	0.0
			CEF1-34	Behaviour & Attendance	T	0.0	497.0	0.0	-340.7
			CEF3-6	Commissioning & Performance	T	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0
			CEF4-3	Devolved Schools Costs	T	-563.0	0.0	340.7	0.0
		Tidy budgets re Administration restructure	CEF2-22	Family Placement	P	-83.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
			CEF2-23	Children Looked After (Including Asylum)	P	0.0	162.7	0.0	0.0
			CEF2-33	Assessment	P	-79.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		Reverse contribution towards new senior Practitioner post.	CEF2-21	Placement & Care Costs	P	-7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			CEF2-33	Assessment	P	0.0	7.0	0.0	0.0
		Correct virement in relation to disabilities and fostering in relation to salaries.	CEF2-1	Management & Central Costs	P	0.0	126.6	0.0	0.0
			CEF2-5	Services for Disabled Children	P	-126.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
		Correction to reallocation of school budgets	CEF4-1	Delegated Budgets (Indicative)	T	0.0	3,691.1	0.0	-3,691.1
		Increase schools contingency School development grant	CEF4-1	Delegated Budgets (Indicative)	T	0.0	464.0	0.0	-464.0
			CEF4-3	Devolved Schools Costs	T	-464.0	0.0	464.0	0.0
		Increase schools contingency - July pupil number increase	CEF4-1	Delegated Budgets (Indicative)	T	0.0	210.0	0.0	-210.0
			CEF4-3	Devolved Schools Costs	T	-210.0	0.0	210.0	0.0
Increase schools contingency- Local Authority Central Spend Equivalent Grant	CEF4-1	Delegated Budgets (Indicative)	T	0.0	333.0	0.0	-333.0		
	CEF4-3	Devolved Schools Costs	T	-333.0	0.0	333.0	0.0		

CABINET IS RECOMMENDED TO APPROVE THE VIREMENTS AS DETAILED BELOW:

Directorate	Month of Cabinet meeting	Narration	Budget book line	Service Area	Permanent / Temporary	Expenditure From / Decrease (-) £000	Expenditure To / Increase (+) £000	Income From / Decrease (+) £000	Income To / Increase (-) £000
CEF	Nov	Increase schools contingency - Primary Dedicated Schools Grant	CEF4-1	Delegated Budgets (Indicative)	T	0.0	143.0	0.0	-143.0
			CEF4-3	Devolved Schools Costs	T	-143.0	0.0	143.0	0.0
		1-2-1 budget into Individual Schools Budget	CEF4-1	Delegated Budgets (Indicative)	T	0.0	2,745.0	0.0	-2,745.0
			CEF4-3	Devolved Schools Costs	T	-2,745.0	0.0	2,745.0	0.0
		Reinstate contingency Dedicated Schools Grant budgets	CEF4-1	Delegated Budgets (Indicative)	T	0.0	812.4	0.0	-812.4
SCS	Nov	Reduction of OCC Contribution by Supporting People Efficiency saving 2011.12	SCS1-2C	Pooled Budget Contribution	P	-91.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
			SCS3-5	Supporting People	P	0.0	91.6	0.0	0.0
		Reduction in Contracts and Commissioning Budgets - Learning Disabilities Efficiency savings Plan	SCS1-2B	Social Work & Commissioning	P	-155.7	0.0	155.7	0.0
EE	Nov	Adjust current budget to more accurately reflect actual activity in this cost centre to enable the manager to forecast effectively	EE5-4	Human Resources	T	-303.4	84.4	275.0	-56.0
Interdirectorate	Nov	3 months' salary virement from EL1395 to G21041	CEF1-41	Educational Transformation & Effectiveness	P	-13.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			EE5-4	Human Resources	P	0.0	13.0	0.0	0.0
		3 months salary virement from G21041 to EL1395, reversal of matching Permanent Virement	CEF1-41	Educational Transformation & Effectiveness	T	0.0	13.0	0.0	0.0
			EE5-4	Human Resources	T	-13.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

CABINET IS RECOMMENDED TO APPROVE THE VIREMENTS AS DETAILED BELOW:

Directorate	Month of Cabinet meeting	Narration	Budget book line	Service Area	Permanent / Temporary	Expenditure From / Decrease (-) £000	Expenditure To / Increase (+) £000	Income From / Decrease (+) £000	Income To / Increase (-) £000
Interdirectorate	Nov	Return Asylum income to Strategic Measures	CEF2-23	Children Looked After (Including Asylum)	P	0.0	0.0	0.0	-328.0
			SM	Strategic Measures	P	0.0	328.0	0.0	0.0
		Transfer of Business and Skills from CEF to E&E Growth & Infrastructure	CEF1-6	Business & Skills (Previously 14-19 Team (Young People's Learning Agency Transfer))	T	-675.5	0.0	26.6	0.0
					P	-1,330.6	0.0	445.5	0.0
			EE2-3	Economy, Spatial Planning & Climate Change	T	0.0	675.5	0.0	-26.6
			P	0.0	1,330.6	0.0	-445.5		
Grand Total						-8,084.9	12,881.6	5,200.2	-9,996.8

NEW VIREMENTS FOR CABINET TO NOTE

Directorate	Month of Cabinet meeting	Narration	Budget book line	Service Area	Permanent / Temporary	Expenditure From / Decrease (-) £000	Expenditure To / Increase (+) £000	Income From / Decrease (-) £000	Income To / Increase (-) £000
EE	Nov	Set budgets for Customer Service Centre - Carers Funding recharge 2011/12	EE5-8	Customer Services	T	0.0	111.3	0.0	-111.3
		Highways Depot Clearance works funded from in-year PT Rev Support Underspend	EE1-32	Operations	T	0.0	140.0	0.0	0.0
			EE1-44	Public Transport	T	-140.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CEF	Nov	(blank)	CEF1-6	Business & Skills (Previously 14-19 Team (Young People's Learning Agency Transfer))	T	-36.0	30.0	6.0	0.0
		Transfer Continuing Professional Development budget to the Music Service	CEF1-41	Educational Transformation & Effectiveness	T	0.0	9.3	0.0	0.0
			CEF3-6	Commissioning & Performance	T	-9.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
		Positive Activities budget September to March	CEF1-31	Early Intervention Hubs	T	0.0	109.6	0.0	0.0
			CEF1-33	Youth & Inclusion Services	T	-155.6	46.0	0.0	0.0
		EDAS 11-12 BUDGET TIDY	CEF1-41	Educational Transformation & Effectiveness	T	-986.0	1,031.5	0.0	-45.5
		ICT STAFFING BUDGET	CEF1-41	Educational Transformation & Effectiveness	T	-85.0	114.4	0.0	-29.4
		Transformation Staffing budgets	CEF1-41	Educational Transformation & Effectiveness	T	-90.1	97.4	0.0	-7.3
		Restructure of Children's Social Care disabilities service	CEF2-1	Management & Central Costs	T	-129.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
			CEF2-5	Services for Disabled Children	T	-31.4	160.5	0.0	0.0
SCS	Nov	Budget tidy up following JMG agreement on the use of additional funds from NHS	SCS1-1A	Prevention & Early Support	T	0.0	54.0	0.0	0.0
			SCS1-1E	Pooled Budget Contributions	T	-54.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		Transfer of Carers funding to Mental Health Pool	SCS1-1A	Prevention & Early Support	T	-30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			SCS1-3B	Pooled Budget Contributions	T	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0
Interdirectorate	Nov	Virement of budget to fund salary subsidy for vulnerable Social Care apprentices	CEO2-3	Organisational Development	T	-4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
			EE5-4	Human Resources	T	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0
Grand Total						-1,751.1	1,938.5	6.0	-193.4

VIREMENTS NOTED IN PREVIOUS REPORTS

Directorate	Month of Cabinet meeting	Narration	Budget book line	Service Area	Permanent / Temporary	Expenditure From / Decrease (-) £000	Expenditure To / Increase (+) £000	Income From / Decrease (-) (£000)	Income To / Increase (-) (£000)
EE	Sep	Allocation of budget to match planned costs & income	EE5-4	Human Resources	T	-108.3	32.9	98.2	-22.8
		Customers Services estimated staff costs re Concessionary Fares call handling 11/12	EE1-41	Customer & Business	T	-67.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			EE5-8	Customer Services	T	0.0	67.0	0.0	0.0
		One-Off staff costs 11/12	EE1-1	Highways & Transport Management	T	-99.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
		EE1-31	Infrastructure & Design	T	0.0	99.7	0.0	0.0	
	Oct	Set budgets for Customer Service Centre - Carers Funding set-up costs	EE5-8	Customer Services	T	0.0	15.1	0.0	-15.1
CEF	Jun	Increase salary budget for Independent Chair in North area	CEF2-1	Management & Central Costs	T	-17.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
			CEF2-4	Safeguarding & Quality Assurance	T	0.0	17.5	0.0	0.0
	Jul	5/12 budget for the 0.5fte Drugs posts (from the Substance misuse budget which was allocated to the hubs)	CEF1-31	Early Intervention Hubs	T	-15.0	15.0	0.0	0.0
			CEF1-32	Children's Centres and Childcare	T	-170.2	177.7	0.0	-7.5
			CEF1-32	Children's Centres and Childcare	T	-188.3	191.6	0.0	-3.3
			CEF1-32	Children's Centres and Childcare	T	0.0	45.4	0.0	-45.4
			CEF4-2	Early Years Single Funding Formula (Nursery Education Funding)	T	-45.4	0.0	45.4	0.0
			CEF1-32	Children's Centres and Childcare	T	-352.0	359.7	0.0	-7.7
	Sep	Bicester Children's Centre Budget Approval	CEF1-32	Children's Centres and Childcare	T	-403.4	404.4	0.0	-1.0
			CEF1-1	Management & Central Costs	T	-16.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
			CEF2-6	Youth Offending Service	T	0.0	16.1	0.0	0.0
			CEF1-32	Children's Centres and Childcare	T	-162.1	187.0	0.0	-24.9
CEF1-31			Early Intervention Hubs	T	0.0	29.5	0.0	0.0	
	CEF2-6	Youth Offending Service	T	-29.5	0.0	0.0	0.0		

VIREMENTS NOTED IN PREVIOUS REPORTS

Directorate	Month of Cabinet meeting	Narration	Budget book line	Service Area	Permanent / Temporary	Expenditure From / Decrease (-) £000	Expenditure To / Increase (+) £000	Income From / Decrease (-) £000	Income To / Increase (-) £000
CEF	Sep	Early Intervention Service funded posts are not due until September (2)	CEF1-31	Early Intervention Hubs	T	-21.6	29.5	0.0	0.0
			CEF2-6	Youth Offending Service	T	-7.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
		Florence Park Children's Centre Budget Approval	CEF1-32	Children's Centres and Childcare	T	-365.4	372.1	0.0	-6.7
		Reversal of Early Intervention Service funded posts not due until September (1)	CEF1-31	Early Intervention Hubs	T	-29.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
			CEF2-6	Youth Offending Service	T	0.0	29.5	0.0	0.0
		Safeguarding Admin post April to August 2011	CEF1-31	Early Intervention Hubs	T	-8.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
			CEF1-34	Engagement in Education, Employment & Training (EEET)	T	0.0	8.5	0.0	0.0
		The Orchard Children's Centre Budget Approval	CEF1-32	Children's Centres and Childcare	T	-197.0	206.0	0.0	-9.1
		Willow Tree Children's Centre Budget Approval	CEF1-32	Children's Centres and Childcare	T	-144.3	146.5	0.0	-2.2
		SENSS equipment budget	CEF1-22	SEN Support Services (SENSS)	T	0.0	9.7	0.0	0.0
			CEF3-1	Children, Education & Families Management & Central Costs	T	-9.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
		Early Intervention Management - temp budget changes	CEF1-1	Management & Central Costs	T	-82.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
			CEF1-31	Early Intervention Hubs	T	0.0	11.8	0.0	0.0
			CEF1-41	Educational Transformation & Effectiveness	T	0.0	56.3	0.0	0.0
			CEF1-52	School Organisation & Planning	T	0.0	14.0	0.0	0.0
		Adjustment for Education Psychology budget - restructure from September	CEF1-23	Identification & Assessment	T	-248.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
			CEF1-31	Early Intervention Hubs	T	0.0	248.1	0.0	0.0
		Parenting budget for April to August - from Early Intervention funding.	CEF1-31	Early Intervention Hubs	T	-30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	CEF3-6	Commissioning & Performance	T	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0		

VIREMENTS NOTED IN PREVIOUS REPORTS

Directorate	Month of Cabinet meeting	Narration	Budget book line	Service Area	Permanent / Temporary	Expenditure From / Decrease (-) £000	Expenditure To / Increase (+) £000	Income From / Decrease (-) £000	Income To / Increase (-) £000
CEF	Oct	Vire budget to Head of Service to support staffing costs	CEF2-1	Management & Central Costs	T	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
			CEF2-22	Family Placement	T	-100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		Staff movement from SCT101 to Family Placement Team area budget	CEF2-22	Family Placement	T	0.0	78.4	0.0	0.0
		Butterfly Meadows Children's Centre budget approval	CEF2-5	Services for Disabled Children	T	-78.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
		Contribution towards post with pay protection for Advocacy Co-ordinator	CEF1-32	Children's Centres and Childcare	T	-163.2	163.9	0.0	-0.7
			CEF1-31	Early Intervention Hubs	T	-4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
SCS	Jun	Expenditure and income budgets for Bucks Fire & Rescue contribution to salary	CEF2-4	Safeguarding & Quality Assurance	T	0.0	4.7	0.0	0.0
			SCS2-1	Fire & Rescue Service	T	0.0	8.0	0.0	-8.0
		Set up an income and expenditure budget for income received from the PCT for Carers Breaks	SCS1-3B	Pooled Budget Contributions	T	0.0	39.9	0.0	-39.9
		Assisted Technology Carers Bid	SCS1-1A	Prevention & Early Support	T	-6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		Assisted Technology Carers Bid - move from SKT321 to SPT562	SCS1-1C	Social Work & Commissioning	T	0.0	6.0	0.0	0.0
			SCS1-1A	Prevention & Early Support	T	0.0	6.0	0.0	0.0
Interdirectorate	Jul	Change Fund funding for the Capital Resources part 2 project CFB053	SCS1-1C	Social Work & Commissioning	T	-6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			CEO1-2	Change Fund	T	-18.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
		Change Fund CFB062: E&E Oxfordshire Broadband	EE4-1	Business Improvement	T	0.0	18.7	0.0	0.0
		Change Fund CFB063: ICT - Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery	CEO1-2	Change Fund	T	-20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			EE2-3	Economy, Spatial Planning & Climate Change	T	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
		Change Fund CFB064: Trading Standards Oxon Bucks Partnership	CEO1-2	Change Fund	T	-150.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	EE3-1	Corporate Property	T	0.0	150.0	0.0	0.0		
	CEO1-2	Change Fund	T	-25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
	SCS2-5	Trading Standards	T	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0		

VIREMENTS NOTED IN PREVIOUS REPORTS

Directorate	Month of Cabinet meeting	Narration	Budget book line	Service Area	Permanent / Temporary	Expenditure From / Decrease (-) £000	Expenditure To / Increase (+) £000	Income From / Decrease (-) £000	Income To / Increase (-) £000
Interdirectorate	Sep	SCS transfer to CEF Continued Professional Development Budget	CEF3-6	Commissioning & Performance	T	0.0	9.3	0.0	0.0
			SCS3-1	Resource Management	T	-9.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
		Temporary funding for Direct Payment monitoring post in Payments Team	EE5-3	Financial and Management Accounting	T	0.0	27.3	0.0	0.0
			SCS1-1C	Social Work & Commissioning	T	-27.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
		Contribution to Corporate Finance training budget	CEO1-1	Chief Executive's Personal Office	T	0.0	7.0	0.0	0.0
			EE5-3	Financial and Management Accounting	T	-7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		Virement of salary budget from Organisation Development	CEO2-3	Organisational Development	T	-22.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
			EE5-4	Human Resources	T	0.0	22.2	0.0	0.0
	Workforce initiatives funding 2 apprentices	CEO2-3	Organisational Development	T	-10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
		EE5-4	Human Resources	T	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	
	Oct	CFB065 HRMAT (HR Management Advice Team) increased workload	CEO1-2	Change Fund	T	-22.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			EE5-4	Human Resources	T	0.0	22.0	0.0	0.0
		Virement of budget to fund Oxfordshire Employment Service post to assist in creating jobs for people with disabilities	CEO2-3	Organisational Development	T	-4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
			SCS1-4E	Employment Services	T	0.0	4.6	0.0	0.0
CEO	Jul	Change Fund CFB032: Lead Oxfordshire part 3	CEO1-2	Change Fund	T	-213.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
			CEO2-3	Organisational Development	T	0.0	213.3	0.0	0.0
	Oct	CFB061 Starters, Leavers, Movers form	CEO1-2	Change Fund	T	-10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
			CEO2-1	Strategic Human Resources	T	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0
		CFB066 joint initiative between Legal Services and Trading Standards	CEO1-2	Change Fund	T	-7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	CEO4-1	Legal Services	T	0.0	7.0	0.0	0.0		
Grand Total						-3,723.3	3,774.0	143.6	-194.3

Supplementary Estimates

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES REQUESTED THIS REPORT

Directorate	Month of Cabinet meeting	Narration	Budget book line	Service Area	Permanent / Temporary	Expenditure	Expenditure	Income	Income
						From / Decrease (-) £000	To / Increase (+) £000	From / Decrease (+) £000	To / Increase (-) £000
Grand Total									

Redundancy Costs 2010/11									
Directorate	Funded by Directorate				Funded by Efficiency Reserve				Total £m
	Actual Payments made to individuals in year £m	Known payments accrued for in year £m	Estimated Provision £m	Total £m	Actual Payments made to individuals in year £m	Known payments accrued for in year £m	Estimated Provision £m	Total £m	
	<b>Children, Education &amp; Families</b> - National Strategies & EDAS - Business Strategy - Student Support - Other	0.030	1.255 0.093	1.958	1.255 1.958 0.030 0.093				
<b>Social &amp; Community Services</b> - Restructure of Adult Social Care - Cultural & Community Development - Community Safety		0.015		0.000 0.015 0.000	0.468 0.049 0.067	0.129	2.917	3.514 0.049 0.067	3.630
Oxfordshire Customer Services	0.282			0.282	0.287			0.287	0.569
Chief Executive's Office	0.564			0.564				0.000	0.564
Environment & Economy	0.170	0.338		0.508	0.182			0.182	0.690
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.046</b>	<b>1.701</b>	<b>1.958</b>	<b>4.705</b>	<b>1.053</b>	<b>0.129</b>	<b>2.917</b>	<b>4.099</b>	<b>8.789</b>

Page 40

Redundancy Costs 2011/12									
Directorate	Funded by Directorate				Funded by Efficiency Reserve				Total £m
	Actual Funded by Directorate £m	Actual costs relating to 2010/11 accrual £m	Actual costs charged against 2010/11 Provision £m	Total £m	Actual Payments made to individuals in year £m	Actual costs relating to 2010/11 accrual £m	Actual costs charged against 2010/11 Provision £m	Total Funded £m	
	<b>Children, Education &amp; Families</b> - National Strategies & EDAS - Business Strategy - Student Support -Other		1.091	0.394	1.091 0.000 0.000 0.394				
<b>Social &amp; Community Services</b> - Restructure of Adult Social Care - Cultural & Community Development - Community Safety	0.030 0.006 0.002	0.015		0.030 0.022 0.002	0.110	0.049	0.634	0.792 0.000 0.000	0.846
Oxfordshire Customer Services	0.003			0.003				0.000	0.003
Chief Executive's Office				0.000				0.000	0.000
Environment & Economy	0.058	0.336		0.394				0.000	0.394
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.099</b>	<b>1.442</b>	<b>0.394</b>	<b>1.936</b>	<b>0.110</b>	<b>0.049</b>	<b>0.634</b>	<b>0.792</b>	<b>2.728</b>

September Financial Monitoring and Business Strategy Delivery Report  
 CABINET - 15 November 2011  
 EARMARKED RESERVES & PROVISIONS

CA6

Annex 4

Earmarked Reserves	2011/12			August 2011 Balance at 31 March 2012 £000	Change in Closing Balance Forecast £000	Commentary
	Balance at 1 April 2011 £000	Movement				
		Contributions from Reserve £000	Contributions to Reserve £000			
<b>Children, Education &amp; Families</b>						
Primary	12,583			12,583	0	
Secondary	7,698			7,698	0	
Special	1,288			1,288	0	
<b>Sub-total schools' revenue reserves</b>	<b>21,569</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21,569</b>	<b>0</b>	
School Loans	-1,187			-1,187	0	
<b>Total schools' reserves</b>	<b>20,382</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20,382</b>	<b>0</b>	
Schools' Contingency	-14			-14		
Schools' Partnerships	290			290		
Schools' Insurance	265			265		
Youth Management Committee	308	-188		120		
Supply Cover	260			260		
Oxfordshire Rural Children's Centres	18			18		
Safeguarding Board	122			122		
Youth Support Service - computer system	139	-49		90		To be renamed EIS Equipment reserve
Residential Centres	95	-84		11		
Youth Offending Service	147	-147		0		To fund 4.5 FTE members of staff for the year
Joint Use Reserve	171			171		
<b>Directorate Total</b>	<b>22,183</b>	<b>-468</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21,952</b>	<b>-237</b>	
<b>Social &amp; Community Services</b>						
Cultural Services General	69		59	128	0	
ICT/Digitisation projects	851		132	983	0	Provision for updating of software/hardware to maintain an effective library management system.
Vehicle Renewals	107		52	159	0	
Donations	25	-1		24	0	
Older People Pooled Budget and Learning	1,424	-1,424		0	0	Utilisation of Winter Pressures funding.
Disabilities Pooled Budget Reserve						
OSJ Client Income Reserve	64			64	0	
Personal Budgets	188			188	0	
S117 Reserve	23			23	0	
<b>Fire &amp; Rescue</b>						
Securing Water Supplies	27			27	0	
Protective Clothing	39		51	90	51	
Breathing Apparatus Equipment	217		10	227	10	
Communications Fund	84		20	104	20	
Vehicles	457	-1,120	870	207	-250	
IT	160	-130		30	-130	
Rescue Equipment	26			26	0	
Fire Control	377		201	578	201	
Fire Link	139			139	0	
New Dimensions	25		25	50	25	

September Financial Monitoring and Business Strategy Delivery Report

CABINET - 15 November 2011

EARMARKED RESERVES & PROVISIONS

CA6

Annex 4

Earmarked Reserves	2011/12			Balance at 31 March 2012 £000	August 2011 Balance at 31 March 2012 £000	Change in Closing Balance Forecast £000	Commentary
	Balance at 1 April 2011 £000	Movement					
		Contributions from Reserve £000	Contributions to Reserve £000				
<b>Emergency Planning</b>							
Vehicle Renewals	42			42	42	0	
<b>Trading Standards</b>							
Vehicles Replacement Reserve	7			7	7	0	
Trading Standards Reserve	12			12	12	0	
Gypsy & Traveller Services - Site Refurbishment	198			198	198	0	
<b>SCS Directorate Total</b>	<b>4,561</b>	<b>-2,675</b>	<b>1,420</b>	<b>3,306</b>	<b>3,379</b>	<b>-73</b>	
<b>Environment &amp; Economy</b>							
Countryside Ascot Park	18			18	18	0	
Carbon Reduction	60			60	60	0	
SALIX Repayments	129			129	129	0	
Highways Winter Maintenance	18			18	18	0	
Dix Pit WRC Development	13			13	13	0	
Oxfordshire Waste Partnership Joint Reserve	121			121	121	0	
Transport	250			250	250	0	
Tourism Signs	102			102	102	0	
On Street Car Parking	1,093			1,093	1,093	0	Anticipated to have a net nil movement to/from reserve, but it is dependent on the new charges. We could see a contribution to reserve by the end of the year.
Dix Pit Engineering Works	866	-322	167	711	711	0	Used to fund construction of cell 3K, Dix Pit
Waste Management	1,913	-2,070	1,937	1,780	1,780	0	Used to support the bid & planning costs of the Waste Treatment Project
Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme	327			327	327	0	
Vehicle Renewals	61			61	61	0	
Capital Salaries transfer	53			53	53	0	
Property Disposal Costs	115			115	115	0	
Developer Funding (Revenue)	191			191	191	0	
West End Partnership	218	-75		143	143	0	
<b>Oxfordshire Customer Services</b>							
Development Reserve	472	-472		0	0	0	Used to fund projects which will contribute to the business strategy
Money Management Reserve	40			40	40	0	Contingency in case of an overspend if income received is less than budget
Oxfordshire - Buckinghamshire partnership	332	-332		0	0	0	To be spent by the partnership
Food with Thought / QCS Cleaning	1,409	-526	300	1,183	1,183	0	To be used to invest in the business plus a contingency for unforeseen costs
Customer Service Centre Reserve	1,883	-1,017		866	866	0	Project funding
Schools ICT	10	-10		0	0	0	
<b>EE Directorate Total</b>	<b>9,694</b>	<b>-4,824</b>	<b>2,404</b>	<b>7,274</b>	<b>7,274</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Chief Executive's Office</b>							
Change Fund	869	-522	308	655	655	0	See paragraph 11 of the report
CIPFA Trainees	36			36	36	0	This provides cover for any unbudgeted CIPFA trainee costs - pay costs fluctuate according to the qualification level that the current trainees have reached.
Council Elections	207			207	207	0	This will be used for the 2013 election
FMSIS Audit	27	-27		0	0	0	To be used for school audits
Registration Service	180			180	180	0	To be used for refurbishing the Registration buildings and facilities
<b>CEO Directorate Total</b>	<b>1,319</b>	<b>-549</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>1,078</b>	<b>1,078</b>	<b>0</b>	

September Financial Monitoring and Business Strategy Delivery Report  
 CABINET - 15 November 2011  
 EARMARKED RESERVES & PROVISIONS

CA6

Annex 4

Earmarked Reserves	2011/12			Balance at 31 March 2012 £000	August 2011 Balance at 31 March 2012 £000	Change in Closing Balance Forecast £000	Commentary
	Balance at 1 April 2011 £000	Movement					
		Contributions from Reserve £000	Contributions to Reserve £000				
<b>Corporate</b>							
Insurance Reserve	6,249	-2,400		3,849	3,849	0	
Carry Forward Reserve	9,891	-9,891	2,605	2,605	8,972	-6,367	
Capital Reserve	16,579			16,579	16,579	0	
Other Reserves	-1			-1	-1	0	
LABGI Reserve	496			496	496	0	
Budget Reserve - Agreed 2009	6,107	-6,107	4,361	4,361	4,361	0	
Efficiency Reserve	3,776	-589	6,670	9,857	9,587	270	
Prudential Borrowing Reserve	3,885		1,250	5,135	5,135	0	
<b>Corporate Total</b>	<b>46,982</b>	<b>-18,987</b>	<b>14,886</b>	<b>42,881</b>	<b>48,978</b>	<b>-6,097</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>84,739</b>	<b>-27,503</b>	<b>19,018</b>	<b>76,254</b>	<b>82,661</b>	<b>-6,407</b>	

# September Financial Monitoring and Business Strategy Delivery Report

CABINET - 15 November 2011

CA6

Annex 5

## Forecast Revenue Balances

Date	Forecast 2011/12 £m	£m	Budget 2011/12 £m
Provisional outturn 2010/11	14.059		13.056
Local Area Agreement (LAA) Performance Reward Grant	0.678		
County Fund Balance		<u>14.737</u>	<u>13.056</u>
Planned Contribution to Balances		1.619	1.619
<b>Original forecast outturn position 2011/12</b>		<b>16.356</b>	<b>14.675</b>
<b>Additions</b>			
<b>Calls on balances deducted</b>		<u>0.000</u>	0.000
Jul-11 Foster Care Loan			
Aug-11 Skills LAA Reward Grant		-0.339	
Aug-11 PRG for Broadband project		-0.116	
Aug-11 PRG for OCVA (Oxfordshire Community Voluntary Association) & ORCC (Oxfordshire Rural Community Council)		-0.107	
Aug-11 PRG for District Council Partnerships		<u>-0.116</u>	
Total calls on balances		<u>-0.678</u>	-2.000
Total calls on balances		-0.690	
<b>Net Forecast Balances</b>		<b>15.666</b>	<b>12.675</b>
<b>Total budget requirement</b>		<b>408.616</b>	<b>408.616</b>
<b>Provisional balances as a % of budget requirement</b>		<b>3.83%</b>	<b>3.10%</b>
<b>Net Forecast Balances</b>		<b>15.666</b>	
<b>Calls on balances agreed but not actioned</b>			
		<u>0.000</u>	
<b>Calls on balances requested in this report</b>		<u>0.000</u>	
<b>Revised Forecast Outturn position</b>		<b>15.666</b>	

Pooled Budgets

Older People, Physical Disabilities and Equipment Pool

Last Month Budget £m	Latest Budget £m		Forecast Variance September £m	Forecast Variance August 2011 £m	Change in Variance £m
		<b>Council Elements</b>			
		<b>Older People</b>			
49.539	51.220	Care Homes	+0.337	+0.472	+0.135
30.850	27.271	Community Support Purchasing Budget	-0.815	+0.000	-0.815
<b>80.389</b>	<b>78.491</b>	<b>Total Older People</b>	<b>-0.478</b>	<b>+0.472</b>	<b>-0.950</b>
		<b>Physical Disabilities</b>			
2.546	2.546	Care Homes	+0.480	+0.396	+0.084
4.190	4.190	Community Support Purchasing Budget	+1.253	+1.180	+0.073
<b>6.736</b>	<b>6.736</b>	<b>Total Physical Disabilities</b>	<b>+1.733</b>	<b>+1.576</b>	<b>+0.157</b>
0.827	0.881	<b>Equipment</b>	+0.235	+0.224	+0.011
<b>87.952</b>	<b>86.108</b>	<b>Total Council Elements</b>	<b>+1.490</b>	<b>+2.272</b>	<b>-0.782</b>
		<b>PCT Elements</b>			
24.843	24.843	Older People	+1.314	+1.245	+0.069
6.112	6.274	Physical Disabilities	-0.074	+0.164	-0.238
0.309	0.308	Equipment	+0.128	+0.137	-0.009
<b>31.264</b>	<b>31.425</b>	<b>Total PCT Elements</b>	<b>+1.368</b>	<b>+1.546</b>	<b>-0.178</b>
<b>119.216</b>	<b>117.533</b>	<b>Total Older People, Physical Disabilities and Equipment Pool</b>	<b>+2.858</b>	<b>+3.818</b>	<b>-0.960</b>

Pooled Budgets

Learning Disabilities Pool

Last Month Budget £m	Latest Budget £m		Forecast Variance September £m	Forecast Variance August 2011 £m	Change in Variance £m
		<b>Council Elements</b>			
46.331	46.331	Personal Budgets	+0.077	+0.077	+0.000
17.507	17.507	Other Services	0	0	0
<b>63.838</b>	<b>63.838</b>	<b>Total Council Elements</b>	<b>+0.077</b>	<b>+0.077</b>	<b>+0.000</b>
		<b>PCT Elements</b>			
8.681	8.681	Personal Budgets	+0.014	+0.014	+0.000
3.281	3.281	Other Services	0	0	0
<b>11.962</b>	<b>11.962</b>	<b>Total PCT Elements</b>	<b>+0.014</b>	<b>+0.014</b>	<b>+0.000</b>
<b>75.800</b>	<b>75.800</b>	<b>Total Learning Disabilities Pool</b>	<b>+0.091</b>	<b>+0.091</b>	<b>+0.000</b>

Government Grant Details - 2011/12

Directorate	Budget Book	In year Adjustments/ New Allocations previously reported	In year Adjustments/ New Allocations reported this month	Latest Allocation
	£m	£m		£m
<u>Children, Education &amp; Families</u>				
Dedicated Schools Grant				0.000
2011/12 Allocation	386.803	-0.570		386.233
2010/11 Allocation		2.692		2.692
Pupil Premium	3.400	0.516	0.701	4.617
Young People Learning Agency – Sixth Form Funding	27.608			27.608
Young People Learning Agency – SEN	0.491			0.491
Additional Grant - Phonics, Physical Education, Maths & Science Teachers (MAST) and New Opportunities			0.340	0.340
Music	0.640	0.064		0.704
Youth Justice Board		0.924		0.924
Young People's Learning Agency - Young Apprentice		0.033		0.033
Intensive Interventions Programme (DfE)		0.140		0.140
Intensive Interventions Programme (DfE) Sector Advisors		0.015		0.015
Children's Centres Payment by Results Pilot		0.075		0.075
Asylum (UASC & Post 18)		1.000	0.328	1.328
<b>Total Children, Education &amp; Families</b>	<b>418.942</b>	<b>4.889</b>	<b>1.369</b>	<b>425.200</b>
<u>Social &amp; Community Services</u>				
Workstep Grant		0.275		0.275
<b>Total Social &amp; Community Services</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.275</b>		<b>0.275</b>
<u>Environment &amp; Economy</u>				
Skills Funding Agency - Adult Education	3.803			3.803
Natural England	0	0.221		0.221
<b>Total Environment &amp; Economy</b>	<b>3.803</b>	<b>0.221</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4.024</b>
<u>Strategic Measures</u>				
Early Intervention Grant	21.329	0.094		21.423
Learning Disabilities & Health Reform Grant	19.224			19.224
Fire Revenue Grant	0.183			0.183
Community Safety Fund	0.563	0.004		0.567
Lead Local Flood Authority	0.158			0.158
Extended Rights to Free Travel		0.630		0.630
New Homes Bonus	0	0.491		0.491
Council Tax Freeze Grant	7.063	0.004		7.067
<b>Total Strategic Measures</b>	<b>48.520</b>	<b>1.223</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>49.743</b>
<b>Total Grants</b>	<b>471.265</b>	<b>6.387</b>	<b>1.369</b>	<b>475.218</b>

September Financial Monitoring & Business Strategy Delivery Report  
 CABINET -15 NOVEMBER 2011  
 Oxfordshire County Council's Treasury Management Lending List

CA6

Annex 8

Counterparty Name	Lending Limits		
	Standard Limit	Group Limit	Period Limit
	£	£	
<b>PENSION FUND Call Accounts / Money Market Funds</b>			
Royal Bank of Scotland Liquidity Select A/c	50% Pension Fund Portfolio		Overnight
Ignis Sterling Liquidity Fund - (Pension Fund)	50% Pension Fund Portfolio		6 months
<b>Call Accounts / Money Market Funds</b>			
Royal Bank of Scotland - Call A/c	5,000,000	5,000,000	Overnight
Goldman Sachs Sterling Liquid Reserves Fund	25,000,000	25,000,000	6 months
Deutsche Managed Sterling Fund	25,000,000	25,000,000	6 months
Prime Rate Sterling Fund	25,000,000	25,000,000	6 months
Ignis Sterling Liquidity Fund - (County Council)	25,000,000	25,000,000	6 months
<b>Money Market Deposits</b>			
Bank of Montreal	20,000,000	0	6 months
Bank of New York Mellon	20,000,000	0	6 months
Bank of Nova Scotia	20,000,000	0	6 months
Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce	20,000,000	0	6 months
Commonwealth Bank of Australia	25,000,000	0	6 months
Dot Management Account Deposit Facility	100% Portfolio	0	6 months
DnB NOR Bank	10,000,000	0	1 month
English, Welsh and Scottish Local Authorities	25,000,000	0	3 years
HSBC Bank plc	20,000,000	0	6 months
JP Morgan Chase Bank	20,000,000	0	6 months
National Australia Bank (Through Broker)	20,000,000	20,000,000	6 months
National Australia Bank (Direct)	20,000,000	20,000,000	6 months
National Bank of Canada	10,000,000	0	3 months
Nordea Bank Finland	20,000,000	0	1 month
Rabobank Group (Through Broker)	25,000,000	25,000,000	6 months
Rabobank Group (Direct)	25,000,000	25,000,000	6 months
Royal Bank of Canada	25,000,000	0	6 months
Standard Chartered Bank	20,000,000	0	6 months
Svenska Handelsbanken	20,000,000	0	6 months
Toronto-Dominion Bank	20,000,000	0	6 months

## Capital Programme 2011/12 to 2015/16

Directorate	Latest Approved Capital Programme (Cabinet October 2011)			Latest Forecast			Variation			Current Year Expenditure Monitoring				Performance Compared to Original Programme (Council February 2011)		
	Current Year £'000s	Future Years £'000s	Total £'000s	Current Year £'000s	Future Years £'000s	Total £'000s	Current Year £'000s	Future Years £'000s	Total £'000s	Actual expenditure to date £'000s	Commitments £'000s	Expenditure Realisation Rate %	Actuals & Commitments %	Current Year £'000s	Variation £'000s	Use of Resources Variation %
Children, Education & Families 1 - OCC	30,689	145,071	175,760	30,689	145,071	175,760	0	0	0	13,387	8,010	44%	70%	34,643	-3,954	-11%
Social & Community Services	9,927	13,787	23,714	9,927	14,987	24,914	0	1,200	1,200	685	2,811	7%	35%	10,521	-594	-6%
Environment & Economy 1 - Transport	23,648	80,746	104,394	22,945	81,449	104,394	-703	703	0	6,138	10,254	27%	71%	19,261	3,684	19%
Environment & Economy 2 - Other Property Development Programmes	4,670	11,642	16,312	4,070	12,242	16,312	-600	600	0	589	748	14%	33%	6,522	-2,452	-38%
Chief Executive's Office	105	20	125	105	20	125	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	90	15	17%
<b>Total Directorate Programmes</b>	<b>69,039</b>	<b>251,266</b>	<b>320,305</b>	<b>67,736</b>	<b>253,769</b>	<b>321,505</b>	<b>-1,303</b>	<b>2,503</b>	<b>1,200</b>	<b>20,799</b>	<b>21,823</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>71,037</b>	<b>-3,301</b>	<b>-5%</b>
Schools Local Capital	7,787	11,308	19,095	7,787	11,308	19,095	0	0	0	4,270	0	55%	55%	6,930	857	12%
Earmarked Reserves	0	57,645	57,645	0	57,622	57,622	0	-23	-23					63	-63	-100%
<b>OVERALL TOTAL</b>	<b>76,826</b>	<b>320,219</b>	<b>397,045</b>	<b>75,523</b>	<b>322,699</b>	<b>398,222</b>	<b>-1,303</b>	<b>2,480</b>	<b>1,177</b>	<b>25,069</b>	<b>21,823</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>78,030</b>	<b>-2,507</b>	<b>-3%</b>

Financial Monitoring & Business Strategy Delivery Report September 2011 (Cabinet 15 November 2011)  
Capital Programme 2011/12 to 2015/16

In-year Expenditure Forecast Variations

Project/ Programme Name	Previous 2011/12 Forecast * £'000s	Revised 2011/12 Forecast £'000s	Variation £'000s	Comments
<u>Children, Education &amp; Families</u>				
<b>CE&amp;F TOTAL IN-YEAR VARIATION</b>			<b>0</b>	
<u>Social &amp; Community Services</u>				
<b>S&amp;CS TOTAL IN-YEAR VARIATION</b>			<b>0</b>	
<u>Environment &amp; Economy (excluding Transport)</u>				
Kidlington WRC	750	150	-600	
<b>E&amp;E (EXCLUDING TRANSPORT) TOTAL IN-YEAR VARIATION</b>			<b>-600</b>	
<u>Highways &amp; Transport</u>				
A44 Crossing, Yarnton	345	32	-313	Delay in start date due to conflict with other works in the area
Didcot Station Forecourt	1,037	722	-315	Pre-construction works causing delay to start date
Other small changes			-75	
<b>HIGHWAYS &amp; TRANSPORT TOTAL IN- YEAR VARIATION</b>			<b>-703</b>	
<b>CAPITAL PROGRAMME TOTAL IN-YEAR VARIATION</b>			<b>-1,303</b>	

\* As approved by Cabinet 18 October 2011

Financial Monitoring & Business Strategy Delivery Report August 2011 (Cabinet 15 November 2011)  
Capital Programme 2011/12 to 2015/16

New Schemes and Budget Changes

Project/ Programme Name	Previous Total Budget * £'000s	Revised Total Budget £'000s	Variation £'000s	Comments
<u>Children, Education &amp; Families</u>				
<b>CE&amp;F TOTAL PROGRAMME SIZE VARIATION</b>			0	
<u>Social &amp; Community Services</u>				
<u>New schemes</u>				
Bicester Library	0	1,200	1,200	Was a scheme on hold. Self-financed scheme from S106 contributions and potential capital receipt from exisitng library.
<b>S&amp;CS TOTAL PROGRAMME SIZE VARIATION</b>			1,200	
<u>Environment &amp; Economy (excluding Transport)</u>				
<b>E&amp;E (EXCLUDING TRANSPORT) TOTAL PROGRAMME SIZE VARIATION</b>			0	
<u>Highways &amp; Transport</u>				
<b>HIGHWAYS &amp; TRANSPORT TOTAL PROGRAMME SIZE VARIATION</b>			0	
<b>CAPITAL PROGRAMME TOTAL PROGRAMME SIZE VARIATION</b>			1,200	

\* As approved by Cabinet 18 October 2011

This page is intentionally left blank

Division(s): NA

## CABINET – 15 NOVEMBER 2011

### TREASURY MANAGEMENT MID TERM REVIEW 2011/12

#### Report by Assistant Chief Executive and Chief Finance Officer

#### Introduction

1. The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy's (CIPFA's) 'Code of Practice on Treasury Management (Revised) 2009' recommends that members are informed of Treasury Management activities at least twice a year. This report therefore ensures this authority is embracing Best Practice in accordance with CIPFA's recommendations.
2. The following annexes are attached:
  - Annex 1 Lending List Changes
  - Annex 2 Debt Financing 2011/12
  - Annex 3 PWLB debt Raised and Maturing
  - Annex 4 Prudential Indicator Update.

#### Strategy 2011/12

3. The approved Treasury Management Strategy for 2011/12 was based on an average *base rate forecast of 0.75%*.
4. The Strategy for Long Term Borrowing was to use internal balances only.
5. The Strategy included the continued use of the services of external fund managers, Scottish Widows Investment Partnership (SWIP) and Investec.

#### Economic Background

6. **Growth:** Global growth prospects deteriorated considerably over the six months to September, moving from an expectation of modest expansion to the risk of a double-dip recession. Q1 2011 GDP in the UK was 0.5%, but was just 0.2% in Q2. Even economies like Germany's, which were hitherto seemingly strong, began to flounder with growth registering 0.1% in Q2.
7. **Inflation:** Inflation remained stubbornly high. Annual CPI for September 2011 was 5.2%; CPI has remained above the MPC's 3% upper limit now for 21 consecutive months and required the Bank of England's Governor to write his seventh open letter to the Chancellor. The Bank believes the elevated rate of inflation reflects the temporary impact of several factors including, the increase in the VAT rate to 20%, past increases in global energy prices and import prices. The expectation is that in early 2012, the year on year impact of these factors will fall out and inflation will start to lower.

8. The Bank of England's August Inflation Report downgraded the growth forecast even as it acknowledged energy price rises could push CPI to 5% before inflation fell back to the 2% target over the medium-term. The UK's strategy of combining loose monetary policy (the Bank Rate had remained at 0.5% for 2½ years and Quantitative Easing at £200bn) with tight fiscal policy supported the rebalancing of the economy and also commanded support in the markets.
9. In the US, the country's weak economic and fiscal situation and an unemployment rate of 9.1% left the Federal Reserve little option but to commit to "exceptionally low" interest rates until mid 2013.
10. The European sovereign debt crisis has deepened. The agreement in July 2011 to address Greece's fiscal problems and broaden the mandate for the European Financial Stability Facility (EFSF) only bought time for the Eurozone as market pressure increased on Italy and Spain, but did little to address the issue of overburdened sovereign balance sheets. The further EU bailout plan agreed in late October 2011, comprising a 100bn euro loan and 50% debt write off in return for deep cuts in public spending now hangs in the balance following the announcement by the Greek Prime Minister of a referendum on the deal.
11. The European Banking Authority (EBA) released the results of the second of its stress tests in July. 8 banks (two Greek, one Austrian and five small domestic Spanish banks) out of 91 banks failed the tests. All of the UK and non-UK banks tested by the EBA and which are on the Council's lending list met the 'stressed' Core Tier 1 Ratio of 5%, none were adjudged as 'near-failed' (i.e. having ratios between 5% and 6%).
12. **Gilt yields and money market rates:** The economic uncertainty resulted in analysts postponing the likelihood of an increase in the UK Bank Rate until mid 2012. Gilts were considered a safe haven and benefited from market turmoil. Gilt yields fell to their lowest levels in five years. 5-year gilt yields fell to 1.25%, 10-year yields to 2.2% and 20-year yields to 3.05%.

## Treasury Management Activity

### Debt Financing

13. Oxfordshire County Council's (the Council) debt financing to date for 2011/12 is analysed in Annex 2.
14. The 2011/12 borrowing strategy is to use internal balances where necessary to refinance maturing debt. This is intended to reduce the cost of carry (the difference between borrowing rates and investment returns) and reduce counterparty risk by minimising the level of cash balances.
15. There has been no change to this strategy.
16. The Council's cumulative total external debt has decreased from £434.41m on 1 April 2011 to £424.07m by 30 September 2011, a net decrease of £10.34m. No new debt

has been arranged during the year. The total forecast external debt for 31 March 2012, after repayment of loans maturing during the year is £420.74m. The forecast debt financing position for 31 March 2012, is shown in Annex 2.

17. At 30 September 2011, the authority had 72 PWLB<sup>1</sup> loans totalling £374.07m and 10 LOBO<sup>2</sup> loans totalling £50m. The combined weighted average interest rate for debt as at 30<sup>th</sup> September 2011 was 4.52%.

### **Maturing Debt**

18. The Council repaid £10.34m of maturing PWLB loans during the first half of the year. The details are set out in Annex 3.

### **Debt Restructuring**

19. There has been no restructuring of Long Term Debt during the year.

### **Investment Strategy**

20. Security and liquidity of cash was prioritised above the requirement to maximise returns. The Council continued to adopt a cautious approach to lending to financial institutions and continuously monitored credit quality information relating to counterparties.
21. A mixture of short term, (up to 12 months), and longer term, (greater than 12 months), deposits have been arranged throughout the first half of the financial year. An emphasis has been placed on lending to high credit quality banks and other Local Authorities.
22. The continued European bank turmoil and recent credit rating downgrades of UK banks has reduced the number of counterparties and the limits on the approved Treasury Management Lending List. A policy of lending longer term to other Local Authorities has limited the impact of this.
23. The Council used fixed and structured deposits, as well as call accounts and Money Market Funds to deposit its in-house temporary cash surpluses during the first half of 2011/12.

### **The Council's Lending List**

24. The Council's in-house cash balances are deposited with institutions that meet the Council's approved credit rating criteria. The approved Lending List is regularly updated to reflect changes in bank and building society credit ratings. Changes are reported to Cabinet each month. Annex 1 shows the amendments incorporated into the

---

<sup>1</sup> PWLB (Public Works Loans Board) is a Government agency operating within the United Kingdom Debt Management Office and is responsible for lending money to Local Authorities.

<sup>2</sup> LOBO (Lender's Option/Borrower's Option) Loans are long-term loans which include a re-pricing option for the bank at predetermined intervals.

Lending List during the first half of 2011/12, in accordance with the approved credit rating criteria and additional temporary restrictions.

25. During May 2011, a maturity limit was breached when a 3 year loan was arranged one week in advance of the loan start date. The forward period was not taken into account when the maturity date was fixed. The maturity limit was consequently breached by one week. Also during May a 5 month loan was arranged with a counterparty which, at the time of the deal was subject to a temporary maturity limit reduction from 3 years to 1 month, due to uncertainty about the strength of the Sovereign. However, the restriction was lifted shortly afterwards, during a lending list review. There has been no financial loss to the Council as a result of the breaches of the temporary lending restrictions.

## **Investment Outturn**

26. The average daily balance of temporary surplus cash invested in-house in the six months to 30<sup>th</sup> September was £257m. The Council achieved an average in-house return for that period of 1.11%, producing gross interest receivable of £1.429million (excluding interest accrued on Landsbanki deposits). Temporary surplus cash includes; developer contributions; school balances; council reserves and balances; trust fund balances; and various other funds to which the Council pays interest at each financial year end, based on the average earned on all balances.
27. The Council uses the three month inter-bank sterling bid rate as its benchmark to measure its own in-house investment performance. During the first half of 2011/12 the average seven-day interbank sterling rate was 0.72%. The Council's average in-house return (1.11%) thus exceeded the benchmark by 0.39%. The Council operates a number of call accounts and instant access Money Market Funds to deposit short-term cash surpluses. The average balance held on call in the 6 months to 30 September was £56.7million.

## **Icelandic deposits**

28. On Friday 28<sup>th</sup> October, the council received notification that the Icelandic Supreme Court had upheld the decision to apply priority creditor status to the local authority test cases. However, as Oxfordshire County Council was not one of the test cases, the authority awaits confirmation from the winding up board of Landsbanki stating how they will apply the Supreme Court decision to the non-test cases and their intended next steps.

## **External Fund Managers**

29. The Council has continued to use the services of two external fund managers: Investec Asset Management Limited and Scottish Widows Investment Partnership Limited (SWIP). Each fund manager manages £10m of the Council's cash, plus their accumulated returns. Investec began managing the fund on 13 April 2006 and SWIP on 13 July 2006. The fund managers were given slightly different investment targets and performance is measured against different benchmarks.

30. SWIP's annualised return for the first 6 months of the year was 1.05% (net of management charges); compared to their annualised benchmark of 0.48%. Investec's annualised return net of management charges for the first 6 months of the year was 0.075%, compared with a benchmark of 1.48%.

### **Prudential Indicators for Treasury Management**

31. During the financial year, the Council operated within the treasury limits and Prudential Indicators set out in the Council's Treasury Management Strategy Report. The outturn for the Prudential Indicators is shown in Annex 4.

### **External Performance Indicators and Statistics**

32. The County Council is a member of the CIPFA Treasury and Debt Management benchmarking club and receives annual reports comparing returns and interest payable against other authorities. The benchmarking results for 2010/11 showed that Oxfordshire County Council had achieved an average return of 0.9% compared with an average of 1.1% for their comparative group of County Councils and an average of 1.2% for all 96 members. The lower average interest received was mainly due to higher than average balances in short-term deposits and lower balances in longer-term and structured products.
33. The average interest rate paid for all debt during 2010/11 was 4.3% compared with the comparative group of County Councils' average of 4.7%. Oxfordshire County Council had 88% of its debt portfolio in PWLB loans compared with a County Council member average of 84%

### **Training**

34. As stated in the Treasury Management Strategy, key Treasury Management officers will be encouraged to study towards the new CIPFA and ACT<sup>3</sup> joint Certificate on International Treasury Management – Public Finance. Two of the current dealers have the qualification and the newly appointed members of the treasury management team will be encouraged to study for the examinations as early as is practical.
35. On 17 October 2011 members and officers were invited to attend a half day training seminar on Treasury Management and Debt which had been prepared by the Treasury Management and Capital Financing teams. Arlingclose, the Council's Treasury Management advisors, presented some of the training sessions.

### **Financial and Legal Implications**

36. Interest payable and receivable in relation to Treasury Management activities are only two parts of the overall Strategic Measures budget.

---

<sup>3</sup> Association of Corporate Treasurers

37. The 2011/12 budget for interest receivable is £2.519m. The forecast outturn for interest receivable is £2.715m giving net forecast excess income of £0.196m. The increase is mainly due to higher average cash balances due in part to changes to grant funding which has resulted in the receipt of grant income being weighted more to the first half of the financial year. This has offset lower than expected interest rates.
38. The 2011/12 budget for interest payable is £18.808m. The forecast outturn for interest payable is £19.274m giving a net forecast overspend of £0.466m. The increase is due to no LOBO loans being repaid this year.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

39. **The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to note the report, and to RECOMMEND Council to note the Council's Mid Term Treasury Management Review 2011/12.**

SUE SCANE

Assistant Chief Executive and Chief Finance Officer

Contact officer: Donna Ross, Principal Financial Manager Tel: (01865) 323976

October 2011

**Lending List Changes during 2011/12****Counterparties added/reinstated**

Svenska Handelsbanken

**Counterparties removed/suspended**

Clydesdale Bank Plc  
 Crown Agents Bank  
 BNP Paribas  
 Credit Industriel et Commercial

**Lending limits & Maturity limits decreased**

<b>Maturity</b>	<b>New Lending limit</b>	<b>Maximum</b>
Royal Bank of Scotland Plc	£5m	Overnight
Santander UK Plc	£5m	3 months
Lloyds TSB Bank Plc	£5m	3 months
Bank of Scotland Plc	£5m	3 months
Nationwide Building Society	£5m	3 months
Barclays Bank Plc	£15m	6 months
HSBC Bank Plc	£20m	6 months
Standard Chartered Bank	£20m	6 months
DnB Nor Bank	£10m	1 month
Nordea Bank Finland	£20m	1 month
Svenska Handelsbanken	£20m	6 months
Rabobank Group	£25m	6 months
All American, Canadian & Australian Counterparties	Unchanged	6 months
All other Counterparties (excl. other Local Authorities)	Unchanged	6 months

## OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL DEBT FINANCING 2011/12

<u>Debt Profile</u>		£m
1. PWLB	88%	384.41
2. Money Market LOBO loans	11%	<u>50.00</u>
3. Sub-total External Debt		434.41
4. Internal Balances	1%	<u>3.21</u>
<b>5. Actual Debt at 31 March 2011</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>437.62</b>
6. Government Supported Borrowing		0.00
7. Unsupported Borrowing		8.92
8. Borrowing in Advance		0.00
9. Minimum Revenue Provision		<u>-20.18</u>
<b>10. Forecast Debt at 31 March 2012</b>		<b>426.36</b>
<u>Maturing Debt</u>		
11. PWLB loans maturing during the year		-13.67
12. PWLB loans repaid prematurely in the course of debt restructuring		<u>0.00</u>
<b>13. Total Maturing Debt</b>		<b>-13.67</b>
<u>New External Borrowing</u>		
14. PWLB Normal		0.00
15. PWLB loans raised in the course of debt restructuring		0.00
16. Money Market LOBO loans		<u>0.00</u>
<b>17. Total New External Borrowing</b>		<b>0.00</b>
<u>Debt Profile Year End</u>		
18. PWLB	86%	370.74
19. Money Market LOBO loans	11%	<u>50.00</u>
20. Sub-total External Debt		420.74
21. Internal Balances	3%	<u>5.62</u>
<b>22. Forecast Debt at 31 March 2012</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>426.36</b>

## Line

- 1 – 5 This is a breakdown of the Council's debt at the beginning of the financial year (1 April 2011). The PWLB is a government agency operating within the Debt Management Office. LOBO (Lender's Option/ Borrower's Option) loans are long-term loans, with a maturity of up to 60 years, which includes a re-pricing option for the bank at predetermined time intervals. Internal balances include provisions, reserves, revenue balances, capital receipts unapplied, and excess of creditors over debtors.
- 6 'Government Supported Borrowing' is the amount that the Council can borrow in any one year to finance the capital programme. This is determined by Central Government, and in theory supported through the Revenue Support Grant (RSG) system.
- 7 'Unsupported Borrowing' reflects Prudential Borrowing taken by the authority whereby the associated borrowing costs are met by savings in the revenue budget.
- 8 'Borrowing in Advance' is the amount the Council borrowed in advance to fund future capital finance costs.
- 9 The amount of debt to be repaid from revenue. The sum to be repaid annually is laid down in the Local Government and Housing Act 1989, which stipulates that the repayments must equate to at least 4% of the debt outstanding at 1 April each year.
- 10 The Council's forecast total debt by the end of the financial year, after taking into account new borrowing, debt repayment and movement in funding by internal balances.
- 11 The Council's normal maturing PWLB debt.
- 12 PWLB debt repaid early during the year.
- 13 Total debt repayable during the year.
- 14 The normal PWLB borrowing undertaken by the Council during 2011/12.
- 15 New PWLB loans to replace debt repaid early.
- 16 The Money Market borrowing undertaken by the Council during 2011/12.
- 17 The total external borrowing undertaken.
- 18-22 The Council's forecast debt profile at the end of the year.

**Long-Term Debt Maturing 2011/12****Public Works Loan Board: Loans Matured during first half of 2011/12**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Amount £m</b>	<b>Rate %</b>
01/04/2011	5.000	9.50
22/05/2011	3.000	9.00
13/07/2011	0.500	2.35
31/07/2011	0.500	2.35
31/08/2011	0.342	1.12
16/09/2011	1.000	9.50
<b>Total</b>	<b>10.342</b>	

**Public Works Loan Board: Loans Due to Mature during second half of 2010/11**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Amount £m</b>	<b>Rate %</b>
01/12/2011	2.000	7.50
13/01/2012	0.500	2.35
31/01/2012	0.500	2.35
28/02/2012	0.344	1.12
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.344</b>	

**Prudential Indicators Position 30th September 2011****Authorised and Operational Limit for External Debt**

<b>External Debt</b>	<b>Operational Limit £m</b>	<b>Authorised Limit £m</b>	<b>Actual 30/09/11 £m</b>	<b>Forecast 31/03/12 £m</b>
Borrowing	543	553	424	421
Other Long-Term Liabilities	40	40	6	6
<b>TOTAL External Debt</b>	<b>583</b>	<b>593</b>	<b>430</b>	<b>427</b>

Capital Financing Requirement for year £429,164,000

**Fixed Interest Rate Exposure**

Fixed Interest Net Borrowing limit 150%  
Actual at 30 September 2011 113%

**Variable Interest Rate Exposure**

Variable Interest Net Borrowing limit 25%  
Actual at 30 September 2011 -13%

**Sums Invested over 365 days**

Total sums invested for more than 364 days limit £100,000,000  
Actual sums invested for more than 364 days £ 37,000,000

**Maturity Structure of Borrowing**

	<b>Limit %</b>	<b>Actual %</b>
Under 12 months	0 - 20	4.31
12 – 24 months	0 - 25	4.33
24 months – 5 years	0 - 35	9.20
5 years to 10 years	5 - 40	14.86
10 years +	50 - 95	67.30

This page is intentionally left blank

Division(s):

## **CABINET – 15 NOVEMBER 2011 OXFORDSHIRE CONCESSIONARY FARES SCHEME**

### **Report by Deputy Director of Environment (Highways and Transport)**

#### **Introduction**

1. On 1 April 2011 responsibility for administering the National Concessionary Fares scheme passed from the five Oxfordshire District councils to the County Council. Prior to this, in November 2010, Cabinet agreed the basic Oxfordshire Concessionary Fares Scheme, which set out how Concessionary Passes can be used and the basis for reimbursement of bus companies, with the Council adopting the revised central Government reimbursement guidance for 2011/12. The way this works is described in more detail in Annex 1.
2. In January 2011 Cabinet agreed the proposals for the scheme for the 2011/2012 financial year and that the issuing of passes would be delegated back to District Councils for this year. Officers were asked to report back on their experience of running the Scheme during 2011/2012 in order to agree the details of the scheme for subsequent years (including any possible changes) and the taking over of pass issuing by the County Council. On 20 September, Cabinet approved proposals for how pass issuing function should be delivered in-house from 1 April 2012. A Communications & Engagement Strategy is being developed to help manage the transition from District Councils and ensure we have answers to Frequently Asked Questions.
3. This report deals with the reimbursement of bus companies and the formal conditions of pass usage from the start of 2012/2013, in order that the proposed Scheme can be published by the beginning of December for consultation with bus operators, which is a statutory requirement.

#### **Experience so far in 2011/2012**

4. Reimbursement rates have been established with the operators (as described in Annex 1) so the final out-turn costs of operating the scheme mainly depends upon the amount of pass usage (though it may also be influenced by any major changes in fares or service levels). The figures for 2011/12 so far, which are based on the first few months of operation, show that the number of concessionary pass journeys in Oxfordshire continues to rise with the number of journeys around 4% higher than the previous year, in line with recent trends.
5. Despite this rise, initial financial results show the total cost of reimbursing operators is around 8% lower compared to the District Council spend on reimbursement in the equivalent period last year; equivalent to a saving of 11.5% in the cost per passenger journey. The forecast out-turn expenditure on operator reimbursement for 2011/12 is currently around £7.2m, compared with around £7.7m incurred in 2010/11. However there remains a level of

uncertainty in the likely outcome for 2011/12 and a number of variables outside the Council's direct control which could affect this figure. In particular the effects of the major change in services in Oxford arising from the Bus Qualifying Agreement introduced in July are not yet clear, and there may be other changes which would have some effect, for example fare increases – every 1% increase in fares increases concessionary reimbursement by the Council by about 0.8%.

6. The statutory national scheme has a 09.30 start time and 23.00 end time during the week. The introduction of a standard (Monday to Friday) start time of 0900 across the County, an enhancement to the minimum scheme, was welcomed by users and bus operators. Some pass holders have raised the issue that they are unable to use their passes after 2300 during the week: on Friday nights this is especially odd as passes can be used after midnight (i.e. Saturday morning) but not between 2300 and 2400. This will be covered later in the report.
7. The decision to allow free travel on Dial-a-Ride bus services for Concessionary pass holders, although not a legal requirement and therefore an enhancement to the statutory minimum scheme, was also welcomed by these users especially as they usually have mobility problems. The total cost of this concession is currently estimated to be £104,000 in 2011/12. This will also be covered later in the report.
8. The process of re-imbursing bus operators has been set up “from scratch” and a Concessionary Fares Officer appointed to manage the scheme and check the claims. This followed on from a lengthy project, using a specialist Consultant, who set up the re-imburement methodology with the bus operators. Different payments are made for commercial and subsidised bus services and, without doubt, the whole process is extremely complicated and bureaucratic. There are currently 35 operators, including Dial-a-Ride and Community Transport organizations, claiming reimbursement payments. Experience has shown that some operators delay sending in their monthly invoices and this makes budget forecasting more difficult and less accurate at any given time
9. A framework and methodology for validating operator claims has also been established: more details are provided in annex 1. The smartcard ticket machines purchased by the three major bus operators introduced as part of the new Oxford SmartZone scheme, also read the “chips” embedded in the Concessionary Passes and this has great potential to combat fraud. It also allows for a more accountable audit trail by these operators who, between them, carry most (around 85%) of the passengers across the County.

### **Possible changes to Operating Times and User Eligibility**

10. *Start time.* It is not possible to precisely calculate the cost of adopting a 09.00 start as most pass holders would simply delay their journey by 30 minutes and would not be deterred from traveling. Bus operators in the areas which had a 09.30 start informed us that buses at this time were even more crowded than in areas with a 09.00 start. If a 0930 start were introduced it is possible that, at least in the City, additional buses may have to be provided to cope with a 09.30

“rush” and operators would be entitled to claim additional cost from the reimbursement scheme for putting these on. A change from the 09.00 start could result in an increase in cost, and it is therefore recommended that the 09.00 start is retained.

11. *End time.* There is a case for adopting a 24.00 cut off time for the acceptance of passes on Monday to Friday at minimum cost - it is likely that any increase in costs will be negligible, since the vast majority of journeys which might be made between 23.00 and 24.00 will be replacements for journeys currently made before 23.00, rather than ‘new’ journeys. This would make the scheme more easily understood by pass holders and bus drivers. It is recommended that this is included.
12. *Dial-a-Ride.* These services are costly to support, though there are benefits to the elderly and infirm that rely on them in provision being free at the point of use via inclusion within the Concessionary Travel scheme. Looking forward, the outlook for Dial-a-Ride will be influenced by reduced funding and by the opportunities being considered as part of the development of a new Community Transport Strategy for Oxfordshire. Given this, it is considered that Dial-a-Ride should be retained in the Concessionary Travel scheme for 2012/13, but for this to be reviewed as part of the development and approval of the Community Transport Strategy.

## Potential Changes to Operator Reimbursement Calculations

13. There are two basic choices for the Council: to continue with a formula approach based on Government (or other) guidelines similar to the system currently used, or to move to some form of ‘fixed price’ reimbursement model (of which there are variants, touched on below). Use of the revised Government guidelines in the current financial year is likely yield a small saving but additional savings cannot be expected in 2012/2013 with costs likely to remain dependent to a large extent on passenger numbers.
14. It is believed that the Department for Transport may be about to release new guidance to Local Authorities on Concessionary Fares Schemes for 2012/2013 although nothing has yet been received. It is possible that any new guidance may have an effect on the recommendations below. Any update on this situation received before the meeting will be reported orally
15. New strategies being adopted by some County Councils are to either agree a fixed reimbursement payment for commercial bus services or a fixed pot of money to be divided up on a pro rata basis, or some other variant (which could include, for example, fixing payments within certain thresholds). These types of model would give greater certainty of out-turn expenditure compared to the Oxfordshire methodology (as described in Annex 1) and would considerably reduce the resource required to administer the function. However it would mean the loss of the direct link between number of journeys made and the funding received by the operator. The financial consequences of adopting such an alternative strategy will depend upon the outcome of negotiation with operators, and consequently cannot be accurately predicted in this report,

although initial indications are that Oxfordshire's main operators are likely to support this approach in principle.

16. Although concessionary pass holders are a relatively small proportion of the total carried on commercial bus services, there are a large number of smaller bus companies operating subsidised services: contracts for these services currently allow operators to claim for concessionary fares reimbursement. It is known that the administrative burden of making reimbursement claims in these small companies takes up a lot of their time and therefore there may well be an administrative saving for the operators as well as the Council if contracts were let on the basis of "no reimbursement". However, as operators take into account reimbursement revenue in their tender prices there would almost certainly be an increase in contract prices and this would have to be weighed with the decrease in reimbursement costs and administration.
17. Further work is needed to establish the best solution for Oxfordshire, but there are strong arguments to suggest that, with very significant further savings on current cost levels highly unlikely to materialize, some form of fixed price model which gives greater cost certainty will be a better financial solution.

### **Financial Implications**

18. The budgeted cost for Concessionary 2011/2012 is £8.2 million, which includes costs of around £500,000 for meeting District Council costs for pass-issuing and costs involved in operating Customer Service Centre support for the project. The cost of the whole scheme significantly exceeds the central Government Grant received by the Council for this responsibility, which was around £4.2 million this year. Even if the possible savings in reimbursement identified earlier in the report do materialize, the Council is still looking at a shortfall of at least £3.5m for this area. There are risks in terms of accurate financial planning of the current reimbursement methodology, which a fixed price model should largely overcome.
19. Further costs (in the region of £50,000 per annum) would be incurred with the need for the Council to either procure its own (or buy into) a Host Operator Processing System (HOPS), which is required to support Concessionary Pass operation, when the free national HOPS system comes to an end in September 2012. The procurement costs and options for doing this are currently being investigated and options are proposed to be presented to the Cabinet Member for Transport for a decision in early 2012.

### **Equality Impact**

20. Retaining eligibility of Concessionary Passes on Dial-a-Ride services would help protect the availability of affordable public transport for those in most need.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### 21. Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to:

- a) **Retain the 09.00 start time for the use of Concessionary Passes on Monday to Friday.**
- b) **Introduce a later cut off time of 24.00 Monday to Friday for the acceptance of Concessionary Passes.**
- c) **Retain the use of Concessionary Passes on Dial-a-Ride services for 2012/13, for review once the new Community Transport Strategy has been adopted.**
- d) **Give the Deputy Director, Highways and Transport, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport, delegated authority to:**
  - i. **negotiate the most cost effective reimbursement scheme with the operators of commercial bus services;**
  - ii. **negotiate the most appropriate solution for reimbursement with operators of subsidised services, including Dial-a-Ride and Community Transport services, including considering the effect of the Council issuing tenders for subsidised bus services without any separate concessionary fare reimbursement.**

STEVE HOWELL

Deputy Director – Highways and Transport - Environment & Economy

Contact Officers:

John Disley (Tel: 810460); Strategic Manager, Transport Policy and Strategy

Allan Field (Tel: 815826): Bus Services Manager

November 2011

## Operation and management of bus company reimbursement in 2011/12.

1. The law requires bus companies throughout England to carry at no charge all holders of a valid concessionary bus pass, irrespective of which English local authority issued the pass. This legal duty applies on all 'registered local services' – buses available to the general public which run to a regular timetable and which have stops less than 15 miles apart – between 09.30 and 23.00 on Mondays to Fridays, and all day Saturday and Sunday. The Travel Concession Authority (TCA) – which since 1 April 2011 has been the County Council – is obliged by law to reimburse the bus companies for every free journey which starts in the Authority's area.
2. This reimbursement must be on the basis that the bus company should end up no better and no worse off than it would have been had no travel concession scheme existed. The methodology for calculating this reimbursement takes into account the fact that many concessionary passengers would not have travelled by bus (or would have travelled much less frequently) had they had to pay full fare for each journey. The way in which this should be calculated was the main thing which was changed in the most recent Government guidance; the methodology is complicated – and the result varies to some extent between individual bus companies - but essentially, in Oxfordshire, it comes out with just under 60% of concessionary journeys which are assessed as being 'generated' – ie would not have been made had the passenger had to pay full fare.
3. The bus operator therefore receives reimbursement of the fare for only around 40% of the 'free' journeys. In order to calculate the fare reimbursement, the bus companies are required to tell us each month, on each route, the average fare paid by fare-paying passengers, and they are reimbursed on the basis of that fare. The destination of the journey made by concessionary passholders is therefore irrelevant; the only information which needs to be collected on concessionary journeys is the number of journeys made (and, on routes which cross the county boundary only, where the passenger boarded). Indeed, from the Council's point of view it is irrelevant whether a ticket is issued at all to concessionary passengers.
4. It is recognised that the bus company does incur some extra costs for carrying the 60% of 'generated' passengers, so a payment is made in recognition of this. The total payment made, per concessionary passenger, is thus 40% of the average fare paid by fare-paying passengers on that route, plus 60% of the average extra cost to the bus company of carrying an extra passenger.
5. The above arrangements apply to the main commercial services – which account for around 86% of a passenger journeys made in Oxfordshire. Simpler arrangements apply for very infrequent (once a day or less) services, services run by voluntary organisations, and dial-a-ride services – they simply get 100% of the fare the concessionary passenger would have paid. For subsidised services, the estimated extra cost is not paid for generated passengers – on the basis that these costs are already covered within the terms of the subsidy contract – but an alternative arrangement is offered for established subsidy contracts, under which operators receive a fixed reimbursement amount equal to the amount which they received from the relevant district councils in the first year of the contract. Most operators have chosen to take advantage of this alternative, which (once established) greatly simplifies administration of these contracts.
6. In negotiating the Scheme the following principles were followed:
  - i. Use of the revised Government guidance in a way which maximises potential savings compared to the previous District Council practice (rather than negotiate a "no change from last year" fixed price arrangement as some authorities did);

- ii. Take a 'hard line' in those cases where there has been scope for interpretation within the guidance; subject to ensuring that subsidised services are not adversely impacted in a way which might lead to increases in subsidy prices;
  - iii. Establishing a system of fixed price reimbursement for subsidised services which ensures certainty of funding for these services, and minimises management workload during the year;
  - iv. Requiring reimbursement claims to be submitted monthly to enable close monitoring of expenditure patterns in the initial year;
  - v. Requiring submission of the fullest possible information in support of each claim by operators, to maximise the likelihood of anomalies being spotted.
7. The reimbursement process is managed by the Council's Bus Services Team, who has an established expertise in dealing with bus services and has the best possible chance of spotting anomalies or errors in claims. Fare levels and passenger numbers claimed are assessed on a month-by-month basis against other known information and officers' extensive experience of the numbers and patterns of use of bus services. In addition comparisons are undertaken with previous years' data from districts; any anomalies identified are immediately queried with operators. County Council officers have also visited the main operators and ensured that the methodology for recording passenger journeys which each is adopting is sound and likely to lead to accurate claims. The recent introduction of smartcard readers by all of the three biggest operators in Oxfordshire provides the potential to give a much more rigorous record of passholder journeys made – once initial teething problems with reliability have been fully resolved.
  8. This framework which has been established is believed to provide the best possible basis for controlling and minimising costs during the financial year. A full strategy has been produced which lays down the month-by-month arrangements for monitoring.
  9. The month-by-month practice has, in addition, been assessed by auditors from Deloitte, who identified a number of detailed issues to be improved (whilst finding no major shortcomings). These issues are progressively being addressed, to further ensure a system of claims monitoring in which there can be full confidence.

This page is intentionally left blank

Division(s):

## **CABINET – 15 NOVEMBER 2011**

### **Progress Report On Children In And Leaving Care: To Note Progress And Issues In Relation To The Children And Young People In Council's Care.**

**Report by Director for Children, Education & Families**

#### **Introduction**

1. This report reviews the performance and outcomes of Looked After Children and Care Leavers (LAC) over the last six months, and of the revised Corporate Parenting Strategy which was last updated in May 2011 in partnership with its Children in Care Council (CICC).
2. Since the last Cabinet report, the OFSTED findings on their inspection of Looked After Children services has been published with an overall rating of "Good". Specifically, all our services received a rating of "Good" except for Children and Young People's involvement, including our Children In Care Council (CICC), which received an "Outstanding", and our intensive support services, including those to "Children on the edge of Care" which were judged as "Excellent". "Enjoy and Achieve" received a rating of "Satisfactory". The reports and action plans have been presented to cabinet separately but this report will include updates on these
3. In addition, members will be aware that OFSTED have also inspected both of our Children's Homes, which both received overall ratings of "Good" with "Outstanding" features, as did our Adoption services, although the final report for this has been seriously delayed because of the illness of the inspector.

#### **The Council's Corporate Parenting Strategy**

4. Although considerable progress has been made since the last report to cabinet, the priorities remain the same: the need for stable and consistent care; the support necessary to minimise time spent in care; access to the best possible appropriate education and healthcare, and ensuring all children and young people (CYP) feel valued and listened to.
5. Our Corporate Parenting role currently (end of August, 2011) extends to 439 CYP who are looked after, 23% of whom are from BaME. Of these, 249 are males and 190 females, 161 are aged 0 – 9, 150 aged 10 – 15 and 128 are aged 16+. These numbers are very volatile and show a rise of 5% since April with a further slight growth in the number of 16-18s. It should be noted that the figures released for 10-11 again highlight the fact that Oxfordshire have low rates of LAC compared to our Statistical Neighbours (SNs) 31/10,000 against 37. There are also 315 care leavers, including 150 Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASCs). The strategy also includes children on the edge of care and those who have left care for permanent placements, e.g. adoption.

6. Staff across the Council and Children's Trust, including Health and Police, continue to be made aware of LAC's needs and of their Corporate Parenting responsibility, and regularly provide updates to Corporate Parenting Panel. A specific focus on the safeguarding of LAC is to be reported to the Safeguarding Board and a new policy on Friends and Family care is being presented to the Children's Trust.
7. Members of the Corporate Parenting Panel have now established a regular visiting pattern to both children's homes (Regulation 33 visits) and continue to provide constructive challenge to the care provided. They have contributed to a programme of continuous improvement in the quality of the environment and care and the outcomes being achieved by children and young people. Their findings continue to be discussed at Corporate Parenting Panel along with all other inspection and monitoring reports.
8. Councillors and officers recently hosted a visit of the Children's Minister, Tim Laughton, who launched Extended Projects using evidence-based programmes to improve outcomes for LAC. Oxfordshire has been awarded £140,000 and £175,000 for its first two years as part of a four year programme to develop Multi-treatment Foster Care, an intensive foster care programme for adolescents and those at risk of custody, and KEEP, a behaviour management programme for carers including adopters. Oxfordshire has also been selected to help other Local Authorities develop their own programmes. Finally, we are one of two authorities selected by DFE to develop a research informed training programme for residential staff.

### **Review (Grouped Under Strategy Objectives)**

The remainder of this report will reflect the key elements of our Corporate Parenting strategy.

#### **All professionals, statutory services and the voluntary and private sectors to work in effective partnership.**

9. 219 days of B&B were used in the first four months of this year, illustrating that the significant reductions shown last year have been maintained, although it is clear that there is an increasingly troubled, albeit small, group of CYP with complex needs who need enhanced provision to help them. A review of their needs is underway.
10. The Cross Regional Commissioning projects to provide additional residential placements for children with complex needs has now opened three homes with three more in the advanced planning stages designed to complete the project. Oxfordshire has currently used two of its 7 eventual placements and whilst the project suffered some significant teething problems, due in part to establishing sufficiently experienced staff groups and part due to the difficulty of establishing the right mix of children whilst we have so few beds to choose from. However, it is providing savings of around £2,000/ week on two beds we are using although it is difficult to predict the annual savings at this time since we may well have to pay for some voids. The same model is being extended to commission Independent Fostering Agency (IFA) placements to complement our own growing fostering service and is now at the tendering stage. We are confident that this is the right approach if the Local Authority is to meet our responsibilities to develop a "sufficiency" of local provision.

11. It is recognised that changes in partnership working with adult services have improved transitions for those with learning difficulties. The setting up of the vulnerable adults' panel, along with the mental health review and new mental health housing strategy, is designed to improve service delivery for those vulnerable adults, including care leavers, who formerly have not met the criteria for adult services and/or are too chaotic to engage. This has been going less well, due in part to the relative lack of provision for this age group, who have a growing number of complex needs. The chairing of the panel will be taken over by John Dixon with a meeting due to take place in November to finalise the work programme needed to address the issues. Those identified include;
  - training between children and adult services to address the gaps in knowledge and expertise about each other's procedures and legislative requirements, for both SCS and CSC staff;
  - Agreement needed to minimise late "Fair Access to Community Service Assessments" (FACs) and thus late decision making about eligibility for services;
  - The level of personal budget available, which of course makes planning very difficult, especially where CSC has been funding costly residential provision, and even more so when this has been out of county and it is necessary to plan for a return at 18 with adequate services in place, and
  - FACS assessments which are focussed on current rather than likely future needs as adults.
12. The timeliness of initial health assessments has improved to 85% being completed within a month of admission with significant positive feedback being received from CYP and their carers on the thoroughness of the assessment and the positive respectful experience providing a faster and more satisfactory basis on which to access specialist services.
13. The inter-agency missing person's strategy led by the police continues to meet monthly and has established a robust system for ensuring all CYP concerned are interviewed and issues arising from their missing episode acted upon, with systemic issues and action plans developed and monitored by members of the group. There has been some disruption to the processes following the recent re-organisation of services. Between January and August, there were 795 missing episodes reported to the police concerning 398 children but the impact of this work has been the reduction of missing episodes in our children's homes, an achievement positively noted by OFSTED.
14. Close partnerships with local colleges and work providers are assisting CYP into preparation to work schemes and various pilots are underway to work out the most effective way to ensure the most complex CYP are helped into work. The RAISE , our Care Leaving Education team have created a Virtual team to ensure that support for our CYP is well co-ordinated

**Challenges**

15. A review of supported housing is being undertaken to identify the best way of housing and meeting the needs of a small cohort of young people with chaotic behaviour and prevent the use of B&B or nightly charge accommodation. This was an action identified by OFSTED.

16. Delivering the work programme to improve the transition to adult services for those with the most complex needs.
17. Re-establishing the strategic management group to oversee the missing persons work and ensure all agencies understand and fulfil their contribution to this work.
18. Developing effective provision for engaging those with complex needs in work.

**Attaining best possible outcomes for LAC**

19. **Key Stage 2** outcomes for a cohort of 6 students show significant improvement, with 50% gaining level 4+ in both English and Maths, an improvement of 19.2% on the previous year. This is above the national and statistical neighbours' average for the last three years and shows four consecutive years of improvement. All but one student were on the SEN register and 5/6 pupils made the expected 2+ levels of progress in English and 4/6 in Maths.
20. **Key Stage 4** results are measured for two cohorts of CYP, those who have been in care for a year ( 50 students) and those who have spent any time in care during year 11 (73 students). 64% of students who had been in care for a year were on the SEN register.

Overall there was a pattern of improvement on the previous year. The comparative figure is given in brackets:

8% (+1.6) gained 5+ A\*-C including English and Maths.

50%(+9.6) gained 5+ A\*-G including English and Maths.

76% (+10) gained 1+ A\*-G.

However, the figures for 5+ A\*-C including English and Maths remain below the national average for 2010 of 11.6%.

In relation to the second cohort results showed an improvement on 2010 outcomes, apart from those achieving 5+ A\*-C which deteriorated by 5.59%.

21. The number of CYP with a Personal Education Plan (PEP) completed on time improved from 73% in September 2009 to 94% in March 2011. All PEPs are quality assured and show steady signs of improvement.
22. There were no LAC permanently excluded last year. Attendance continues to remain an area of significant concern since it is fundamental to improving attainment. For the second year running levels of school attendance deteriorated. In Oxfordshire in 2009/10 the levels of absence were higher than statistical neighbours and the England average. Overall absence in 2009/10 was 6.6% and in 2010/11 was 7.8%. Persistent absence (less than 80% attendance) in 2009/10 was at a level of 4.8% and in 2010/11 this deteriorated to 9.5%.
23. EET performance of our CYP is measured at 19 and fell for the first time this year. The performance was 68% compared with last year's 78%. However, this includes a number of YP who have lost their right to work or been removed from the country because of their Asylum status and, although this is not allowed for in the returns, when these YP are removed from the cohort,

the out turn is 88% which exceeds last year. Numbers going to university have shown a further rise this year from 12 to 14% proceeding.

### **Challenges**

24. Key Stage 4, results at 5+A\*- C including English and maths remain below national averages and thus a priority, in order to address the disadvantages between LAC and their peers.
25. The recent restructure has put in place seven early intervention hubs and established a countywide Behaviour, Inclusion and Attendance Team. Members of these teams will have direct responsibility to support improved outcomes for LAC, including attendance and engagement in learning. A termly list of LAC will be made available to these teams who will prioritise and target LAC. This will inevitably bring about a higher profile for this vulnerable group with an opportunity for earlier intervention and a broader offer of support. The Virtual School governors are also closely monitoring this and all Councillors will be given a termly list of LAC so they can support and promote a whole Council approach to improve this situation
26. There is a growing concern about the impact of the current economic climate, with a deterioration in the numbers of care leavers in EET. A number of intensive programmes have been established to identify the most effective way of addressing these issues and the next cabinet report will report on their effectiveness.

### **Ensuring stable relationships**

27. The improvements in reviewing CYP on time have been maintained. 94% have had their reviews on time (SNs = 87.7% for 09/10).
28. Long term actions are improving short term stability (the number of children who have three placements or more in a year) and outcomes. Current performance extrapolated to the end of the year has reduced to 5.5% against year end performance in 2010-11 of 12.6%. Key actions which have contributed to this improvement include: the new care and placement plans; targeting intensive support packages to reduce the numbers of emergency admissions; improvements in the recruitment of carers continuing to provide more placement choice, and additional training and therapeutic support programmes to improve the skill base of carers,
29. The rise in long term stability has been maintained at 77 % (SE average for 09/10 = 70%).
30. Numbers placed for adoption within a year of the decision to adopt is projected to rise slightly to 90% at year end (SNs = 73.3%) Comparatively high levels of LAC continue to leave the system to permanent placements so, whilst the authority only had 9% leaving care to go to adoption (cf 11% nationally and 9% SNs) another 9.5% left as a result of Special Guardianship Orders (National figures = 6%). Oxfordshire is extending its partnerships with voluntary agencies and piloting more intensive ways to find adoptive families for its older children who require permanency, although ensuring our specialist support services continue to develop will be imperative to ensure robust and successful placements. The new commissioning arrangements with IFA also put this as an essential part of the required service

31. 99% of care leavers are in contact with the service with the numbers in suitable housing rising from 92% to 94%.

**Challenges**

32. Oxfordshire's decision to run an increased number of Multi Treatment Foster Care (MTFC) placements, which is designed to improve long term placement, can have an adverse effect on this indicator.
33. Delays in agreeing the sustainability in running the MTFC programmes means that there has been a loss of momentum since potential carers have been reluctant to commit to giving up their jobs, due to lack of certainty.
34. Increasing the number of LAC exiting to permanent placements. whether or not these placements are in the care system, needs robust support systems including, in most cases, regular financial support.

**Listening to LAC**

35. CICC has continued in active engagement in local, regional and national events, including regular meetings with the Children's Minister, Tim Laughton. Their intention is to develop reviews of key areas of policy and entitlement. To address the new structures and a reduction in the service time available to run the CICC, is moving to the Play and Involvement team.
36. 97% of LAC participated in their reviews.
37. Current plans include combining a Celebration event (now a national expectation) and a Christmas party to attract more members.

**Challenges**

38. Ensuring the CICC remains a vibrant Council and extends its reach to those who do not attend its meetings.
39. We also need to find other ways to ensure the small minority of CYP who do not participate in reviews are engaged.

**Valuing and celebrating the uniqueness of each LAC**

40. The Directorate has a contract through care planning that all children should have the right to participate in at least one activity of their choice per week.
41. CYP and their carers continue to participate in a variety of activities to raise self esteem and prevent offending. Activities have included foster and adoption picnics, arts weekends, holidays and a conference. Although the service has not been able to provide residential events at Hillend this year, other popular activities have been and will be maintained through fundraising by the Oxfordshire Foster Care Association, the CYP themselves and a donation from the Schools Forum.

**Obtaining best value**

42. Using the full range of Family Placement Support Services to ensure stability is considerably less expensive than having to respond when placements disrupt, a prime factor in CYP escalating along the care trajectory to the most expensive options. Targeted family support delivered in a range of multi-agency activities has ensured that Oxfordshire continues to have a relatively low number of LAC(31/10,000) compared with its SNs (37/10,000), a further confirmation of the worth in our investment in preventative services.

43. No further benchmarking information is available since the last cabinet report which showed us to be cost effective.
44. The successful pilot of MTFC has led to improved outcomes for children with particularly disturbing histories, been recognised nationally for the effectiveness of our implementation, improved outcomes for the children and saved placement costs. The Council has taken the decision to extend the funding for MTFC.
45. Our recruitment strategy for new carers continues to be successful although the new Care Planning regulations mean that we have had less flexibility to make placements. Attracting carers for disabled CYP and BaME remain a challenge.
46. The Community Parenting Programme in partnership with the Elmore Team, which uses Parents Under Pressure, a research informed programme, has attracted National interest and it is hoped this will develop into a project capable of addressing most of our needs in this area and is designed to increase support to families at risk of care and speed up decision making for their children. Future success is currently dependent on the Elmore securing further grant funding.

### **Challenges**

47. The financial climate makes further streamlining of support services crucial. Oxfordshire is well-placed to address this because it has already adopted a strategy on commissioning to achieve better value for money, has relatively low numbers in agency placements and a relatively high proportion of LAC in in-house foster care. At this time of the financial year, it is difficult to give accurate estimates about potential in-year savings. However, whilst it is clear that the additional in-house bed at the “The Moors” (formerly Thornbury) has made a difference as has the new Cross Regional project and placing CYP in enhanced foster placements, there has been a rise in the number of expensive placements and uncertainty about the start date for MTFC (i.e. when sufficient carers will be recruited) and the costs associated with removing CYP from B&B and other unsuitable housing. Equally, the realignment of the placement budget has meant that the exponential increase rise in placement costs in one area, e.g. Special Guardianship Orders has been met by moving money from reducing payments in other areas e.g. Residence Orders, adoption allowances etc. However, it is clear that these pressures can be met within the overall cost centre.
48. There is a rapidly decreasing number of UASCs entitled to grant funding due to the rising number of CYP receiving citizenship, and an increasing number who have exhausted all their rights to services have had to be re-established following a recent court ruling.

### **Conclusions**

49. The Corporate Parenting Strategy has proved effective at helping our LAC and in achieving best value, and is endorsed by them through the CICC and other forums, such as the Sounding Boards and the Virtual School Governing Body. Clearly, Education, Stability and support to Children On the Edge of Care, including adopted children, remain our priorities and continue to present

challenges. Failure to grow our specialized support services will undoubtedly lead to increased entrants to the LAC system.

50. Other challenges are coming from or expected to come from capacity issues surrounding the implementation of the new Care Planning regulations, particularly: the new IRO roles; the need to deliver increased services to care leavers; independently chaired reviews of relevant CYP; foster carers' annual reviews; and the Sufficiency Strategy (a legal requirement to provide stable local placements based on timely and effective care plans). In relation to the IRO role, it is hoped a reconfiguration of staff will ease capacity issue, whereas it is not clear at this stage what the take up will be in relation to extended care-leaver rights to help with Further Education.
51. Additionally, pressures continue from: the need for cost savings (particularly regarding Leisure and Cultural Activities for our CYP); the need for CYP to remain in care for longer, i.e their right to remain in foster care post 18; the increase in complex needs of those entering care later as a result of the Southwark Judgement, and the expected increased responsibilities for young people who will get care leaving status as a result of the proposed changes to financial and legal responsibility for remanded CYP.
52. Working in closer partnerships with all agencies, voluntary and statutory, to support our LACs the best way to ensure that the most effective services are delivered at the earliest point to prevent escalation. To do this, we need to:
  - Build our knowledge of vulnerable individuals and groups within our care population so that we continue to focus performance management and resources at children and young people's identified and assessed need
  - Review and invest in what we have learned really works and brings about significant positive results
  - Respond to the financial constraints on local government by continuing to ensure value for money and obtaining better outcomes are linked with appropriate management of risk.
  - Continue to involve LAC in the review and design of services so that our approaches to the work and the pattern of provision is robust and flexible to meet future challenges
  - Continue to work on achieving placement sufficiency through recruitment and retention of foster carers

### **Financial and Staff Implications**

53. There are no new financial assessments arising from this report. The report contains examples of how we have delivered both cashable savings or avoided costs and achieved better value in our commissioning of placements for CLA, which also ensures they are closer to the communities they come from. It is currently forecast that services for children in and leaving the authority's care will spend in line with the approved budget for 2011-12.

### **Recommendations**

54. **The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to continue to support the Corporate Parenting Strategy and to work to the current objectives of the strategy;**

CA9

MEERA SPILLETT  
Director Children, Education & Families

Background Papers: Nil

Contact Officer: Jim Leivers, Head of Children's Services,

Tel: (01865) 818271

Fran Fonseca, Corporate Parenting Manager Tel: (01865) 323098

This page is intentionally left blank

Division(s): Woodstock

## **CABINET – 15 NOVEMBER 2011**

### **FINAL REPORT ON RESPONSE TO STATUTORY NOTICE TO EXPAND WOODSTOCK CE PRIMARY SCHOOL**

**Report by Director for Children, Education & Families**

#### **Introduction**

1. At the meeting on 5th July 2011 the Cabinet agreed to the publication of formal proposals to expand Woodstock CE Primary School from 1 form entry to 1.5 form entry. The report outlining the basis for this decision is attached at Annex 1.
2. The statutory notice (attached at Annex 2) was published by the Authority in the Oxford Mail on 7<sup>th</sup> September 2011 and expired following 4 weeks of formal consultation on 5th October 2011. In accordance with legislation the notice was also posted at the school gate and local library. A copy of the proposal (attached at Annex 3) and the notices were sent to the governing body and the Secretary of State and additionally made available on the Oxfordshire County Council website.
3. The decision-making power in terms of determining the notice lies with the Cabinet or can be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Schools Improvement (if there have been no objections). In meeting as 'decision-maker' the Cabinet or Cabinet Member must have regard to government guidance and statutory timescales otherwise a decision can be referred to the independent Schools' Adjudicator for reconsideration. The Cabinet decision must be made within 2 months of the close of the notice period; as a consequence, it is necessary for the Chairman of the Council to determine that the decision cannot be subject to 'call-in' as this would, in most cases, prevent a decision being finalised within the required timescale and mean that the Cabinet's role would be negated by referral to the Schools' Adjudicator.
4. As objections in relation to the proposal have been received the decision is referred to the Cabinet. The proposed implementation date for the proposal is 1 September 2013.

#### **The Proposal**

5. The proposal is to increase the formal published admission number from 30 to 45 children, on a permanent basis from September 2013 (an admission number of 30 has already been published for 2012). This will eventually increase the school's total capacity from its current 210 places in Years F1- Y6 to a maximum of 315.

6. To accommodate this growth in pupil numbers, there will be a need for additional classrooms and a feasibility study is well advanced to investigate how this can best be provided.

## Representations

7. The formal representation (Statutory Notice) phase was from 7 September 2011 – 5 October 2011 and a Statutory Notice (Annex 1) was publicly displayed at Woodstock CE Primary School, was also available on the OCC website and was published in The Oxford Mail newspaper on 7<sup>th</sup> September 2011.

8. Two representations were received:

One representation supported the proposal (from a parent).

One representation was made by a member of the public who was also a member of Woodstock Town Council, objecting to the proposal. This representation is attached at Annex 4.

9. The following concerns/issues were raised: increase in traffic, perceived lack of demand locally for the additional pupil places, perceived lack of notification to Woodstock Town Council of the proposal. CEF's response to these is:

*Woodstock Primary School has been over-subscribed from within its catchment area for the last few years, which has resulted in 4-year-olds having to leave the town to go to school, which generates traffic as well as being undesirable for children and families. There have been, and continue to be, small housing developments within the town which will increase this pressure.*

*This is stage 2 of the consultation; during stage 1 the school's Headteacher, Mrs Rowe, and Chair of Governors presented the proposal to a Town Council Meeting. The Minutes note that Mrs Rowe advised that the first stage informal consultation would be completed at the end of August and a second stage formal consultation would be issued by OCC in September 2011. The Town Council noted its overwhelming support for the Woodstock Primary School ambitions. One of the school's governors is also on the Town Council and would have been able to update the Town Council since.*

*As required by school organisation regulations, the public notice was published in the Oxford Mail on 7 September and displayed on all the exterior doors to the school and on the outside public Extended Services noticeboard, where they could be read from the pavement outside school by anyone passing. It was also published on the county council's consultation website.*

11. As concerns in relation to the proposal have been raised, the decision on whether to implement the proposal is referred to the Cabinet rather than the Cabinet Member for Schools Improvement.

## Legal background

12. School expansions are subject to statutory procedures, as established by The Education and Inspections Act 2006 (EIA 2006) and The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended). Local authorities also have a duty to have regard to statutory guidance, in this particular case 'Expanding a Maintained Mainstream School by Enlargement or Adding a Sixth Form', ("the Guidance"). When reaching a decision, Cabinet must have regard to The Guidance. Cabinet is referred in particular to pages 19 to 40 of The Guidance.
13. In terms of reaching a decision all proposals should be considered on their merits but the following factors should be borne in mind but are not considered to be exhaustive. The Decision Maker should consider the views of all those affected by the proposals. The Cabinet, as Decision Maker, must be satisfied that the statutory consultation has been carried out prior to the publication of the notice. Details of the consultation should be included in the proposals. The Decision Maker must be satisfied that the consultation meets statutory requirements. If the requirements have not been met, the Decision Maker may judge the proposals to be invalid and should consider whether they can make a decision on the proposals. Alternatively the Decision Maker may take into account the sufficiency and quality of the consultation as part of their overall judgement of the proposals as a whole.
14. **The effect on standards, school improvement and diversity.** The government aims to create a dynamic system shaped by parents that delivers excellence and equality, closing weak schools, encouraging new providers and popular schools to expand. Decision Makers should be satisfied that the proposals will contribute to raising local standards of provision and improved attainment and consider the impact on choice and diversity. They should pay particular attention to the effect on groups that tend to under-perform including children from certain ethnic minorities and deprived backgrounds. The decision-maker should consider how the proposals will help deliver the 'Every Child Matters' principles.
15. **School characteristics.** The Decision Maker should consider whether there are any sex, race or disability discrimination issues that arise and whether there is supporting evidence to support the extension and take into account the existence of capacity elsewhere. The Decision Maker needs to consider the accessibility of the provision for disadvantaged groups as the provision should not unduly extend journey times or cost.
16. **Need for places.** The Decision Maker should consider whether there is a need for the expansion and should consider the evidence presented for the expansion. There is a strong presumption that proposals to expand popular and successful schools should be approved. If surplus capacity exists in neighbouring schools the Decision Maker should ask how it is planned to tackle any consequences for other schools.

17. **Funding and land.** The Decision Maker should be satisfied that any land, premises and capital required to implement the proposals will be available.

## **Financial and Staff Implications**

18. The financial implications of this report are linked to the capital works that will be carried out should the proposal be approved. The Capital Investment Board (CIB) has approved funding for the initial feasibility work to establish the preferred option for meeting the additional accommodation needs. Resources for the capital works required for this expansion have been identified within the Capital programme 2011/12–2015/16 (existing demographic pupil provision – basic needs programme). In accordance with OCC Capital Governance requirements this will be the subject to a separate Stage 2 – Full Business Case/ Project Approval in due course
19. Developer contributions towards this expansion are already held and will also be sought from any relevant future developments in the area.
20. There will also be on-costs to the school for additional staff and for increased maintenance requirements. These will need to be funded from the school's delegated School Budget Share, which will increase in proportion to increases in pupil numbers, and to a lesser extent in proportion to the floor area of new buildings. Resources for School Budget Shares are provided by government through the Dedicated Schools Grant, which will increase proportionately to increases in overall pupil numbers in Oxfordshire.

## **Equality and Inclusion Implications**

21. The Equality Impact Assessment of Oxfordshire's Pupil Place Plan (June 2011) identified that increasing school places at the heart of their communities has a positive impact on equalities through promoting social inclusion and minimising barriers to accessing education.

## **Decision**

22. In considering the proposals for a school expansion, the Decision Maker can decide to:
- Reject the proposals;
  - Approve the proposals;
  - Approve the proposals with a modification (e.g. the implementation date); or
  - Approve the proposals subject to them meeting a specific condition (see the Guidance).

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to:**

- (a) Consider the representations made in response to the statutory closure notice with particular reference to the issues detailed in paragraphs 12-20 and the Statutory Guidance; and**
- (b) Approve the permanent expansion of Woodstock CE Primary School with effect from 1 September 2013.**

**MEERA SPILLET**

Director for Children, Education & Families

Background papers: Initial consultation document

Annexes: Annex 1: Cabinet Member report 19 April 2011  
Annex 2: Statutory notice  
Annex 3: Statutory proposal  
Annex 4: Representation from member of Woodstock  
Town Council

Contact Officer: Barbara Chillman, Principal Officer School Organisation,  
School Organisation & Planning, 01865 816459

October 2011

This page is intentionally left blank

## PROPOSAL TO EXPAND WOODSTOCK PRIMARY SCHOOL

### Report by Children, Education & Families

#### Introduction

1. Until recently Woodstock CE Primary School had planned to admit 30 children each year. Due to growth in the local population of young children, in recent years the school has received more applications from within the Woodstock catchment area than it has been able to accommodate.
2. Population data shows that this level of demand can be expected to continue. In addition, nearly 100 new homes are being, or have recently been built, close to the school, and this can be expected to increase demand for pupil places.
3. Woodstock CE Primary School is a primary school for 3-11 year-olds in Woodstock town. The school has a formal admission number of 30 for September 2011 but has worked with the county council to agree an increase to 45 for September 2011 – 38 children had by May been allocated places, although there may also be late applicants. In September 2010, 40 parents chose the school as their first preference, with 67 preferences in total for the school. The current number of children (January 2011 pupil census) in Years 1-6 is 173, and in Years F1-6 is 203, as shown below:

F1	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6	F1-Y6	Y1-6
30	30	30	29	24	30	30	<b>203</b>	<b>173</b>

4. There are five statutory stages for a proposal to expand a school:
  - i. consultation;
  - ii. publication of a statutory notice;
  - iii. representation;
  - iv. decision;
  - v. implementation.

This proposal has completed the first consultation stage, and a decision is now sought as to whether to proceed to publication of a statutory notice and representation.

#### The Proposal

5. The proposal is to increase the school admission number (at F1 entry) from 30 to 45. Because the published admission number for 2011 and 2012 has already been decided, the school's admission number can only now formally change from 2013. However, the school would like to accept over its official

admission number in 2011 and 2012 to allow all in-catchment children to attend. The plan is therefore to accept up to 45 children into Reception (F1) from September 2011.

6. To accommodate this growth in pupil numbers, there will be some extension of the school's buildings, and a feasibility study is underway to investigate how this can best be provided. Some minor enabling works are already programmed to be carried out in the summer holiday 2011 at the school to extend the current Foundation room to ensure that the agreed 45 pupils may be accommodated from September 2011, as stated above.

## Representations

7. During the Stage 1 consultation phase (27 April 2011 – 8 June 2011) a meeting was held at the school for parents to discuss their concerns with a county council officer, and a consultation document (Annex 1) was sent to parents of children at the school, as well as to local councillors, other schools and early years providers in the area, and other stakeholders; it was also available on the OCC website. 26 responses were received. 19 respondents (76%) supported the proposal in principle, 4 respondents (16%) raised concerns about the proposal in principle and 3 respondents (12%) were neutral in that they made points both for and against the proposal.
8. The reasons given for supporting the proposal were:
  - Expansion will provide school places for local children; the importance of children being able to attend their local school (18 respondents).
  - This is a successful school which should be allowed to expand (9 respondents).
  - Benefits to the school – resourcing (1 respondent)
9. The following concerns were raised:
  - Traffic around the school. (2 respondents).  
Officer comment: *The County Council Development Control team are being consulted as part of the feasibility study. The school will also be required to update its travel plan to reflect the increased pupil numbers. It is expected that most of the children will live within walking distance. Currently some Woodstock children have to attend schools outside the town, increasing the need for car travel: this expansion is therefore hoped to reduce the need for car travel by providing more school places within the town.*
  - Concern about sufficient permanent buildings being provided (3 respondents)  
Officer comment: *The feasibility study will investigate all options for providing sufficient accommodation for the increased numbers in a timely fashion, including both classroom and non-classroom spaces, and will deliver programmes and costs for the complete expansion of the school to 1.5 form entry.*

- Concern about the design of future buildings (1 respondent)  
Officer comment: *A qualified architect will be appointed and the building project will be subject to the usual Planning legislation and scrutiny. Spaces within the building will conform as far as possible to those used across the county as set out in the Building Bulletin 99 guidelines from the DfE.*
  - Concern about the effect of expansion of the school on its standards of education (6 respondents)  
Officer comment: *The concerns were specifically that there would be 45 pupils in each classroom, which is not the case. Key Stage 1 and 2 classes would still be limited to 30 as a rule but some would be mixed year groups (i.e. taught to ability rather than to age). Mixed age teaching is common in the county and, while presenting some classroom management challenges, has not been shown by research to be detrimental. The school is confident that mixed-age classes will not harm their high and improving standards, as their approach is to target teaching to the ability, not age, of children. The 1.5 form entry school is an organisational model in use across the county and staff to child ratios remain the same as for 1 form or 2 form entry models. The staff at Woodstock are committed to making this model of organisation work and see expansion as an opportunity to enhance their school. In the short-term, the F1 class will be of up to 45 children, but it will be in a double sized classroom, with two specialist teachers as well as classroom assistants (an increase in staffing ratio compared to the current class of 30). It would be more accurate to think of it as two classes of no more than 23 sharing a large open plan space, which is not an uncommon model of delivering early years education. The longer term structure for F1 teaching will depend on the building solution agreed for the school.*
  - Concern about the disruption of building works (2 respondents)  
Officer comment: *It is inevitable that there would be some disruption to the school during any building works. This will be minimised as far as possible by careful planning with the school during the feasibility process and detailed design and delivery of the project. The school staff are clear that they expect disruption and are prepared to work around it as required during the project.*
  - The funding for additional buildings may not be in place (6 respondents).  
Officer comment: *Approval for funding of capital works would be addressed through the separate Project Approval and Resource Appraisal process. Basic Need (demand for additional pupil places) is a capital funding priority and there is a demonstrable rise in Basic Need in Woodstock. Also see paragraphs 17-19 below.*
10. Following the close of the consultation, an additional four responses were received, by post, which had narrowly missed the end date. All four responses were supportive in principle of the proposal and were from local residents with children either at the school or due to start at the school.

Inclusion of these responses in the figures would raise the percentage of those in favour of the proposal to 85% of all received responses.

11. There was a consultation meeting held at the school on 17 May 2011, where similar issues were raised including: funding; building requirements; class organisation and size; and decision-making processes.
12. With respect to accommodation, the feasibility study will identify how accommodation can be provided to meet the statutory requirements for a 1.5 form entry school. This feasibility study will be carried out in full consultation with the school's governors. The final timeline for the capital project will be confirmed during the feasibility study, however the school's existing accommodation includes space that could be adapted to classroom use in the first instance, providing more time to complete the capital works.
13. As concerns in relation to the proposal have been raised, the decision on whether to publish a formal statutory proposal is referred to the Cabinet rather than the Cabinet Member for Schools Improvement.

### **Making a Decision**

14. Sections 18 to 24 of the Education & Inspections Act 2006 and The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools)(England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) ["the Prescribed Alterations Regulations"] establish the procedures that must be followed when enlarging school premises. Local authorities also have a duty to have regard to statutory guidance, in this particular case 'Expanding a Maintained Mainstream School by Enlargement or Adding a Sixth Form: A Guide for Local Authorities and Governing Bodies ("the Guidance").
15. The Prescribed Alterations Regulations require proposers to consult interested parties and the Guidance lists these at paragraph 1.3. The Cabinet must be satisfied that the statutory consultation has been properly carried out prior to the publication of the notice. Annex 2 provides details of the County Council's consultation with interested parties that are required to be consulted with under the Prescribed Alterations Regulations. The period of consultation is not prescribed by legislation, although the Guidance recommends a minimum of 4 weeks. The consultation period was in line with the Guidance having run from 27 April 2011 – 8 June 2011, thereby meeting the four week minimum requirement. The consultation was therefore carried out in accordance with the Prescribed Alterations Regulations.
16. The Guidelines state that "the strong presumption is that proposals to expand successful and popular schools should be approved". There is no single definition of a successful and popular school, but on the suggested indicators, Woodstock CE Primary School would qualify as a successful and popular school. Over the last three years its Key Stage 2 results have consistently outperformed county and national averages, with 95-100% of children gaining

Level 4+ in both English and Maths. As noted above, it is now consistently over-subscribed.

17. A decision is now required as to whether to publish formal proposals for this expansion. If approved, a statutory notice would be published (currently intended to be in the autumn) followed by a formal representation (Stage 3) period of four weeks. The decision-making power in terms of determining the notice will lie with the Cabinet, and a report will be put to the Cabinet Member for Schools Improvement if no representations are received, or to Cabinet if representations are received, for a final decision in due course.

### **Equality and Inclusion Implications**

18. There are not considered to be any equality and inclusion implications arising from this proposal.

### **Financial and Staff Implications**

19. The direct financial implication of this report is the cost of the statutory process recommended, which is planned for and met within the normal CE&F budget provision. There are no significant financial implications or risks at this stage. If the proposal proceeds, following statutory consultation there would be another report to Cabinet in due course seeking a final decision on whether to expand the school.
20. The longer-term financial implications of the current report are linked to the capital works that would be carried out should the proposals be approved. These will be the subject of a separate detailed project approval, and a further paper for decision will follow in due course, subject to the capital policies and processes laid down. The decision to proceed with the statutory process to expand the school is normally done prior to detailed project and funding appraisal, particularly where there is a demonstrable need as with this school. Resources to assist with demographic issues on school places have been identified within the Capital programme 2010/11–2015/16 (existing demographic pupil provision – basic needs programme).
21. If the proposal is finally approved, there will also be on-costs to the school for additional staff and for increased maintenance requirements. These will need to be funded from the school's delegated School Budget Share, which will increase in proportion to increases in pupil numbers, and to a lesser extent in proportion to the floor area of new buildings. Resources for School Budget Shares are provided by government through the Dedicated Schools Grant, which will increase proportionately to increases in overall pupil numbers in Oxfordshire.
22. Publication of a statutory proposal to expand the school requires confirmation from the county council that funds will be made available for the necessary capital costs.

## RECOMMENDATION

23. **The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to approve the publication of a statutory notice for the expansion of Woodstock CE Primary School, Oxford.**

MEERA SPILLETT  
Director for Children, Education & Families

Background Papers: Nil

Contact Officer: Barbara Chillman, Principal Officer School Organisation,  
01865 816459

June 2011



### **Statutory Notice: Proposal to Expand Woodstock CE Primary School**

Notice is given in accordance with section 19(1) of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 that Oxfordshire County Council intends to make a prescribed alteration to Woodstock CE Primary School (Voluntary Controlled) Shipton Road Woodstock Oxon OX20 1LL from 01 September 2013.

This is a proposal to increase Woodstock CE Primary School's Admission Number from 30 to 45 to expand the school to 1.5 form entry. The governing body has agreed to admit up to 45 pupils into F1 (Reception) class from September 2011. This proposal is to formalise this arrangement on a permanent basis.

The current capacity of the school is 210 and the proposed capacity will be 315. The current number of pupils registered at the school is 203. The current admission number for the school is 30 and the proposed admission number will be 45.

Oxfordshire County Council will implement the proposal.

This Notice is an extract from the complete proposal. Copies of the complete proposal can be obtained from: [www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/consultation](http://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/consultation), or by contacting School Organisation & Planning, FREEPOST OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL. Tel: 01865 816453 / Email: [Woodstock2011\\_statnotice-manager@myconsultations.oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Woodstock2011_statnotice-manager@myconsultations.oxfordshire.gov.uk)

Within four weeks from the date of publication of these proposals, any person may object to or make comments on the proposal by sending them to School Organisation & Planning, FREEPOST OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL.

Signed: Meera Spillett, Director Children Education & Families

Publication Date: 7<sup>th</sup> September 2011

This page is intentionally left blank

PROPOSALS FOR PRESCRIBED ALTERATIONS OTHER THAN  
FOUNDATION PROPOSALS: Information to be included in a complete proposal

**Extract of Part 1 of Schedule 3 and Part 1 of Schedule 5 to The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools)(England) Regulations 2007 (as amended):**

**In respect of a Governing Body Proposal: School and governing body's details**

1. The name, address and category of the school for which the governing body are publishing the proposals.

n/a

**In respect of an LEA Proposal: School and local education authority details**

1. The name, address and category of the school.

Woodstock CE (VC) Primary School  
Shipton Road  
Woodstock  
Oxon  
OX20 1LL

**Implementation and any proposed stages for implementation**

2. The date on which the proposals are planned to be implemented, and if they are to be implemented in stages, a description of what is planned for each stage, and the number of stages intended and the dates of each stage.

01/09/2012

**Objections and comments**

3. A statement explaining the procedure for making representations, including

- (a) the date prescribed in accordance with paragraph 29 of Schedule 3 (GB proposals)/Schedule 5 (LA proposals) of The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended), by which objections or comments should be sent to the local education authority; and
- (b) the address of the authority to which objections or comments should be sent.

Within four weeks from the date of publication of this proposal (8 September 2011) any person may object to or make comments on the proposal by sending them to the local authority online at [www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/consultation](http://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/consultation); by post to Diane Cameron, School Organisation & Planning, FREEPOST OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL; or by emailing [Woodstock2011\\_statnotice-manager@myconsultations.oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Woodstock2011_statnotice-manager@myconsultations.oxfordshire.gov.uk)

### **Alteration description**

4. A description of the proposed alteration and in the case of special school proposals, a description of the current special needs provision.

A proposal to expand Woodstock CE Primary School from 1 form entry to 1.5 form entry with an Admission Number of 45.

### **School capacity**

5.—(1) Where the alteration is an alteration falling within any of paragraphs 1 to 4, 8, 9 and 12-14 of Schedule 2 (GB proposals)/paragraphs 1-4, 7, 8, 18, 19 and 21 of Schedule 4 (LA proposals) to The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended), the proposals must also include —

- (a) details of the current capacity of the school and, where the proposals will alter the capacity of the school, the proposed capacity of the school after the alteration;

The current capacity of the school is 210 and the proposed capacity of the school will be 315 (excluding Nursery).

- (b) details of the current number of pupils admitted to the school in each relevant age group, and where this number is to change, the proposed

number of pupils to be admitted in each relevant age group in the first school year in which the proposals will have been implemented;

Admission Number into F1 (Reception) currently is 30. Following the implementation of this proposal, this would rise to 45.

(c) where it is intended that proposals should be implemented in stages, the number of pupils to be admitted to the school in the first school year in which each stage will have been implemented;

n/a

(d) where the number of pupils in any relevant age group is lower than the indicated admission number for that relevant age group a statement to this effect and details of the indicated admission number in question.

n/a

(2) Where the alteration is an alteration falling within any of paragraphs 1, 2, 9, 12 and 13 of Schedule 2 (GB proposals) /paragraphs 1, 2, 8, 18 and 19 of Schedule 4 (LA proposals) to The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended), a statement of the number of pupils at the school at the time of the publication of the proposals.

PLASC figures from May 2011 showed 207 pupils on roll.

### Implementation

6. Where the proposals relate to a foundation or voluntary controlled school a statement as to whether the proposals are to be implemented by the local education authority or by the governing body, and, if the proposals are to be implemented by both, a statement as to the extent to which they are to be implemented by each body.

The local authority will implement the proposal, with the support of the governing body.

### **Additional Site**

7.—(1) A statement as to whether any new or additional site will be required if proposals are implemented and if so the location of the site if the school is to occupy a split site.

No new site will be required.

(2) Where proposals relate to a foundation or voluntary school a statement as to who will provide any additional site required, together with details of the tenure (freehold or leasehold) on which the site of the school will be held, and if the site is to be held on a lease, details of the proposed lease.

n/a

### **Changes in boarding arrangements**

8.—(1) Where the proposals are for the introduction or removal of boarding provision, or the alteration of existing boarding provision such as is mentioned in paragraph 8 or 21 of Schedule 2 (GB proposals)/7 or 14 of Schedule 4 to The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) —

(a) the number of pupils for whom it is intended that boarding provision will be made if the proposals are approved;

n/a

(b) the arrangements for safeguarding the welfare of children at the school;

n/a

(c) the current number of pupils for whom boarding provision can be made and a description of the boarding provision; and

n/a

- (d) except where the proposals are to introduce boarding provision, a description of the existing boarding provision.

n/a

(2) Where the proposals are for the removal of boarding provisions or an alteration to reduce boarding provision such as is mentioned in paragraph 8 or 21 of Schedule 2 (GB proposals)/7 or 14 of Schedule 4 (LA proposals) to The School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended) —

- (a) the number of pupils for whom boarding provision will be removed if the proposals are approved; and

n/a

- (b) a statement as to the use to which the former boarding accommodation will be put if the proposals are approved.

n/a

### **Transfer to new site**

9. Where the proposals are to transfer a school to a new site the following information—

- (a) the location of the proposed site (including details of whether the school is to occupy a single or split site), and including where appropriate the postal address;

n/a

- (b) the distance between the proposed and current site;

n/a

(c) the reason for the choice of proposed site;

n/a

(d) the accessibility of the proposed site or sites;

n/a

(e) the proposed arrangements for transport of pupils to the school on its new site; and

n/a

(f) a statement about other sustainable transport alternatives where pupils are not using transport provided, and how car use in the school area will be discouraged.

n/a

## Objectives

10. The objectives of the proposals.

The proposal's objective is to provide sufficient primary pupil places to serve the community in Woodstock CE Primary School's catchment area.

## Consultation

11. Evidence of the consultation before the proposals were published including—

- (a) a list of persons who were consulted;
- (b) minutes of all public consultation meetings;
- (c) the views of the persons consulted;

- (d) a statement to the effect that all applicable statutory requirements in relation to the proposals to consult were complied with; and
- (e) copies of all consultation documents and a statement on how these documents were made available.

- a) A public consultation was held by Oxfordshire County Council on the proposal to expand Woodstock CE Primary School between 27 April 2011 and 8 June 2011. Consultation was carried out with staff, governors and parents of children at the school, local councillors and MPs; relevant trade unions; nearby primary and nursery schools; and other interested parties.
- b) A meeting for parents of children at the school was held at Woodstock CE Primary School on 17 May 2011. Issues raised at the meeting included:
  - funding of the expansion;
  - building requirements;
  - class organisation and size;
  - clarification of decision-making processes
- c) 26 written responses were received during the consultation. 19 respondents (76%) supported the proposal in principle, 4 respondents (16%) raised concerns about the proposal in principle and 3 respondents (12%) were neutral in that they made points both for and against the proposal.

The reasons given for supporting the proposal were:

- Expansion will provide school places for local children; the importance of children being able to attend their local school (18 respondents).
- This is a successful school which should be allowed to expand (9 respondents).
- Benefits to the school – resourcing (1 respondent)

The following concerns were raised:

- Traffic around the school. (2 respondents).
- Concern about sufficient permanent buildings being provided (3 respondents)
- Concern about the design of future buildings (1 respondent)
- Concern about the effect of expansion of the school on its standards of education (6 respondents)
- Concern about the disruption of building works (2 respondents)

- o The funding for additional buildings not being in place (6 respondents).

Following the close of the consultation, an additional four responses were received, by post, which had narrowly missed the end date. All four responses were supportive in principle of the proposal and were from local residents with children either at the school or due to start at the school. Inclusion of these responses in the figures would raise the percentage of those in favour of the proposal to 85% of all received responses.

- d) All statutory requirements were complied with.
- e) The consultation leaflet is attached as Appendix 1. These were sent via the school to parents. Consultation leaflets were also sent to local primary and nursery schools, the feeder secondary school, local councillors and MPs, and other stakeholders. The leaflets were also available on the county council's website.

### **Project costs**

**12.** A statement of the estimated total capital cost of the proposals and the breakdown of the costs that are to be met by the governing body, the local education authority, and any other party.

The school's immediate need for additional Reception class accommodation from September 2011 is being met through internal alterations which are being undertaken in the summer holiday period 2011. This project is already identified in the County Council's Capital Programme 2011/12 with a funding allocation of £50,000.

A feasibility study is currently underway to identify the options and costs of providing longer term additional accommodation to address the infrastructure issues related to this expansion. Funding for providing the necessary accommodation will be sought from the County Council's Capital Programme 2012/13. Funding will also be sought from housing developers to mitigate the impact of housing developments within the school's catchment area

The school will be required to provide the necessary furniture and equipment, including ICT equipment, for the new spaces.

13. A copy of confirmation from the Secretary of State, local education authority and the Learning and Skills Council for England (as the case may be) that funds will be made available (including costs to cover any necessary site purchase).

Once the feasibility study has identified the preferred solution, costs and phasing options, funding will be allocated from within the County Council's Capital Programme 2012/13 onwards. The costs for the work will be partly met by housing developer funding (S.106) agreements.

**Age range**

14. Where the proposals relate to a change in age range, the current age range for the school.

n/a

**Early years provision**

15. Where the proposals are to alter the lower age limit of a mainstream school so that it provides for pupils aged between 2 and 5—

(a) details of the early years provision, including the number of full-time and part-time pupils, the number and length of sessions in each week, and the services for disabled children that will be offered;

n/a

(b) how the school will integrate the early years provision with childcare services and how the proposals are consistent with the integration of early years provision for childcare;

n/a

(c) evidence of parental demand for additional provision of early years provision;

n/a

(d) assessment of capacity, quality and sustainability of provision in schools and in establishments other than schools who deliver the Early Years Foundation Stage within 3 miles of the school; and

(e) reasons why such schools and establishments who have spare capacity cannot make provision for any forecast increase in the number of such provision.

n/a

**Changes to sixth form provision**

**16.** (a) Where the proposals are to alter the upper age limit of the school so that the school provides sixth form education or additional sixth form education, a statement of how the proposals will—

- (i) improve the educational or training achievements;
- (ii) increase participation in education or training; and
- (iii) expand the range of educational or training opportunities for 16-19 year olds in the area;

n/a

(b) A statement as to how the new places will fit within the 16-19 organisation in an area;

n/a

(c) Evidence —

- (i) of the local collaboration in drawing up the proposals; and
- (ii) that the proposals are likely to lead to higher standards and better progression at the school;

n/a

(d) The proposed number of sixth form places to be provided.

n/a

17. Where the proposals are to alter the upper age limit of the school so that the school ceases to provide sixth form education, a statement of the effect on the supply of 16-19 places in the area.

n/a

**Special educational needs**

18. Where the proposals are to establish or change provision for special educational needs—

(a) a description of the proposed types of learning difficulties in respect of which education will be provided and, where provision for special educational needs already exists, the current type of provision;

n/a

(b) any additional specialist features will be provided;

n/a

(c) the proposed numbers of pupils for which the provision is to be made;

n/a

(d) details of how the provision will be funded;

n/a

- (e) a statement as to whether the education will be provided for children with special educational needs who are not registered pupils at the school to which the proposals relate;

n/a

- (f) a statement as to whether the expenses of the provision will be met from the school's delegated budget;

n/a

- (g) the location of the provision if it is not to be established on the existing site of the school;

n/a

- (h) where the provision will replace existing educational provision for children with special educational needs, a statement as to how the local education authority believes that the new provision is likely to lead to improvement in the standard, quality and range of the educational provision for such children; and

n/a

- (i) the number of places reserved for children with special educational needs, and where this number is to change, the proposed number of such places.

n/a

**19.** Where the proposals are to discontinue provision for special educational needs—

- (a) details of alternative provision for pupils for whom the provision is currently made;

n/a

- (b) details of the number of pupils for whom provision is made that is recognised by the local education authority as reserved for children with special educational needs during each of the 4 school years preceding the current school year;

n/a

- (c) details of provision made outside the area of the local education authority for pupils whose needs will not be able to be met in the area of the authority as a result of the discontinuance of the provision; and

n/a

- (d) a statement as to how the proposer believes that the proposals are likely to lead to improvement in the standard, quality and range of the educational provision for such children.

n/a

**20.** Where the proposals will lead to alternative provision for children with special educational needs, as a result of the establishment, alteration or discontinuance of existing provision, the specific educational benefits that will flow from the proposals in terms of—

- (a) improved access to education and associated services including the curriculum, wider school activities, facilities and equipment with reference to the local education authority's Accessibility Strategy;
- (b) improved access to specialist staff, both educational and other professionals, including any external support and outreach services;

- (c) improved access to suitable accommodation; and
- (d) improved supply of suitable places.

n/a

**Sex of pupils**

**21.** Where the proposals are to make an alteration to provide that a school which was an establishment which admitted pupils of one sex only becomes an establishment which admits pupils of both sexes—

- (a) details of the likely effect which the alteration will have on the balance of the provision of single sex-education in the area;

n/a

- (b) evidence of local demand for single-sex education; and

n/a

- (c) details of any transitional period which the body making the proposals wishes specified in a transitional exemption order (within the meaning of section 27 of the Sex Discrimination Act 1975).

n/a

**22.** Where the proposals are to make an alteration to a school to provide that a school which was an establishment which admitted pupils of both sexes becomes an establishment which admits pupils of one sex only—

- (a) details of the likely effect which the alteration will have on the balance of the provision of single-sex education in the area; and

n/a

- (b) evidence of local demand for single-sex education.

n/a

### Extended services

**23.** If the proposed alterations affect the provision of the school's extended services, details of the current extended services the school is offering and details of any proposed change as a result of the alterations.

n/a

### Need or demand for additional places

**24.** If the proposals involve adding places—

- (a) a statement and supporting evidence of the need or demand for the particular places in the area;

Woodstock CE Primary School is oversubscribed from families living within its catchment area. In September 2010, 11 pupils from the catchment area could not be offered a place at the school and had to travel to schools further away. For September 2011 the school, working with OCC, has agreed to admit up to 45 pupils into F1 (Reception) on an informal basis to alleviate the pressure for Basic Need in Woodstock at primary age. Housing developments within the village will add to this sustained rise in pupil numbers.

- (b) where the school has a religious character, a statement and supporting evidence of the demand in the area for education in accordance with the tenets of the religion or religious denomination;

Woodstock CE Primary School is a Church of England Voluntary Controlled school. Demand for it is evidenced in its oversubscription from within its catchment area.

- (c) where the school adheres to a particular philosophy, evidence of the demand for education in accordance with the philosophy in question and any associated change to the admission arrangements for the school.

n/a

**25.** If the proposals involve removing places—

- (a) a statement and supporting evidence of the reasons for the removal, including an assessment of the impact on parental choice; and

n/a

- (b) a statement on the local capacity to accommodate displaced pupils.

n/a

### **Expansion of successful and popular schools**

**25A.** (1) Proposals must include a statement of whether the proposer considers that the presumption for the expansion of successful and popular schools should apply, and where the governing body consider the presumption applies, evidence to support this.

(2) Sub-paragraph (1) applies to expansion proposals in respect of primary and secondary schools, (except for grammar schools), i.e. falling within:

(a) (for proposals published by the governing body) paragraph 1 of Part 1 to Schedule 2 or paragraph 12 of Part 2 to Schedule 2;

(b) (for proposals published by the LA) paragraph 1 of Part 1 to Schedule 4 or 18 of Part 4 to Schedule 4

of the School Organisation (Prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended).

The presumption for the expansion of successful and popular schools should apply in this case. Woodstock CE Primary School is graded Good in its latest OFSTED inspection report (2008) and is oversubscribed by families from within its catchment area. Over the last three years its Key Stage 2 results have consistently out-performed county and national averages, with 95-100% of children gaining Level 4+ in both English and Maths.



This page is intentionally left blank

## **Representation Received from Member of the Public**

I am writing to object to the proposal to ultimately extend the numbers of pupils at Woodstock Primary School by 50%.

The current number of children in Woodstock will not fill this additional capacity and this means that there will be additional children brought in from outside Woodstock adding to the already massive congestion in Shipton Road.

It is also almost certain that any subsequent shortfall in numbers filling these extra places will be used as part of the local plan process in an effort to demonstrate the need for more houses in Woodstock.

It is clearly necessary to accommodate all those children currently living in Woodstock but otherwise there is no demonstrable need for an additional capacity of more than 100 on a current capacity of 210.

As a resident backing onto the school grounds I am shocked that I have not had any official personal notification of these plans. I am now aware that there was a notice in the Oxford Times but as I don't purchase this paper I would not have seen it.

There have been no local notices to alert neighbours.

Furthermore as a town councillor I have been made aware that the County Council has not informed the Town Council - which would have been an automatic source to disseminate the information.

I do not believe that many other residents of Shipton Road will know of this proposal that will have a great effect on them in terms of increased school traffic.



Division(s):

## CABINET – 15 NOVEMBER 2011

### ESTABLISHMENT REVIEW

#### Report by Head of Human Resources

#### Introduction

1. This report provides an update on establishment and staffing activity during the period 1 July 2011 to 30 September 2011. It also tracks progress on staffing numbers since 1 April 2010 as we implement our Business Strategy

#### Current numbers

2. The establishment and staffing numbers (FTE) as at 30 September 2011 are 4952.70 Establishment, 4602.38 employed in post. These figures exclude the school bloc, but include cleaning and catering staff based in schools employed within Environment & Economy.
3. We continue to monitor the balance between full time and part time workers to ensure that the best interests of the Council and the taxpayer are served. For information, the numbers as at 30 June 2011 were as follows - Full time 3024 and Part time 3368. This equates to the total of 4602.38 FTE employed in post.
4. The main changes between Quarter 4 2010/11 and Quarter 2 2011/12 are shown in the table below. A breakdown of movements by directorate is provided at Appendix 1. The vacancy numbers at 30 September 2011 reflect on-going restructuring at that time and many of these posts will be deleted from the establishment in the coming weeks.

	FTE Employed	Establishment FTE
Reported Figures at 31 March 2011 – Non-Schools	4906	5314
Changes	-304	-361
Reported Figures at 30 September 2011 – Non-Schools	4602	4953

5. The reductions in staffing numbers since 1 April 2010 (i.e. the last 6 quarters) are shown in the table below. This equates to a 12.9% reduction in FTE employed and 15.1% reduction in Establishment FTE.

	FTE Employed	Establishment FTE
Reported Figures at 1 April 2010 – Non-Schools	5283	5836
Changes	-681	-883
Reported Figures at 30 September 2011 – Non-Schools	4602	4953

### Agency costs

6. We remain committed to redeploying displaced staff wherever possible via our Career Transitions Service but also recognise that operational services are critical and cannot be left without any cover. Prudent use of agency staff is therefore deployed to ensure continuity of service. The cost of agency staff for Quarter 2 2011/12 was £471,990. This is a further 3.77% reduction in spend from the previous quarter.

### Accountability

7. Deputy Directors/Heads of Service are required to check and confirm staffing data for their service area on a quarterly basis with appropriate challenge provided by the relevant HR Business Partner.

### Recommendation

8. The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to:
- (a) note the report;
  - (b) confirm that the Establishment Review continues to meet requirements in reporting and managing staffing numbers.

**STEVE MUNN**  
**Head of Human Resources**  
**1 November 2011**  
**Contact Officer: Sue James, Strategic HR**

DIRECTORATE	Total Established Posts at 30 September 2011	Changes to Establishment since 31 March 2011	FTE Employed at 30 September 2011	Changes in FTE Employed since 31 March 2011	Vacancies at 30 September 2011	Cost of Agency Staff * £
CHILDREN, EDUCATION & FAMILIES	1533.64	-65.91	1380.14	-75.82	112.18	1,512
SOCIAL & COMMUNITY SERVICES	1334.99	-236.50	1244.53	-190.12	74.95	167,480
COMMUNITY SAFETY	411.05	-5.30	404.16	-7.24	10.38	8,795
ENVIRONMENT & ECONOMY	809.13	-36.36	771.25	-26.73	42.47	194,299
OXFORDSHIRE CUSTOMER SERVICES	671.13	3.00	623.85	4.37	30.63	62,957
CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S OFFICE	192.76	-20.57	178.45	-8.53	8.00	36,948
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4952.70</b>	<b>-361.64</b>	<b>4602.38</b>	<b>-304.07</b>	<b>278.61</b>	<b>471,990</b>

Please note: The vacancies plus the FTE employed will not always be equivalent to the Establishment. Where employees are absent eg on maternity leave or long term sick and have been temporarily replaced, both the absent employee and the temporary employee will have been counted.

\* This figure does not necessarily bear a direct relationship with vacant posts.

This page is intentionally left blank

Division(s): N/A
------------------

## CABINET – 15 NOVEMBER 2011

### FORWARD PLAN AND FUTURE BUSINESS

#### Items identified from the Forward Plan for Forthcoming Decision

Topic/Decision	Portfolio/Ref
<b>Cabinet, 12 December 2011</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 1em; margin-left: -1em;">▪</span> <b>Proposals for the Future of the Library Service</b>                      To consider the report on the outcomes of the public consultation on the future of the library service; agree the way forward and savings targets for that service for 2012-2013 to 2014-2015.                 </li> </ul>	Cabinet, 2011/172
<b>Cabinet, 20 December 2011</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 1em; margin-left: -1em;">▪</span> <b>Hampshire and Oxfordshire County Council ICT Partnership</b>                      To seek approval in principle for an ICT Partnership between Hampshire County Council and Oxfordshire County Council through a framework arrangements.                 </li> </ul>	Cabinet, 2011/184
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 1em; margin-left: -1em;">▪</span> <b>Corporate Plan Performance and Risk Management Report for the 2nd Quarter 2011</b>                      Quarterly Performance Monitoring report.                 </li> </ul>	Cabinet, 2011/143
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 1em; margin-left: -1em;">▪</span> <b>A Revised Policy for Transport Eligibility within Adult Services</b>                      To consider an in principle agreement to a revised policy to support the eligibility criteria for the provision of transport within adult services and seek authority to proceed with a 3-month public consultation on the revised policy.                 </li> </ul>	Cabinet, 2011/140
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 1em; margin-left: -1em;">▪</span> <b>Development in the Oxfordshire Care Partnership Agreement</b>                      To seek approval to the principles for developing the Partnership Agreement with the Oxfordshire Care Partnership and specific service developments to achieve service and financial objectives of the Council and the Oxfordshire Care Partnership.                 </li> </ul>	Cabinet, 2010/216
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 1em; margin-left: -1em;">▪</span> <b>2011/12 Financial Monitoring &amp; Business Strategy Delivery Report - October 2011</b>                      Monthly financial report on revenue and capital spending against budget allocations, including virements between budget heads.                 </li> </ul>	Cabinet, 2011/141
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <span style="display: inline-block; width: 1em; margin-left: -1em;">▪</span> <b>Business Strategy and Service &amp; Resource Planning Report for 2012/13 - 2016/17 - December 2011</b>                      To provide an update to the service and resource planning process for 2012/13 – 2016/17, including the review of charges.                 </li> </ul>	Cabinet, 2011/142

- **Developer Contributions to Service Infrastructure** Cabinet,  
To consider a summary of developer contributions secured to 2011/048  
County service infrastructure through the planning process for  
2010/11 and the amounts negotiated, received and spent  
throughout the year.

- **Oxfordshire Museums Strategy** Cabinet,  
To approve the Oxfordshire Museums Strategy as devised by 2011/195  
Oxford University, Oxfordshire County Council, Oxford City  
Council and Cherwell District Council to create a shared vision  
for the future of Oxfordshire's museum collections.

### **Cabinet Member for Schools Improvement, 6 December 2011**

- **Cotteslowe Primary School** Cabinet Member  
If no objections to the statutory proposal are received, to decide for Schools  
whether to expand Cotteslowe Primary School. Improvement,  
2011/121

### **Cabinet Member for Adult Services, 9 December 2011**

- **Supporting People Strategy for 2012-16** Cabinet Member  
To seek approval of commissioning intentions for 2012-16 and of for Adult Services,  
the Annual Plan for 2012/13. 2011/182

### **Cabinet Member for Safer & Stronger Communities, 12 December 2011**

- **Oxfordshire County Museums Service Human Remains Policy** Cabinet Member  
To approve a Human Remains Policy to give guidance to those for Safer &  
seeking to submit a claim for the return of human remains on the Stronger  
circumstances in which a claim may be accepted. It also sets Communities,  
out how the Service curates, researches and displays the human 2011/194  
remains in its care.