



County Council

5 April 2016

Agenda

Declarations of Interest

The duty to declare.....

Under the Localism Act 2011 it is a criminal offence to

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

Whose Interests must be included?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

List of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests:

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

For a full list of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and further Guidance on this matter please see the Guide to the New Code of Conduct and Register of Interests at Members’ conduct guidelines. <http://intranet.oxfordshire.gov.uk/wps/wcm/connect/occ/Insite/Elected+members/> or contact Glenn Watson on (01865) 815270 or glenn.watson@oxfordshire.gov.uk for a hard copy of the document.

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

To: **Members of the County Council**

Notice of a Meeting of the County Council

Tuesday, 5 April 2016 at 10.00 am

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



P.G. Clark
Head of Paid Service

March 2016

Contact Officer: **Deborah Miller**
Tel: (01865) 815384; E-Mail: deborah.miller@oxfordshire.gov.uk

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

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

A buffet luncheon will be provided

AGENDA

1. Minutes (Pages 1 - 12)

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 16 February 2016 (**CC1**) and to receive information arising from them.

2. Apologies for Absence

3. Declarations of Interest - see guidance note

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

4. Official Communications

5. Appointments

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

6. Petitions and Public Address

7. Questions with Notice from Members of the Public

8. Questions with Notice from Members of the Council

9. Report of the Cabinet (Pages 13 - 18)

Report of the Cabinet Meetings held on 15 December 2015, 26 January 2016, 23 February 2016 and 15 March 2016 (**CC7**).

10. Audit & Governance Annual Report (Pages 19 - 34)

The Annual Report sets out the role of the Audit & Governance Committee and summarises the work that has been undertaken both as a Committee and through the support of the Audit Working Group in 2015.

Council is RECOMMENDED to receive the report.

11. Constitution Review (Pages 35 - 36)

Report by the Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer (**CC11**)

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

- Comply with the law

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

Other changes will only be made by Full Council, following a recommendation of the Monitoring Officer. This report seeks Council's approval to a potential amendment to a Council Procedure Rule. Full Council gave preliminary consideration to this at its meeting in December 2016 and asked that the Audit & Governance Committee give consideration to the proposal. The Committee did so at its meeting in January 2016 and expressed itself to be fully supportive of the change.

Council is RECOMMENDED to agree the proposed change to the Council Procedure Rules outlined at paragraph 5 of this report.

MOTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

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

12. Motion From Councillor Ian Hudspeth

"This Council welcomes the fact that the recent Unitary proposal by the City & District councils recognises that there needs to be reorganisation of local Government within Oxfordshire. This Council agrees that more than 1 option should be considered and will work with the City, District, Town and Parish councils to provide full details in an open and transparent manner to allow a full debate on all options to take place."

13. Motion From Councillor Mark Cherry

"With regard to the persistent problems experienced by the Oxfordshire public as a result of congestion and accidents on the M40, the County Council calls on the Leader of the Council to write to the Secretary of State for Transport asking him to bring forward improvements to junctions 8 to 11 to relieve these issues for those living and passing through Oxfordshire who use the M40"

14. Motion From Councillor Stewart Lilly

"Recent years have seen an increase in the number of planning applications received by our Planning Department for rectification of earlier inaccurate submissions and misdemeanours by various commercial organisations. Also an increased number of instances occur where operators have commenced work prior to planning permissions being issued. Road Traffic Agreements are not being correctly monitored by the organisations, and in many cases are doing nothing to rectify some obvious and blatant disregard for the Conditions and routeing agreements, that have been issued by this Authority. "

We, as Councillors, regularly receive complaints from the public about such indiscretions. These then result in retrospective applications. This takes time and

resources of our staff.

Council asks Cabinet to investigate and bring forward proposals for this Council to introduce a levy of financial penalties that can be imposed, for such misdemeanours. Our Officers have had to spend extra time, resources, and on some occasions, require legal opinion, to rectify these anomalies which could be controlled if the applicants themselves.

Other Councils in the UK are researching similar deterrents. So should we. Recently Ealing Borough Council successfully prosecuted a contractor for similar misdemeanours and were awarded a six figure sum as compensation plus all their legal costs.

I trust that Councillors will support this proposal.”

15. Motion From Councillor John Tanner

“This County Council congratulates the Cabinet Member for Children, Education & Families on her criticism of the Government proposal to force all Oxfordshire schools to become academies. We wholeheartedly agree that schools should be given a free choice of whether to become Academies or to continue to be supported by Oxfordshire County Council. Council asks the Leader of the Council to write to the Secretary of state asking to withdraw this unhelpful proposal.”

16. Motion From Councillor David Williams

“If the Fire Service is to be transferred to the Police and Crime Commissioner, the LEP is to take responsibility for economic planning, there is to be closer working with the Health Commissioning bodies via a multi county agency and all schools are to become Academies, large areas of County services are now effectively being dismantled by Central Government policies.

Having accepted the reality of diminished responsibilities for the County, consultations with the District and the City of Oxford be commenced immediately to formulate at least two and perhaps three optional structures for the delivery of the remaining services focused on a single County model a District level delivery with three or four unitary elements. These models all to be within the existing County boundaries. These models to be put to the electorate in a formal public consultation to illustrate what the people of Oxfordshire see as the most suitable structure for their local government.

The conclusions of that consultation to be presented to central government for further negotiation in seeking an agreed structure that illustrates the greatest degree of subsidiarity and efficiency and resolves the issue of shared services.

A clear no compulsory redundancy and TUPE agreements for the transfer of staff to be established at the earliest opportunity.”

17. Motion From Councillor Sam Coates

“A recent Freedom of Information request by residents revealed that there were only 381 properties in the top band of Council tax payers (band H) in the City out of a total number of rates domestic properties totalling 60,000. As band H is all properties valued above £320,000 it is clear that the present valuation scales that are in use, drawn up as they were in 1991, are now totally out of line with the present value of property not only in the City but throughout the County. It is also clear that the present banding system of A-H does not cover a full even spectrum of worth focused as it is on lower valued property who carry the main burden of Council Tax payments.

Given these anomalies, that grow ever wider with every leap in house prices, this Council calls on the Government to generally review the way local government is funded, to seek a more efficient and equitable system and announce in the interim a general rate revaluation based on 2016 values and to add at least two new tax bands focused on properties values over £1m.

Councils asks the Leader of the Council to write to the current Minister for Local Government to outline the views of Council on this issue.”

18. Motion From Councillor David Williams

“Council services across the board will be influenced by the Referendum on the 23rd of June as to if the UK should stay in the European Union or should leave.

EU regulations related to pollution controls have become critical to our traffic management policies as have directives related to waste management in guiding our recycling systems. Our County economic infrastructure plans are clearly now profoundly influenced by monies channelled via the European Union structural funds and regional aid policies. Competition rules and international trade regulation plus employment directives from the EU influence our contracting, employment and procurement regulations underpinning a great deal of Council tendering.

With the Referendum now offering a clear option to voters the County Council is clear in its advocacy of a vote to remain in the European Union on the basis that membership on balance has provided a progressive legal framework and positive advantages to the services administered by the Authority and the people of Oxfordshire.

The County are also of the opinion that the general economy of Oxfordshire would be severely damaged if the UK were to leave the European Union a move that would undermine the financial security of the County.

The fact that the County after due deliberation favours remaining within the European Union to be made clear on the Council website and on any press releases on the subject up until the 27 May 2016. “

19. Motion From Councillor David Williams

“All future meetings between political Group Leaders that are staffed and supported by officers of the Council will include all political parties represented on the County Council. There shall be no threshold or barriers set by larger parties as to which participation will be seen as a right.

Council asks the Monitoring Officer to review the Constitution and report back to Council accordingly.”

Pre-Meeting Briefing

There will be a pre-meeting briefing at County Hall on **Monday 4 April 2016 at 10.15 am** for the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Group Leaders and Deputy Group Leaders

AMENDMENTS TO MOTIONS ON NOTICE**Agenda Item 12 – Motion From Councillor Ian Hudspeth - Amendment to be moved by Councillor Neil Fawcett**

“This Council welcomes the fact that the recent Unitary proposal by the City & District councils recognises that there needs to be reorganisation of local Government within Oxfordshire. This Council agrees that more than 1 option should be considered and will work with the City, District, Town and Parish councils to provide full details in an open and transparent manner to allow a full debate on all options to take place.”

This would mean that the cost reductions that result can be directed in the first instance towards saving services not currently fully funded due to the cap central government has imposed on local government’s income raising powers over recent years.

Agenda Item 13 – Motion From Councillor Mark Cherry - Amendment to be moved by Councillor Bob Johnston

“With regard to the persistent problems experienced by the Oxfordshire public as a result of congestion and accidents on the M40, the County Council calls on the Leader of the Council to write to the Secretary of State for Transport asking him to bring forward improvements to junctions 8 to 11 to relieve these issues for those living and passing through Oxfordshire who use the M40.

The Secretary of State should also be asked to discuss the provision of additional passenger capacity on the railway services between Banbury and stations to both the north and south of the town, especially during the rush-hour when current services are heavily overloaded. This extra provision would help offer an alternative to further road development and at a much cheaper cost.

Agenda Item 15 – Motion From Councillor John Tanner – Amendment to be moved by Councillor Mills

“This County Council congratulates the Cabinet Member for Children, Education & Families on her criticism of the Government proposal to force all Oxfordshire schools to become academies. We wholeheartedly agree that schools should be given a free choice of whether to become Academies or to continue to be supported by Oxfordshire County Council. Council asks the Leader of

the Council to write to the Secretary of state asking to ~~withdraw this unhelpful proposal.~~ **give Local Authorities, dioceses and schools more time on this matter.**”

Agenda Item 15 – Motion From Councillor John Tanner – Amendment to be moved by Councillor John Howson

“This County Council congratulates the Cabinet Member for Children, Education & Families on her criticism of the Government proposal to force all Oxfordshire schools to become academies. We wholeheartedly agree that schools should be given a free choice of whether to become Academies or to continue to be supported by Oxfordshire County Council. Council asks the Leader of the Council to write to the Secretary of state asking to withdraw this unhelpful proposal.” **that would:**

- **transfer the land and buildings of all community schools from being owned by local residents through their local authority to central ownership by the Secretary of State;**
- **remove the requirement for schools to elect parent governors;**
- **leave local authorities with the responsibility for various aspects of the education system, including provision of sufficient school places, whilst apparently “freeing schools from local authority control”; and**
- **allow head teachers more flexibility in relation to using unqualified teachers.**

Agenda Item 17 – Motion From Councillor Sam Coates – Amendment to be moved by Councillor Liz Brighthouse

“A recent Freedom of Information request by residents revealed that there were only 381 properties in the top band of Council tax payers (band H) in the City out of a total number of rates domestic properties totalling 60,000. As band H is all properties valued above £320,000 it is clear that the present valuation scales that are in use, drawn up as they were in 1991, are now totally out of line with the present value of property not only in the City but throughout the County. It is also clear that the present banding system of A-H does not cover a full even spectrum of worth focused as it is on lower valued property who carry the main burden of Council Tax payments.

Given these anomalies **and the fact that increases in Council Tax disproportionately affect the poorest**, that grow ever wider with every leap in house prices, this Council calls on the Government to generally review the way local government is funded, to seek a more efficient and equitable system and announce in the interim a general rate revaluation based on 2016 values and to add at least two new tax bands focused on properties values over £1m, **including the ability for councils to calculate Council Tax levels on the ability to pay.**

Councils asks the Leader of the Council to write to the current Minister for Local Government to outline the views of Council on this issue.”

OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting held on Tuesday, 16 February 2016 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 5.10 pm.

Present:

Councillor John Sanders – in the Chair

Councillors:

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

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

1/16 MINUTES
(Agenda Item 1)

The Minutes of the meeting held on 8 December 2015 were approved and signed, subject to the text 'specific' being inserted before the words 'senior officer' in the 2nd paragraph of Minute 88/15 (Appointment of Independent Person).

2/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

(Agenda Item 2)

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Roz Smith.

3/16 OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS

(Agenda Item 4)

The Chairman reported as follows:

Council paid tribute and held a minute's silence to honour the memory of former County Councillor Don Seale, County Councillor from 1997- 2013 and former County Councillor Barbara Gatehouse, County Councillor from 2001 – 2009.

4/16 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda Item 6)

The Council received the following Petitions and Public Address:

Petitions

Ms Mary Stiles, Parish Transport Representative for Thame, presented a Petition calling on the County Council not to vote for the proposed Budget on 16th February 2016, which included the withdrawal of all bus subsidies, on the basis that the 120/121/123/124 in the Thame area was a lifeline to local people who could not get into the town by any other means, did not have their own transport and could not walk that far. She further made a plea to at least maintain a service 2 to 3 times a week.

Ms Lynne Keen presented a Petition urging the Council not to close the Children's Centres, but instead to keep them open to all families as well as using them for the proposed 8 referral centres being opened to be accessed by referral for most vulnerable families.

Public Address

Ms Josephine French, doctoral student outlined the results of a medical study (the adverse Childhood Experiences Study) and suggested that the Children's centres and services provided protection against the risk factors set out in the study. She urged Councillors to keep the centres open to protect against generational cycles of suffering and social and economic difficulty and warned that there would be an increase in welfare and support services if they were not kept open.

Mr Malcolm Leading spoke as parish transport representative against the withdrawal of bus subsidies on the basis of the detrimental effect it would have on many parishes, including access to health services, doctors, dentists, hospital, shops and increased cars on the roads. He urged the Council to delay the decisions to allow for further talks between the parishes, County Council and Bus companies.

Ms Donna Crook spoke on behalf of 'Save Our Henley Bus campaign', urging the Council to keep the local bus service on the basis that it provided some of the most vulnerable people in the community with a lifeline to local services and enabled people to live independently without care or going into care homes.

Ms Claire Soper, outlined concerns about the Council's proposal to close Health and Wellbeing Centres in 2017 which provided much needed support for the frail and vulnerable elderly, often with dementia, Parkinson's and stroke who could not speak for themselves. She urged the Council to reconsider the proposal to shut all 8 centres and give consideration to retaining 3 'hubs' in the North, City and South.

Ms Clare Ellis and Ms Lesley Dewhurst spoke on behalf of the Homeless Voice Group urging the Council to protect the most vulnerable of Society not to withdraw the housing support budget.

Ms Suzy Imeson and Ms Esme Mutter spoke on behalf of the Stroke Association relating people's experiences with Aspasia, particularly around communication on the telephone. They urged the Council not to support proposals to end funding for the Stroke service.

Mr David Ricketts spoke on behalf of Unit, urging the Council not to cut early intervention Services in Oxfordshire.

Ms Charlie Payne urged the Council not to increase isolation in communities and in particular to the young or the elderly by closing children centre's or old people's day centres. She referred to the consultation on the future of children's services and in particular that 71% of respondents rejected the Council's proposals.

Ms Diane Wilson questioned how the Council could justify the closure of 44 children centres and the subsequent consequences to early intervention when it held £112m pounds in reserve, when to keep all the centres open would only use 7% of the amount.

Ms Jill Huish, a user of the service informed the Council that she had spent many months trying to save the Children's Centres and that the feedback so far on the new proposals put forward showed overriding concern regarding the cutting of universal services that keep families safe. She urged the Council to retain fully functioning Children Centres.

Master Dylan Lovell spoke to the Council of the support he and his mother had received through a very difficult and painful period in their life, including ADHD, Asperger's, domestic abuse and the death of his father. He questioned where children with similar very worrying issues would go in the future if the Children's Centres did not exist.

5/16 QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC
(Agenda Item 7)

The Council received 2 Questions on Notice to Members of the Council

Mr Thomas Grey to Councillor Judith Heathcoat

Following the Chipping Norton Hospital Action Group's survey, the results of which we would like to hand over to OCC for its own evaluation, will OCC now take the views expressed by over 1300 people in the community into account and give consideration to including Chipping Norton War Memorial Community Hospital in the countywide review to be conducted in 2016?

Answer

As with all consultations the Council undertakes, the views of all those in the community who respond will be conscientiously considered.

Ms Suzy Imeson to Councillor Judith Heathcoat

The rationale for the proposed cut to the "SCS15 Intervention and preventative services – aphasia" states that this is to remove duplication and streamline stroke services. What current duplication and lack of streamlined services does this refer to, how has this been assessed and has this been corroborated by service users?

Answer

The aphasia service predominantly supports people who are being discharged from hospital following a stroke, and helps people to regain independence. In this way, it provides similar functions to a range of short-term support (also called intermediate care) services that are typically used to support people following a period of illness or an event which has made them less able to get by in their day to day lives, for example, after a stay in hospital or an injury.

A detailed review of these short-term support services undertaken jointly with NHS partners has identified that there is a significant amount of overlap and duplication between them. As agreed by Cabinet on 26th January 2016, these services will now be replaced with two services: a single Urgent Response & Telecare Service, and a single Hospital Discharge & Reablement Service. It is this duplication and streamlining that was referred to in the rationale, and applies to a wide range of services including aphasia. The rationale was not intended to indicate duplication within stroke services in particular, and I apologise if this was not clear.

I absolutely acknowledge the good work that the service does as part of the wider support provided by the Stroke Association, and appreciate the proposal to stop funding this service is unwelcome news. However, the scale of the budget reductions the council faces are significant and will require

some very difficult decisions to ensure we can set a balanced budget from April 2016 onwards.

We will continue to ensure that people with eligible needs for care and support receive the support they need. Oxfordshire County Council is committed to working with Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group to ensure that appropriate support for people who have had a stroke is in place. If this budget proposal is agreed, we will engage with current users of the service to help ensure that future support for people with aphasia is integrated into the Council's core adult social services, including the new short-term services referred to above. This would include an emphasis on ensuring information and advice, advocacy, assessments and support planning acknowledge people's specific communication needs. We will also continue to invest in services that support carers and families.

Supplementary Question

Our support is specifically to enable long term communication success and is not providing care, it's not a clinical service, a reactive telecare service does not address the needs of people with Aspasia for the simple reason that people to Aspasia struggle to communicate over the phone or via other technology. How long will a hospital discharge and reablement service be involved for and will they be able to support people with Aspasia and their families and carers in their life after stroke when they experience needs long term so that they do not experience a loss in support or independence. Where was the consultation on this review with the people that use this service?

Answer

I feel I gave you a very full response, there is one thing I would like to pick up on within your questions and it refers back to the Budget papers. You are reading duplication as being within stroke services, which in fact we are talking about duplication in short term support and the wording in your question is not the same as that which appears in the budget papers which states that we will be working closely with NHS Partners. I do understand about stroke, I have had personal experience of it, both my mother and my grandmother who were both registered as blind, had strokes, so I know entirely what it means, and there will be talking with you and others because today is the Budget day. Going forward, if the Budget is implemented that is when we will be talking to people.

6/16 PAY POLICY STATEMENT - REMUNERATION COMMITTEE REPORT TO COUNCIL ON 16 FEBRUARY 2016

(Agenda Item 8)

The Council had before them the report of the Remuneration Committee (CC8) which updated the Council's Pay Policy Statement and set out future proposals of the Remuneration Committee in relation to this area.

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

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

7/16 SERVICE & RESOURCE PLANNING 2016/17 - 2019/20
(Agenda Item 9)

The Council had before it the report by the Chief Finance Officer (CC8) which outlined the service & resource planning process for 2016/17 to 2019/20 including the Leader of the Council's overview (Section 1, published on the day), Corporate Plan (Section 2), Chief Finance Officer's statutory report (Section 3) and Budget Strategy and Capital Programme (Section 4), together with a number of statements/policies that the Council was required to approve for the 2016/17 financial year.

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

The Council also had before it budget proposals in the form of: Amendments by the Labour Group to the Cabinet's Revenue Budget (CC9 Labour) and Amendments by the Green Group to the Cabinet's Revenue Budget (CC9 Green), and a statement by the Liberal Democrat Group (CC9 Liberal Democrat), together with a revised Section 4.3 – Council Tax Precepts. (Additional Papers).

Councillor Hudspeth moved and Councillor Brighthouse seconded a motion which sought Council's approval for an adjournment to allow discussion between the Leader of the Council and the Leader of the Labour Group to see if they could agree on a proposal to put before Council.

The motion was put to the vote and was carried nem con. Accordingly, Council was adjourned at 11.00 am for 3 hours and 35 minutes.

Council reconvened at 2.35 pm.

With the consent of Council, Councillor Hudspeth moved and Councillor Brighthouse seconded an amendment to his original motion as shown at Annex 2 to these minutes. In moving the motion, Councillor Hudspeth and Brighthouse paid tribute to Lorna Baxter and Katy Jurczynsyn for all their work in preparing the budget.

With the consent of Council, Councillor Brighthouse withdrew her amendment.

With the consent of Council, Councillor Williams moved and Councillor Coates seconded an amended version of his amendment to the Cabinet's budget as set out in the Annex 1 to these minutes. In moving his motion, Councillor Williams paid tribute to Lorna Baxter and her team for their help and support.

Following debate, the amendment was put to the vote and was lost by 59 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

Following a lengthy debate, the substantive motion was then put to the vote and it was carried by 60 votes to 2 (details of amended 4.2.2. shown at Annex 2)

RESOLVED: (by 60 votes to 2) to:

- (a) approve the Corporate Plan 2016/17 – 2019/20 as set out in section 2.0;
- (b) have regard to the Chief Finance Officer's report (at Section 3) in approving recommendations c to f below;
- (c) (in respect of revenue) approve:
 - (1) the council tax and precept calculations for 2016/17 set out in section 4.3 and in particular:
 - (i) a precept of £305,896,875;
 - (ii) a council tax for band D equivalent properties of £1,281.64;
 - (2) a budget for 2016/17 as set out in section 4.4, as amended by new section 4.2.2
 - (3) a medium term plan for 2016/17 to 2019/20 as set out in section 4.1 (which incorporates changes to the existing medium term financial plan as set out in section 4.2), as amended by new section 4.2.2
 - (4) the use of Dedicated Schools Grant (provisional allocation) for 2016/17 as set out in section 4.7;
 - (5) virement arrangements to operate within the approved budget for 2016/17 as set out in section 4.8;
- (d) (in respect of treasury management) approve:
 - (1) the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy for 2016/17 as set out in section 4.5;
 - (2) the continued delegation of authority to withdraw or advance additional funds to/from external fund managers to the Treasury Management Strategy Team;
 - (3) that any further changes required to the 2016/17 strategy be delegated to the Chief Finance Officer in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Finance;
 - (4) the Prudential Indicators as set out in Appendix A of section 4.5
 - (5) the Minimum Revenue Provision Methodology Statement as set out in Appendix B of section 4.5;
 - (6) the Specified Investment and Non Specified Investment Instruments as set out in Appendix C and D of section 4.5;

- (7) the Treasury Management Policy Statement as set out at Appendix E of section 4.5;
- (e) (in respect of balances and reserves) approve:
 - (1) the Chief Finance Officer's recommended level of balances for 2016/17 as set out in section 4.6.1
 - (2) the planned level of reserves for 2016/17 to 2019/20 as set out in section 4.6.2;
- (f) (in respect of capital) approve:
 - a Capital Programme for 2015/16 to 2019/20 as set out in section 4.9 including the Highways Structural Maintenance Programme 2016/17 and 2017/18 in section 4.9.1.

With the consent of Council, Councillor Hudspeth then moved and Councillor Brighthouse seconded that a full and timetabled consultation for unitary government to be put in place to discuss this issue on a cross-party basis with district, town and parish councils with the clear aim of bringing it to fruition.

The motion was put to the vote and was carried by 57 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.

RESOLVED: (by 57 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions) that a full and timetabled consultation for unitary government to be put in place to discuss this issue on a cross-party basis with district, town and parish councils with the clear aim of bringing it to fruition.

Green Group Budget Amendments - Revenue					
	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	TOTAL
Proposed Council Tax Increase	7.00%	3.99%	3.99%	3.99%	
Band D Council Tax	£1,318.73	£1,371.35	£1,426.07	£1,482.97	
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
Cabinet Net Pressures (+) / Savings (-)	0	10,316	6,169	-1,250	15,235
Corporate					
Additional amount to spend from having a 7.0% Council Tax increase in 2016/17	-8,852	-546	-530	-560	-10,488
Cost of Referendum in 2016/17	638	-638			0
Extend the proposal to create a trading arm of the Council to include other services such as Legal, Finance & HR		-100	-100	-200	-400
Hire out rooms in County Hall for meetings and private functions in the evenings and weekends	-50				-50
Reduce pay budgets of Senior Staff	-100				-100
Share Senior Management Team with other Councils	-200	-200			-400
One-off saving from reduced redundancy costs		-400	400		0
Employers Parking Levy			-2,250	-2,250	-4,500
Contribution to Capital to fund a Benelux Style Cycle network (see also capital programme amendments below)			2,250	2,250	4,500
Contribution to Capital to fund Insulation Scheme	5,000	-5,000			0
Children, Education & Families					
Do not close Children's Centres	800	4,200			5,000
Retain Early Years SEN inclusive teachers provision (CEF6)		100			100
Retain contracts for services to disabled children and families (CEF12)		250			250
Social & Community Services					
Retain funding for the falls service (SCS5)	273				273
Retain funding for carers (SCS8)	60	100			160
Retain funding for Information and Advice (SCS9)			120		120
Retain funding for Carers Respite (SCS10)		100			100
Retain funding for Intervention and Preventative Services (SCS25)				400	400
Funding for Homeless Services		500			500
Crisis Fund for Vulnerable people impacted by the cuts	1,544	-1,544			0
Environment & Economy					
Retain funding for bus subsidies	1,220				1,220
Increase Park & Ride Charges by £2 per day	-700				-700
Subsidy for parking season ticket holders	200				200
Increase other parking charges and CPZ Permits plus new income from additional CPZ	-250				-250
Increase in the charge for Processing Licenses and Planning Applications above the proposed increase	-6				-6
Increase in the general charges	-50				-50
Biodiversity Specialist	35				35
County Cycling Planning Advisory Officer	35				35
Libraries & Culture					
Maintain funding to the Arts			92		92
Delay the Library Savings for one year	522	-522			0
Corporate Services					
Reduce the number of Members on the Cabinet by three	-58				-58
Reduce the level of Members Allowances	-100				-100
Commission a feasibility study to assist NHS PFI buyouts	39				39
Revised Net Pressures (+) / Savings (-)	0	6,616	6,151	-1,610	11,157
Change to Cashflow Position	0	-3,700	-18	-360	-4,078

Annex 2

4.2.2 - Changes to the Budget Proposals - from published Council Papers					
	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	Total
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
Cabinet Net Pressures/Savings - Per Section 4.2	0	6,374	6,169	-1,250	11,293
Remove Savings:					
SCS21a - Tier 2 Day Services (Voluntary Sector provided Day Services)	300	450			750
SCS21b - Tier 3 Day Services (Health and Wellbeing Centres)		2,050			2,050
SCS21c - Transport to Day Centres		200			200
CEF12 -Early Intervention Hubs/Children's Centres		2,000			2,000
New Savings:					
Full review of all day services for older people		-1,000			-1,000
Additional contribution from Budget Reserve	-300	300			0
Revised Net Pressures/Savings	0	10,374	6,169	-1,250	15,293
As a consequence of this amendment to the published Council papers, changes will be required to:					
4.1 Medium Term Financial Plan 2016/17 - 2019/20					
4.2 Summary of Proposed Budget Changes 2016/17 - 2019/20					
4.4 Detailed Revenue Budget 2016/17					

Explanation

1. In relation to SC21AB&C – £1.5million* with full review of the all-day service for older people.
2. SC12** – Put in £2m in order to ensure in terms of service and geography the needs of the Children of Oxfordshire are met.
3. Transition – To create a cross party board of members to consider maximum benefit from use of temporary funds across services and across geography of Oxfordshire. This fund will be for 16/17 a total of £4million with £1million allocated for creating a one off pump priming fund for one year to take to districts and parishes, inviting them to commit money to support Children's Centres which they would help save, a £1million added for income generation pump priming. Homelessness budget also to be considered
4. Workplace – commit to a full review of implications with a view to implementation as early as is feasible.

5 SC1A

A review of cabinet members

* Error – should read £1million

** Error – should read CEF12

..... in the Chair

Date of signing

This page is intentionally left blank

Annex 1 to the Minutes

The named vote on the Green Amendments was as Follows:

Lost by 59 votes against, 2 in favour and 1 abstention.

The Individual Results Were As Follows

Mic Card Delegate Information			Vote
CH0	0	Chairman	NO
2	2	Vice Chairman	NO
5	5	Cllr Nick Carter	NO
6	6	Cllr Melinda Tilley	NO
7	7	Cllr Judith Heathcoat	NO
8	8	Cllr Lawrie Stratford	NO
9	9	Cllr Rodney Rose	NO
10	10	Cllr Ian Hudspeth	NO
11	11	Cllr Arash Fatemian	NO
12	12	Cllr Yvonne Constance	NO
13	13	Cllr Sandy Lovatt	NO
14	14	Cllr Mark Lygo	NO
15	15	Cllr Surinder Dhesi	NO
16	16	Cllr Steve Curran	NO
17	17	Cllr Liz Brighthouse	NO
18	18	Cllr John Christie	NO
19	19	Cllr Nick Hards	NO
20	20	Cllr Laura Price	NO
21	21	Cllr Mike Beal	NO
22	22	Cllr Glynis Phillips	NO
23	23	Cllr David Bartholomew	NO
24	24	Cllr Kevin Bulmer	NO
25	25	Cllr Catherine Fulljames	NO
26	26	Cllr Stewart Lilly	NO
27	27	Cllr Lorraine Lindsay-Gale	NO
28	28	Cllr David Nimmo-Smith	NO
29	29	Cllr Hilary Hibbert-Biles	NO
30	30	Cllr James Mills	NO
31	31	Cllr Neil Owen	NO
32	32	Cllr Richard Langridge	NO
33	33	Cllr Charles Mathew	NO
34	34	Cllr Zoe Patrick	NO
35	35	Cllr Neil Fawcett	NO
36	36	Cllr Roz Smith	
37	37	Cllr Janet Godden	NO
38	38	Cllr Gill Sanders	NO
39	39	Cllr Jamila Azad	NO
40	40	Cllr Susanna Pressel	NO
41	41	Cllr John Tanner	NO
42	42	Cllr Mark Cherry	NO
45	45	Cllr Patrick Greene	NO
46	46	Cllr Tim Hallchurch	NO
47	47	Cllr Anthony Gearing	NO
48	48	Cllr David Wilmshurst	NO
49	49	Cllr Steve Harrod	NO

50	50	Cllr Bob Johnston	NO
51	51	Cllr Jenny Hannaby	NO
52	52	Cllr John Howson	NO
53	53	Cllr Alison Rooke	NO
54	54	Cllr Anne Purse	NO
55	55	Cllr Neville Harris	ABSTAIN
56	56	Cllr Kieron Mallon	NO
57	57	Cllr George Reynolds	NO
58	58	Cllr Maurice Billington	NO
59	59	Cllr Pete Handley	NO
60	60	Cllr Louise Chapman	NO
61	61	Cllr Jean Fooks	NO
62	62	Cllr Richard Webber	NO
63	63	Cllr Les Sibley	NO
64	64	Cllr Mark Gray	NO
65	65	Cllr Lynda Atkins	NO
67	67	Cllr David Williams	YES
68	68	Cllr Sam Coates	YES

The named vote on the substantive motion was as Follows:

Carried by 60 votes in favour and 2 against.

The Individual Results Were As Follows

Mic Card Delegate Information			Vote
CH0	0	Chairman	YES
2	2	Vice Chairman	YES
5	5	Cllr Nick Carter	YES
6	6	Cllr Melinda Tilley	YES
7	7	Cllr Judith Heathcoat	YES
8	8	Cllr Lawrie Stratford	YES
9	9	Cllr Rodney Rose	YES
10	10	Cllr Ian Hudspeth	YES
11	11	Cllr Arash Fatemian	YES
12	12	Cllr Yvonne Constance	YES
13	13	Cllr Sandy Lovatt	YES
14	14	Cllr Mark Lygo	YES
15	15	Cllr Surinder Dhesi	YES
16	16	Cllr Steve Curran	YES
17	17	Cllr Liz Brighthouse	YES
18	18	Cllr John Christie	YES
19	19	Cllr Nick Hards	YES
20	20	Cllr Laura Price	YES
21	21	Cllr Mike Beal	YES
22	22	Cllr Glynis Phillips	YES
23	23	Cllr David Bartholomew	YES
24	24	Cllr Kevin Bulmer	YES
25	25	Cllr Catherine Fulljames	YES
26	26	Cllr Stewart Lilly	YES
27	27	Cllr Lorraine Lindsay-Gale	YES
28	28	Cllr David Nimmo-Smith	YES
29	29	Cllr Hilary Hibbert-Biles	YES
30	30	Cllr James Mills	YES
31	31	Cllr Neil Owen	YES
32	32	Cllr Richard Langridge	YES
33	33	Cllr Charles Mathew	YES

34	34	Cllr Zoe Patrick	YES
35	35	Cllr Neil Fawcett	YES
36	36	Cllr Roz Smith	
37	37	Cllr Janet Godden	YES
38	38	Cllr Gill Sanders	YES
39	39	Cllr Jamila Azad	YES
40	40	Cllr Susanna Pressel	YES
41	41	Cllr John Tanner	YES
42	42	Cllr Mark Cherry	YES
45	45	Cllr Patrick Greene	YES
46	46	Cllr Tim Hallchurch	YES
47	47	Cllr Anthony Gearing	YES
48	48	Cllr David Wilmhurst	YES
49	49	Cllr Steve Harrod	YES
50	50	Cllr Bob Johnston	YES
51	51	Cllr Jenny Hannaby	YES
52	52	Cllr John Howson	YES
53	53	Cllr Alison Rooke	YES
54	54	Cllr Anne Purse	YES
55	55	Cllr Neville Harris	YES
56	56	Cllr Kieron Mallon	YES
57	57	Cllr George Reynolds	YES
58	58	Cllr Maurice Billington	YES
59	59	Cllr Pete Handley	YES
60	60	Cllr Louise Chapman	YES
61	61	Cllr Jean Fooks	YES
62	62	Cllr Richard Webber	YES
63	63	Cllr Les Sibley	YES
64	64	Cllr Mark Gray	YES
65	65	Cllr Lynda Atkins	YES
67	67	Cllr David Williams	NO
68	68	Cllr Sam Coates	NO

The named vote on the additional devolution motion was as Follows:

Carried by 57 votes in favour, 3 votes against and 2 abstentions.

The Individual Results Were As Follows

Mic Card Delegate Information			Vote
CH0	0	Chairman	YES
	2	Vice Chairman	YES
	5	Cllr Nick Carter	YES
	6	Cllr Melinda Tilley	YES
	7	Cllr Judith Heathcoat	YES
	8	Cllr Lawrie Stratford	YES
	9	Cllr Rodney Rose	YES
	10	Cllr Ian Hudspeth	YES
	11	Cllr Arash Fatemian	YES
	12	Cllr Yvonne Constance	YES
	13	Cllr Sandy Lovatt	YES
	14	Cllr Mark Lygo	YES
	15	Cllr Surinder Dhesi	YES
	16	Cllr Steve Curran	YES
	17	Cllr Liz Brighthouse	YES
	18	Cllr John Christie	YES
	19	Cllr Nick Hards	YES

20	20	Cllr Laura Price	YES
21	21	Cllr Mike Beal	YES
22	22	Cllr Glynis Phillips	YES
23	23	Cllr David Bartholomew	YES
24	24	Cllr Kevin Bulmer	YES
25	25	Cllr Catherine Fulljames	YES
26	26	Cllr Stewart Lilly	YES
27	27	Cllr Lorraine Lindsay-Gale	YES
28	28	Cllr David Nimmo-Smith	YES
29	29	Cllr Hilary Hibbert-Biles	YES
30	30	Cllr James Mills	YES
31	31	Cllr Neil Owen	YES
32	32	Cllr Richard Langridge	NO
33	33	Cllr Charles Mathew	YES
34	34	Cllr Zoe Patrick	YES
35	35	Cllr Neil Fawcett	YES
36	36	Cllr Roz Smith	
37	37	Cllr Janet Godden	YES
38	38	Cllr Gill Sanders	YES
39	39	Cllr Jamila Azad	YES
40	40	Cllr Susanna Pressel	YES
41	41	Cllr John Tanner	YES
42	42	Cllr Mark Cherry	YES
45	45	Cllr Patrick Greene	YES
46	46	Cllr Tim Hallchurch	YES
47	47	Cllr Anthony Gearing	YES
48	48	Cllr David Wilmshurst	YES
49	49	Cllr Steve Harrod	YES
50	50	Cllr Bob Johnston	YES
51	51	Cllr Jenny Hannaby	YES
52	52	Cllr John Howson	YES
53	53	Cllr Alison Rooke	YES
54	54	Cllr Anne Purse	YES
55	55	Cllr Neville Harris	YES
56	56	Cllr Kieron Mallon	YES
57	57	Cllr George Reynolds	NO
58	58	Cllr Maurice Billington	NO
59	59	Cllr Pete Handley	ABSTAIN
60	60	Cllr Louise Chapman	ABSTAIN
61	61	Cllr Jean Fooks	YES
62	62	Cllr Richard Webber	YES
63	63	Cllr Les Sibley	YES
64	64	Cllr Mark Gray	YES
65	65	Cllr Lynda Atkins	YES
67	67	Cllr David Williams	YES
68	68	Cllr Sam Coates	YES

QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

ANNEX 2

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

	Answers
1. COUNCILLOR SURINDA DHESI E Cigarettes are dangerous and unsafe, what is being done in Oxfordshire to highlight the dangers?	COUNCILLOR HIBBERT-BILES, CABINET MEMBER FOR PUBLIC HEALTH The use of e cigarettes has opened a debate on a national and international scale. Some consider e-cigarettes as harmful to health and a way of introducing young people and non-smokers to smoking. With the increasing amount of conflicting information for and against e-cigarettes becoming available in the public arena there has naturally been confusion for the public and health professionals alike. In response, Public Health England published an evidence update which concluded that e-cigarettes are significantly less harmful to health than tobacco and have the potential to help smokers quit smoking. Key findings of the report included: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the current best estimate is that e-cigarettes are around 95% less harmful than smoking• nearly half the population (44.8%) don't realise e-cigarettes are much less harmful than smoking• there is no evidence so far that e-cigarettes are acting as a route into smoking for children or non-smokers Whilst the current position from PHE is that e-cigarettes are significantly less harmful than cigarettes they would encourage people to move towards not using either product and seek help to move to complete cessation. PHE have adopted a current watch and wait stance. In the future if more evidence arises of significant harm then the position could change to support stricter regulation of e-cigarettes.

	<p>Currently e-cigarettes are regulated as a consumer product, and there have been concerns about the varying quality of products that are available. From May 2016 e-cigarette products will have to comply with the European Tobacco Products Directive (TPD), which will create a level of regulation and quality control over the e-cigarette products available to consumers.</p> <p>The current evidence suggests that there is a significant harm reduction in using e-cigarettes instead of tobacco. Public health would encourage any individual who has chosen to use e-cigarettes as a method of tobacco cessation to use the local stop smoking services to help them towards a nicotine free life without either tobacco or e-cigarettes. This current position is open to change with future developing guidance and policy.</p>
<p>2. COUNCILLOR SURINDA DHESI</p> <p>The potholes which are reported and eventually repaired are constantly in disrepair, can we learn from other EU Countries and see what material they use? The roads last longer and need less repair; this will save money and reduce complaints from Oxfordshire residents.</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR NIMMO SMITH, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council undertakes pothole repairs using recognised techniques and a 'right first time approach'. The contractual arrangements ensure that repairs are guaranteed for 2 years and any failures are addressed at no cost to OCC. The methodology for pothole repair follows national guidance as set out in the Highways Maintenance Efficiency Programme Pothole Review published in April 2012.</p> <p>OCC work with national groups and other authorities to share best practise and modify repair techniques to minimise the risk of failure and prolong the life of the highway. In addition, working with our Term Contractor OCC seeks to introduce innovative methods of repair and this has included the introduction of the Dragon Patcher, an operation developed in Sweden that has been introduced in Oxfordshire to repair potholes and other highway defects.</p>
<p>3. COUNCILLOR CHARLES MATHEW</p> <p>Could the Leader update the Council on the progress of the Devolution bid?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR IAN HUDSPETH, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>Since last summer the county council had been working hard with partners from the city and district councils, the LEP and CCG to develop proposals for</p>

devolution of funding and power to Oxfordshire that could have resulted in local co-ordination of over £6bn of funding in Oxfordshire, including £1.3bn for health and social care and significant investment in local infrastructure, that otherwise is unlikely to happen.

When I became aware that there was a question mark around the issue of governance for the bid I wrote to all the other Leaders in Oxfordshire on 17th February:

The devolution bid we have is very exciting with the prospect of delivering the infrastructure we lack in Oxfordshire that will drive the jobs & housing growth. Even without the additional funds we'll still have the housing growth only adding to the transport and connectivity problems across the county. Yet we are going to reject this opportunity for all this additional funding, why? Because we aren't prepared to consider a mayor? Our reason that it would add another layer of administration to the system well why don't we have a sensible conversation about removing some of the administration and duplication that would occur yes let's talk about local government in a Unitary context. Let's have a serious look at the options of 1, 2 or 3 councils within Oxfordshire. The idea of cross boundary Unitary would only add to costs and certainly not assist with the health devolution. It's not about 1 council taking over another it would be about all council disbanding then a new or new ones being formed slashing the waste in administration, I'm attaching the EY report regarding the potential savings in Oxfordshire as a reminder, I realise it would have to be updated to take into account recent proposals but the figures would be very similar. In fact when I released this report last year the figures were questioned but nobody came back to me with other figures.

I did not receive any reply to this and was surprised that just over a week later by the announcement in late February from the city and district councils, with the addition of Cotswolds and South Northamptonshire district councils, that they were putting forward separate governance proposals based on four small unitary authorities with an overarching Combined Authority, came as a surprise to the County Council, as the city and district councils had always

	<p>been unwilling to have any conversation with me about alternative governance models, despite repeated requests to consider all options in the best interests of Oxfordshire residents.</p> <p>Since the new proposals were made by the district councils, county council officers have been seeking to clarify the position with the original devolution bid, and were told by officials earlier in March that the proposals for Oxfordshire will not now be considered further by government until the governance arrangements are resolved.</p> <p>Members may share my view that it is of great regret that the unexpected proposals from the district councils have jeopardised the government's willingness to devolve these very significant benefits to Oxfordshire's residents.</p> <p>I, along with all the other political group leaders of this council, am pleased that district and city councils now recognise that the current structure of local government is not fit for purpose. However I do not support the structure that they propose. I would like a public debate on all options for local government reorganisation in Oxfordshire and support the idea of jointly commissioning a single independent report considering all options. Unfortunately the district and city councils have not agreed to this sensible proposal and proceeded with one which focusses on their preferred option. We therefore have had no option to commission an independent review to consider all the options for local government reorganisation in Oxfordshire, a study that we hope will include input from all key stakeholders.</p>
<p>4. COUNCILLOR STEVE HARROD</p> <p>The responsibility for commissioning HV service moved to the council on 1st October 2015. At that time there were some concerns about assuring the safe transfer of services.</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR HIBBERT-BILES, CABINET MEMBER FOR PUBLIC HEALTH</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oxfordshire County Council has been working with NHS England and Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust on the novation of the contract from the NHS to Local Authority;

<p>Can the Cabinet Member assure me that the services are safe?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The local Health Visitor Transition Board has held Oxford Health to account throughout the transition process and the process has been further assured through the Thames Valley Health Visitor Transition Board managed by Public Health England; • All of the residents affected by the boundary change have now successfully transferred either into the service provided by Oxford Health in Oxfordshire or out to services in neighbouring counties based on the postcode of their residence; • This has involved assurance for safeguarding and transfer of notes through the Child Health Information Service (CHIS); • CHIS are patient administration systems that provide an active clinical record for individual children and support a variety of child health and related activities; • Oxford Health has recently been inspected by CQC and received an outstanding for their Community Health Services for children, young people and families.
<p>5. COUNCILLOR PATRICK GREENE</p> <p>Could the cabinet member for Fire Services provide an update on the Didcot A emergency</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR RODNEY ROSE, DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>You will be aware that on the 23rd February at approximately 4 pm, the boiler house part of the Former Power Station at Didcot A site (whilst being prepared for demolition) collapsed suddenly.</p> <p>Immediate rescues were performed and in the following hours and Days Oxfordshire Fire and Rescue coordinated extensive searching of the collapsed structure and tunnels using specialists from all over the Country.</p> <p>Every effort was made to identify either a location of persons still unaccounted for (3) using a range of tactics, to include Urban Search and Rescue, specialist search dogs, thermal imaging equipment, listening equipment used during earth quakes, Drones with video and heat recording, and Army Bomb disposal.</p>

	<p>After 4 Days of searching (24 Hours a Day), it was decided that due to the Dangerous Nature of the Remaining 10 Storey Building, having been significantly weakened as part of the demolition plan, no further searching would be completed that involved Emergency Responders being put at Risk.</p> <p>The Health and Safety Executive and the Police now have primacy in terms of the recovery phase and any future investigations. To undertake this they have secured the best advice from national specialists and the determination is that the remaining building will need to be demolished before the missing persons can be recovered from the Ground Floor of the collapsed Building.</p> <p>The Fire and Rescue Service are maintaining a permanent Silver Commander so that in the event of either a further unplanned collapse, (a full plan has been developed for this eventuality) or the recovery phase restarting we are ready to immediately deploy.</p> <p>The Chief Fire Officer has made a commitment to return the missing persons to their Family with dignity at the earliest opportunity and this commitment remains.</p>
<p>6. COUNCILLOR NEIL OWEN</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member for Libraries inform me when Wi-Fi will be installed at Burford and Carterton Libraries</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LINDSAY-GALE, CABINET MEMBER FOR CULTURAL & COMMUNITY SERVICES</p> <p>Both Burford and Carterton libraries now do have Wi-Fi installed. The Library Service has recently worked closely with our ICT colleagues to successfully bid for funding to install Wi-Fi in all our public libraries. In order to comply with the funding requirements, this work had to be completed by March 31st, and I am very happy to report that we have been able to meet those very tight deadlines. Wi-Fi__33 is now installed in all libraries except Bicester, where we are working within the timeframes set for the new building. The addition of Wi-Fi__33 in our public libraries will add to the library offer and provide an additional service for the people of Oxfordshire, increasing opportunities to get online and further develop their digital skills. There will be local and county wide promotion of this new service during April.</p>

<p>7. COUNCILLOR SANDY LOVATT</p> <p>We all welcome the proposed flood alleviation scheme that will protect the City. Can the Cabinet member explain the impact that the scheme will have on Abingdon and what mitigation is being proposed to ensure there is no adverse effect.</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR RODNEY ROSE, DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>The Environment Agency is currently analysing the options to decide the preferred option for the flood relief channel. As part of this they are using updated flood modelling to ensure that the preferred option will not increase flood risk downstream.</p> <p>If the modelling shows that risk downstream will change, they will put in place measures to mitigate this. At this stage the Environment Agency cannot say what these measures will be, as these depend on the results of the modelling. The scheme will not get approval from Government or the Local Planning Authority if it reduces flood risk in one location to increase it elsewhere.</p> <p>Once they have the results of the modelling in June, the Environment Agency and partners will be able to provide more information on this to the Abingdon communities.</p>
<p>8. COUNCILLOR JAMES MILLS</p> <p>Will the Cabinet member for Transport agree with me that the proposals for the A40 represent a real vision to improve the traffic flow</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR NIMMO SMITH, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>I completely agree with Councillor Mills. There is significant confirmed investment in the A40 corridor within the County, much of which will happen over the next 3-5 years. The Local Growth Fund provides up to £40m investment in the A40 between Eynsham and Oxford for a scheme to substantially improve public transport journeys which will also benefit car users. Current works at Wolvercote and Cutteslowe roundabout (due for completion in Autumn 2016) aim to increase traffic flow and capacity through these junctions, and accommodate future growth. OCC acknowledge a long term strategy for the A40 is needed, and the public consultation last autumn aids this debate about the type/s of scheme (Bus lanes, guided bus, dual carriageway, tram, train, or other). The consultation will report later this spring, and help determine a long term vision.</p>

9. COUNCILLOR MARK GRAY

What work is being undertaken behind the scenes in an attempt to keep as many children's centres open as possible?

COUNCILLOR MELINDA TILLEY, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, EDUCATION & FAMILIES

The Community Initiatives Framework has now been made available on the Oxfordshire Together website along with estimate property costs and frequently asked questions.

As part of the community initiatives offer there is a working group which is meeting monthly to look at communications, project governance and risk management as well as working through the groups and communities that have expressed an interest in running open access services. Cllr Gray has also been invited to attend this group.

There will shortly be a stakeholder communications going out inviting communities to contact us for further discussion. This work is being split by the team into those on school sites, those with childcare on site and other. The team are working with interested parties alongside their county councillor in many cases to look at future solutions.

Community initiatives led by Councillors

Active conversations occurring regarding the following sites :

- Bloxham
- Mapletree
- Chalgrove
- Wantage/ Grove
- Thame
- Bicester
- Faringdon
- Henley
- Carteron
- Wheatley
- Berinsfield

School sites

	<p>Some settings particularly schools are still thinking through what future provision might be ran from the site</p> <p>Conversations are being taken forward with all schools to ascertain where schools are currently in their thinking and take work forward</p> <p>CC sites with childcare</p> <p>The sites with childcare are all being supported to look at delivery of Child care and future sustainability as well as providing a base for outreach</p> <p>We are looking to host an engagement event possibly inviting local groups to hear from officers and members and raise questions.</p>
<p>10. COUNCILLOR NEIL OWEN</p> <p>The HealthCheck programme has the potential to identify those at risk of certain illness at an early stage which in turn can reduce costs to the health system in the longer term. Can the Cabinet Member assure us that the Council is still committed to delivering this service?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR HIBBERT-BILES, CABINET MEMBER FOR PUBLIC HEALTH</p> <p>The NHS HealthCheck programme is a key national public health programme, the delivery of which rests with Local Authorities. Oxfordshire County Council has always been and continues to be committed to the HealthCheck programme.</p> <p>Since the programme was taken over by the County Council in 2013, the Public Health Directorate has worked hard to raise the profile of the programme with the public with good results. The NHS HealthCheck programme is now the most recognised service advertised by the County Council. A recent consultation has shown that 42% of respondents reported seeing something about health checks locally.</p> <p>The activity of the programme delivered by the 77 GP practices continues to increase in Oxfordshire. Since 2013, 111,503 people have been invited for a health check and 54,787 of eligible adults have had their health check done which ranks Oxfordshire second of the 18 Authorities in the South East Area.</p>

<p>11. COUNCLLOR RICHARD LANGRIDGE</p> <p>The Growth board is working on an assumption that the unmet need of Oxford City is up to 15,000. Does that mean this figure will be evenly divided between the 4 Districts or is there a way that a larger strategic site could deliver added infrastructure along with delivering much needed housing?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR IAN HUDSPETH, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>The County and District Councils are working together to look at the way Oxford's unmet need could be accommodated, a process which would identify a proposed apportionment of that need between all of the Councils, to feed into their Local Plan processes. It's disappointing to note that the City and District councils agreed terms of reference and commissioned the SHMA report in November 2012 yet after over 3 years they have failed to agree the figures. This has led to uncertainty in developing their Local Plans that may lead to speculative development on inappropriate sites. There is no assumption that this figure will be divided equally. Work is also looking at the infrastructure which may be needed to support different development options.</p>
<p>12. COUNCILLOR PETER HANDLEY</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member for Fire give an update on service provision across the County</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR RODNEY ROSE, DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>Oxfordshire Fire and Rescue Service constantly reviews its Service Provision and specifically its ability to react to Emergencies. As a result of this iterative process we have deployed a whole-time resource to the West Oxfordshire area based at Burford fire station to support the on-call stations and to provide a resilient resource across the County. We have also set up a resource management team which operate seven days a week to ensure that we deploy our resources effectively across the County to manage our Fire Cover. This enables us to manage our resources at times of peak demand and to move our appliances to areas of greater risk.</p> <p>During this year we are refreshing our integrated risk management plan which identifies how we balance our prevention, protection and response resources across the county to manage our risk. We are currently reviewing the past five year's incident data and overlaying this information over our resource availability. This will provide us with a strategic analysis of risk within Oxfordshire and allow us to ensure our service provision is focused on</p>

	<p>reducing this risk.</p> <p>The recent implementation of the Thames Valley Fire Control Service and the new mobilising system allows us to use Automatic Vehicle Location to mobilise the quickest response to incidents. This alone has led to a significant improvement in our attendance times and we are consistently hitting our performance standards since its inception</p> <p>We are also working with our blue light partners and County Council colleagues to provide a more joined up prevention and protection service. The aim of this is to reduce the number of incidents that we have in the County and to improve the outcomes for our communities. Our previous and new “365 alive” vision sits prevention and education at the heart of what we do.</p> <p>Performance management is key to ensuring that we monitor our service provision and as a result to ensure we provide the highest levels of service delivery we have a Performance Pledge of:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) station availability, and ii) attendance times. <p>The Current standards are</p> <p>On Call Stations Availability 100% of the time (Our Whole Time Service Operated 24/7, 365) The Current Performance is 71.9%</p> <p>Attending all Incidents in Less than 11 minutes on 80% of the time. The Current Performance is 87.14%</p> <p>Attending all Incidents in Less than 14 minutes on 95% of the time. The Current Performance is 95.99%</p> <p>The attendance times are the best indication for the level of service provision</p>
--	---

	<p>across the county, as this reflects the service to the communities that we serve.</p>
<p>13. COUNCILLOR DAVID BARTHOLOMEW</p> <p>Various Berkshire councils and enterprise groups have been campaigning vigorously in recent years for a new Thames crossing known as the 'Third Reading Bridge'. This bridge would link the end of the A329 (M) in Berkshire to Playhatch in Oxfordshire. The enthusiasm of the scheme promoters is not shared by many Oxfordshire residents who are concerned about the large amount of extra traffic that would be deposited on to already congested rural roads. You have assured me via a written answer to a question at Cabinet that OCC participation in the Phase One 'Strategic Outline Business Case' does not indicate that OCC supports the proposal. Please confirm what conditions would need to be met for OCC to give support to Phase Two, the 'Outline Business Case'</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR NIMMO SMITH, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>It is important to first make clear that the ambition of the Berkshire authorities promoting this scheme for an extra bridge is to relieve-congestion around Reading and Wokingham as urban growth areas.</p> <p>One of the objectives of this work will be to define the exact location of a bridge in terms of transport movements; therefore the exact location of the bridge is as yet not confirmed.</p> <p>If it is determined that there is justification for developing a full business case proposal for a bridge, the work will need to take account of its potential wider impacts. Oxfordshire County Council has been consistently pushing for a clearer understanding of the benefits and impacts of such a proposal and that any impact would need corresponding mitigation. The business case would need to show, while achieving its overall objective, how it minimises the impacts on the rural network through location and design and any potential impact has feasible mitigation measures within the overall scheme proposal and how this was considered within business case.</p>

<p>14. COUNCILLOR LES SIBLEY</p> <p>Can the Cabinet member for Transport Update Council on the proposals for London Road Bicester</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR NIMMO SMITH, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>Bicester Village Railway Station was completed in October 2015 and makes way for a new East West rail service, which sees frequent trains between Oxford Parkway Railway Station and London, as well as an eventual service east to Milton Keynes and Bletchley. The service is due to be extended to Oxford Railway Station in December.</p> <p>The Hendy Report reassesses how rail enhancements, including East West Rail Western Section Phase 2, will be delivered and was published in November 2015. It states that there will be 'significant delivery' by March 2019 and completion in the next five-year period; however completion dates cannot be confirmed at this stage.</p> <p>The rail upgrading presents some challenges. More rail traffic means that there is more disruption to the road network where the two cross. In Bicester, a new rail bridge at Charbridge Lane Level Crossing is already being planned, but there are other challenges such as the rail crossing at London Road where options need to be developed further.</p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council (OCC), in partnership with the East West Rail Alliance, is progressing the investigation of options that could replace Bicester London Road Level Crossing in the event that it becomes impracticable to use for road traffic, as a result of increasing rail traffic. A high level engineering and network effectiveness assessment has already been undertaken and options have been focussed down to the few remaining.</p> <p>Network Rail have agreed to jointly (with OCC) fund some further scheme design/development work on options for the crossing, using their consultants, as part of their development work on future phases of East West Rail. This assessment work is due to begin shortly and it is expected that public consultation on the options will be undertaken in the Summer/Autumn. In progressing further work now we can be clear as to what the requirements for a new crossing are for future phases of EWR and have something ready if opportunities arise that can provide funding.</p> <p>However, the London Road crossing is not part of the scope of the next phase</p>
--	---

	<p>of the East West Rail project (phase 2), which includes all the rail infrastructure from east of Bicester (and does include the Charbridge Lane crossing) out to Bedford and Milton Keynes. It is this infrastructure, land requirement etc. which will be part of their Transport & Works Act submission for Phase 2 that does not include London Road as it is not in scope. This all comes back to the Inspector's 2011 view that neither EWR Phase 1 (now open) or Phase 2 required any significant works to London Road, i.e. it could continue to operate as a level crossing even with the extra train services. Network Rail is planning to consult on the T&WA order in the autumn of this year.</p>
<p>15. COUNCILLOR ARASH FATEMAIN</p> <p>Can the cabinet member for ICT confirm that the decision by the City Council not to use our ICT department will free up capacity at the County Council and have no impact on the county council services?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR NICK CARTER, CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS & CUSTOMER SERVICES</p> <p>I can confirm that when the existing Partnership Agreement expired at the end of March 2016, the County Council released technical capacity and resource and that there has been a reduction in demand on the ICT Service Desk and broader ICT staff. These reductions have already been identified and taken as part of the existing Medium Term Financial Plan.</p> <p>From a County Council Services perspective, although the City Council shared the County Council's ICT Infrastructure, the business applications and corresponding data was managed on an independent basis. Therefore, we do not expect any impact on the County Council once the City have migrated into their own operating environment.</p>
<p>16. COUNCILLOR KEVIN BULMER</p> <p>Could the Cabinet member responsible for rail tell me what representations OCC can make regarding the fact that Network Rail have failed to carry out a landscape impact assessment in the AONB when erecting the gantries?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR NIMMO SMITH, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>Road marking work is generally done for one of three reasons:-</p> <p>Firstly, whenever road surfacing takes place (whether by OCC or by utilities or developers) than any pre-existing lining is usually replaced on a 'like-for-like' basis.</p> <p>Secondly, new road markings are laid either because circumstances have</p>

	<p>changed (for example there are new parking restrictions, speed limits etc. or new developments or our own major schemes have altered the road layout) or because there have been specific requests for lining with associated funding (such as access protection markings across private driveways, or Parish-funded village entry treatments).</p> <p>Finally, there is the general maintenance of existing lining to ensure that it continues to be visible to drivers and delivers the road safety and traffic management benefits that led to its initial introduction. For this area of work, in the 2015/16 financial year we spent around £275,000 on this type of work spread across the County covering a wide range of locations from high volume 'A' and 'B' roads (such as the A4074 from Woodcote down towards Reading, and B4526 around Goring) to more localised ones such as in Goring on Thames and in Whitchurch on Thames. These locations are chosen by the Traffic Technician for the area using their detailed knowledge and experience, coupled with an awareness of complaints that have been received. Clearly we need to prioritise the work to match the available budget and this is done based on a "safety first" principle. The volume of non-safety related line refresh has been reducing over recent years as budget reductions have been agreed by Council. Recognising this problem we have also worked with parishes such as Woodcote who are able to use some of their own funds to supplement ours to smarten up their area.</p> <p>Unless it is related to a specific larger scheme, lining works are generally batched together in order to achieve the best value for money as this service is generally provided via a specialist contractor and costed as an attendance charge plus a charge per linear metre of line (therefore the more linear metres you can include in a visit the less the impact of the attendance charge on the overall cost).</p>
<p>17. COUNCILLOR KEVIN BULMER</p> <p>Could the Cabinet member for Transport</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR NIMMO SMITH, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>Road marking work is generally done for one of three reasons:-</p>

<p>explain the procedure for lining across the County?</p>	<p>Firstly, whenever road surfacing takes place (whether by OCC or by utilities or developers) than any pre-existing lining is usually replaced on a 'like-for-like' basis.</p> <p>Secondly, new road markings are laid either because circumstances have changed (for example there are new parking restrictions, speed limits etc. or new developments or our own major schemes have altered the road layout) or because there have been specific requests for lining with associated funding (such as access protection markings across private driveways, or Parish-funded village entry treatments)</p> <p>Finally, there is the general maintenance of existing lining to ensure that it continues to be visible to drivers and delivers the road safety and traffic management benefits that led to its initial introduction. For this area of work, in the 2015/16 financial year we spent around £275,000 on this type of work spread across the County covering a wide range of locations from high volume 'A' and 'B' roads (such as the A4074 from Woodcote down towards Reading, and B4526 around Goring) to more localised ones such as in Goring on Thames and in Whitchurch on Thames. These locations are chosen by the Traffic Technician for the area using their detailed knowledge and experience, coupled with an awareness of complaints that have been received. Clearly we need to prioritise the work to match the available budget and this is done based on a "safety first" principle. The volume of non-safety related line refresh has been reducing over recent years as budget reductions have been agreed by Council. Recognising this problem we have also worked with parishes such as Woodcote who are able to use some of their own funds to supplement ours to smarten up their area.</p> <p>Unless it is related to a specific larger scheme, lining works are generally batched together in order to achieve the best value for money as this service is generally provided via a specialist contractor and costed as an attendance charge plus a charge per linear metre of line (therefore the more linear metres you can include in a visit the less the impact of the attendance charge on the overall cost).</p>
--	--

<p>18. COUNCILLOR LES SIBLEY</p> <p>I welcome the new library at Bicester and would be grateful if the cabinet member for libraries could explain some of the details especially the closer working relationship with Cherwell District Council.</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LINDSAY-GALE, CABINET MEMBER FOR CULTURAL & COMMUNITY SERVICES</p> <p>OCC has worked collaboratively with Cherwell District Council to participate in the construction of a new building to provide excellent facilities for the residents of Bicester. The library has long been planned by Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council as part of Franklins House, the new community building at the heart of the multimillion pound regeneration of Bicester Town Centre. The new library will open its doors to the public on Monday, April 11th. The new library will be larger than the current facility and will allow Oxfordshire County Council’s Library Service to offer an improved service.</p> <p>There will be more public access computers than at the current Bicester Library and the availability of Wi-Fi__33 will offer increased opportunities for people to get online and further develop their digital skills. There will also be a broader choice of books and audio visual items and increased opportunities to join in with regular activities such as weekly rhyme-times for babies and toddlers, family learning activities and reading groups.</p> <p>We will be working closely with Bicester Local History Society and Cherwell’s Economic Development Unit. The Local History Society and the Bicester Job Club will have a presence in the library, with a fortnightly Job Club surgery in the “Bicester Connect” area of the library.</p> <p>The current Bicester library will close its doors at 4:30pm on Saturday, March 19. Staff will spend the closure period moving stock to the new library ready for it to open on Monday, April 11th.</p>

<p>19. COUNCILLOR DAVID WILMSHURST</p> <p>At a time when councils of all persuasions are, or have found it necessary to maintain a sound commercial balance between available funding and facilities across all departments, the Oxfordshire Library Service through the support of a band of dedicated volunteers will continue to serve the interests of the communities it serves across the County.</p> <p>Would the Cabinet Member agree?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LINDSAY-GALE, CABINET MEMBER FOR CULTURAL & COMMUNITY SERVICES</p> <p>The library service is grateful to our Friends Groups and volunteer supporters who help us to deliver library services across the county. We have 21 community supported libraries and also volunteers who give us their time and expertise to support activities such as rhymetimes, computer buddy activities and home library services. Working with the Communications Team, the library service will be launching a campaign in April to expand our bank of home library service volunteers. We will pilot this in the north of the county, rolling out across the whole county in July and August.</p> <p>Last year 831 people supported the library service as volunteers and 22,000 hours of volunteering were delivered.</p>
<p>20. COUNCILLOR SAM COATES</p> <p>In October 1997 the Swedish Parliament adopted its “Vision Zero” (VZ) road safety policy. VZ sets a target of zero deaths and zero serious injuries in the road traffic environment and puts the responsibility for achieving this goal on all those responsible for the total road safety system. This means that the detailed design of the road, the vehicle and driving behavior must be tackled as a “total system” so that “a mistake in the road traffic environment does not carry the death penalty”.</p> <p>This approach is an ethical and civilised response to the unacceptability of road death and serious injury.</p> <p>Vision Zero has been adopted in Vienna, New York, Blackpool and Edinburgh and has been</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR NIMMO SMITH, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>In December 2015 the government published “Working together to build a safer road system: British road safety statement” - see https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/road-safety-statement-working-together-to-build-a-safer-road-system ; this adopts a systems approach to improving road safety, and while not following Vision Zero by setting a target of zero fatal or serious injuries, nevertheless approaches the issues in a very comparable way.</p> <p>As mentioned by Cllr Coates, Vision Zero was adopted in Sweden in 1997, and while the detailed approaches of Sweden and the UK in the intervening years have differences, in terms of outcome, it is interesting to see (see chart on page 9 of above publication) that the death rate (per capita) on the UK’s roads is only very fractionally higher than Sweden’s.</p> <p>OCC’s Local Transport Plan 4 sets out our approach to road safety in respect of the interventions that are the responsibility of the local highway authority.</p>

<p>accepted as a long term target by the European Commission. Could the portfolio holder give a commitment that he will investigate this new approach and report back to the Cabinet illustrating how the new approach could be implemented?</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the current severe funding pressures are inevitably affecting our ability to maintain and improve our road network, including addressing for example accident problem sites, and are also limiting the resources available for local road safety education, training and publicity work. It does not appear that this is affecting to date the number and severity of injuries reported in Oxfordshire, although we will be continuing to monitor trends very closely, including making comparisons with national performance and also our 'statistical neighbours' when the national road casualty statistics for 2015 are released in the early summer (the data available to date for 2016 - to 29/02/2016 - shows the lowest total of killed or seriously injured in Oxfordshire at least over the past 10 years, although clearly not too much weight should be given to the statistics for such a very limited period).</p>
<p>21. COUNCILLOR DAVID WILLIAMS</p> <p>Flooding is coming again to Oxfordshire. We have had six floods since 2000 and the frequency is increasing. According to the flood map one in six of the residents of Oxfordshire are in the potential danger zone if a great flood comes.</p> <p>Up until now the County Council response to flooding has been excellent and I have no doubt that the police, fire and rescue services, the ambulance staff and the local authority workers will do all that is humanly possible but we need the politicians nationally and locally to accept that there needs to be a real comprehensive programme of flood defences and climate action. Can I have an assurance not only that we are ready for the next flood but that we really are making progress with a truly comprehensive range of</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR RODNEY ROSE, DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>We have all witnessed the flooding in Oxfordshire, affecting many homes and causing disruption to many people's lives and also impacting on the local economy. The Emergency Services and Directorates within the Council work hard to prepare for such events and respond in the most effective manner working with the community. The nature of flooding has revealed that no two events are exactly the same, creating new and different challenges with every occurrence. This makes planning for flooding challenging, however all responses are de-briefed to ensure that experience is recorded, learnt from and built upon with each new response.</p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council and Oxfordshire Fire & Rescue Service are all actively engaged in flooding discussions, partnerships, and meetings to ensure that the next flood response is more effective than the last and that the affected communities are fully involved.</p> <p>The following actions have been undertaken by the Council to ensure that we can make a difference to the communities of Oxfordshire:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developing Multi- agency flood plans for high risk areas Provision of fixed pumping facilities on the Botley Road and Abingdon Road Access to up to date on-line information systems (24/7) for emergency

<p>actions that will really make a difference in the medium and long term.</p>	<p>response officers</p> <p>Providing advice and guidance to the public for early warning</p> <p>Developing and distributing information on flood reduction topics, e.g. tree maintenance, ditch and drainage upkeep</p> <p>Developed a Priority Service Register for the vulnerable to register with the utility companies to ensure they are prioritised in the event of an incident</p> <p>Holding flood protection events to educate and inform the communities</p> <p>Informing the national debate on flood resilience with DCLG</p> <p>Identified pre-arranged sandbags dumps for local communities</p> <p>Promoting business continuity planning for local employers and the universities</p> <p>The Local Resilience Forum has developed a 4x4 vehicle provision to provide access to rural communities and vulnerable individuals in all conditions</p> <p>Working with Parish Councils to develop local resilience plans</p> <p>Working with developers to ensure that new developments do not increase the impact of flooding</p> <p>Liaising with the EA on the provision of additional flood protection equipment</p> <p>We are all working towards the same goal of protecting people. We are committed to helping those affected by flooding, however there is only so much each organisation can do. With the current economic climate we are asking everyone to pitch in, helping people to help themselves, and identifying particular risks or vulnerable people, so the responding agencies can be most effective in a response where there are often hundreds of people requiring assistance. Our communities play an important role in the overall flood response and the Emergency Planning Unit promote Community Emergency Plans, Local Flood Groups, and flood wardens as a way of increasing resilience to the area.</p> <p>As you can see we are undertaking a comprehensive range of activities which provides assurance that we continue to invest time and effort into flooding initiatives to improve outcomes for all those living, working or travelling through the County.</p>
--	---

<p>22. COUNCILLOR SAM COATES</p> <p>Is the Leader of the Council aware of the TUC Welfare Charter and the fact that a number of local authorities are backing the call to action that it embodies?</p> <p>Would he agree with me that in an affluent society such as this there is no place for a system that sees pushing people into poverty, the threat of hunger and eviction as a legitimate punishment for not being in work. We need a social security system that enables everyone to have a safe, warm home, good food, proper clothing and being able to participate in society. If he does will he add Oxfordshire County Council endorsement to the recently published TUC Welfare Charter?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR IAN HUDSPETH, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>I believe that the best way for everybody to have a safe, warm home, good food, proper clothing is to have the opportunity of a job. Since the General Election 336,000 more people are in work with the latest employment figures showing that 31.4 million people are in work thanks to the long term economic plan of this Conservative Government. A good social security system should be in place as a safety net for those residents that need it not as an alternative to work. The Council is aware that the TUC is developing a Welfare Charter and looks forward to considering this in more detail in due course. As an employer, the Council supports the National Living Wage that has been brought in by this Conservative Government and will implement this on 1 April This will be alongside early payment of the 1% pay award pending the outcome of the national pay negotiations, which will be honoured. The Council has a good track record of equality in the workplace including a range of policies and a robust Job Evaluation system which ensures that pay is free of bias.</p>
<p>23. COUNCILLOR SAM COATES</p> <p>The Chancellor has announced that all schools will be forced to be Academies. Could I ask why you are expressing such shock and awe at this announcement? Surely as a Conservative you have read the Tory Manifesto and its commitment to promote the Labour Party initiative of Academies. Has it not been your policy to move towards all schools being Academies in Oxfordshire for</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR MELINDA TILLEY, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, EDUCATION & FAMILIES</p> <p>This Council's and my commitment to supporting those schools that wish to become academies is matter of public record. That view has not changed. It is the Chancellor's use of the word 'forced' to which I object".</p>

<p>many years anyway ...why speak out now?</p>	
<p>24. COUNCILLOR SAM COATES</p> <p>The Chancellor in his recent budget stated that he would be cutting the Business Rate by 50% in an effort to help small business. This may seem very commendable but a 50% cut in revenue from the Business Rate will have dramatic impact on local government finances. Could the Portfolio holder give an estimate of how many millions will be lost to Oxfordshire County Council by this move and would he comment on Mr. Osborne's one time commitment to devolve decision making regarding the Business Rate to local government.</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LAWRIE STRATFORD, CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE</p> <p>The Chancellor's budget report set out that Councils will be compensated for the extension of small business rates relief via a specific grant until the switch to full rate retention. Ministers have also indicated that councils would be expected to take on fewer additional responsibilities than originally planned after 2020 with the switch to funding via business rates as a result of the changes to reliefs.</p>
<p>25. COUNCILLOR ZOE PATRICK</p> <p>I understand from the last Cabinet meeting that a further study on usage data is to be undertaken before a final decision on bus subsidies is taken. It was reported at the budget meeting in February, that there could be further money from the £9M Transition Fund that could be used for this purpose. Does this mean that some of this money will now be used to subsidise necessary bus services for those who are needy and vulnerable in Oxfordshire who rely on their local service to access vital facilities?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR NIMMO SMITH, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>We will be creating a cross party board of members to consider maximum benefit from use of transition funds across key services and across geography. Council agreed that £1million of this could be used to create a one off pump priming fund for parishes to support Children's Centres which they would help save, and a further £1million is proposed for income generation pump priming. The remaining £2m will need further consideration by the cross party group on what this could support and the approach to be taken.</p> <p>Whilst this transition money is clearly very welcome, it is only temporary funding which gives us breathing space to plan for yet more cuts over and above those we consulted on in October. As you know, over the next four</p>

	<p>years we will have to find the same amount of money - £69m.</p> <p>Unfortunately we still have to continue with these savings. The availability of this temporary funding does not change our intention to terminate all bus subsidies by 20 July this year, and we are proceeding as planned.</p>
<p>26. COUNCILLOR JOHN TANNER</p> <p>What plans does the Cabinet Member have for repairing the road surface at Folly Bridge, and repairing the dangerous potholes in St Aldates and the High Street in the centre of Oxford?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR NIMMO SMITH, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>Minor patching along the kerb line of Folly Bridge is to be undertaken in early 2016/17 financial year. Once structural work has been undertaken to the bridge in summer 2016, a full resurface of Folly Bridge is planned.</p> <p>Any potholes or safety defects found in St Aldates and the High Street will be repaired within 28 days following the monthly walked and driven inspections of High Street and St Aldates.</p>
<p>27. COUNCILLOR JOHN TANNER</p> <p>Would the Cabinet Member be prepared to use some of the £1 million agreed in the budget for pump-priming to support the growing numbers of street-homeless people in Oxford to move-on from hostels to the kind of accommodation provided by the Julian Housing Association?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR JUDITH HEATHCOAT, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE</p> <p>Thank you for your question, Cllr Tanner. The arrangements for deciding on the use of the transitional funding are in the process of being finalised. Any proposals should be evaluated through those processes when agreed.</p>
<p>28. COUNCILLOR JOHN TANNER</p> <p>If Grandpont Children's Centre in my division became an independent largely self-financing trust would the Cabinet Member give favourable consideration to a bid from the Centre for transitional and possible match-</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR MELINDA TILLEY, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, EDUCATION & FAMILIES</p> <p>Yes.</p>

funding from the County Council?	
<p>COUNCILLOR DAVID WILLIAMS</p> <p>The devolution debate with central government no matter what structure is chosen will result in massive structural changes to local government in Oxfordshire over the next 12 months. Given that reality, would you agree with me that now is not the time to move ahead with a larger scale senior management restructure and although not an ideal situation the temporary arrangements in place should remain until it is clear what the new structure will be?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR IAN HUDSPETH, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>Whilst I would agree that there will be significant structural change likely at some stage whatever the outcome of the unitary discussions and that the Council cannot afford any distraction caused from widespread change to the senior structure of the organisation at this time, what was clear from the senior management review was that our existing structures do not best position us to address the challenges ahead (both short and medium term). Transformation of services is one area we still need to address; succession planning is another important element. As such, whilst the main thrust of the review is paused, it will be important to progress some of the proposals, perhaps on a temporary/interim basis, to better position the Council to do the best for the residents of Oxfordshire over the next few months.</p>

Division(s): N/A

COUNTY COUNCIL – 5 APRIL 2016

REPORT OF THE CABINET

Cabinet Member: Leader

1. Follow up to a Call in of a decision by the Cabinet Member for Environment (Councillor Hudspeth substituting): Proposed Bus Lane & Parking/Waiting Restrictions - Orchard Centre (Phase 2), Didcot

(Cabinet, 23 February 2016)

On 4 February 2016, the Performance Scrutiny Committee considered the decision of the Cabinet Member for Environment (Councillor Hudspeth substituting) which had been made on 14 February 2016 following proper notice of a call in. The Committee had agreed to refer the decision back to Cabinet to consider in the light of a material concern that officers dealing with the matter had not been made aware of the fact that a 1500+ signature petition had been presented to Council opposing the proposal.

Cabinet approved implementation of the proposals as advertised.

Cabinet Member: Deputy Leader

2. Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) Strategy

(Cabinet 15 December 2015)

In July 2015 Cabinet had received a report proposing to consult the public on revised principles for the provision of Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) capacity.

Cabinet had before them a report setting out the results of the consultation alongside an analysis of financial and service pressures. The report sought approval to a revised approach to developing the HWRC network in the medium to long term.

Cabinet approved the Household Waste Recycling Centre Strategy and authorise the Director for Environment and Economy in consultation with the Cabinet Member for the HWRC service to bring forward implementation plans.

3. Cabinet Business Monitoring Report for Quarter 2

(Cabinet, 26 January 2016)

Cabinet noted a report that provided details of performance for quarter two (2015-16) for the Cabinet to consider. The report is required so that the Cabinet can monitor the performance of the Council in key service areas and be assured that progress is being made to improve areas where performance is below the expected level.

4. Staffing Report, Quarter 3 2015/16

(Cabinet, 23 February 2016)

Cabinet agreed a report that gave an update on staffing numbers and related activity during the period 1 October 2015 to 31 December 2015. It gave details of the agreed staffing numbers and establishment at 31 December 2015. The report also provided information on vacancies and the cost of posts being covered by agency staff.

5. Oxfordshire Fire & Rescue - 365 Alive Vision - 2016-2022 - March 2016

(Cabinet, 15 March 2016)

Cabinet noted a report on the completion and success of the current 365ALIVE Vision and adopted the renewed 365alive vision (2016 to 2022).

Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care

6. Future Provision of Intermediate Care in North Oxfordshire

(Cabinet, 26 January 2016)

Following public consultation between 5 October and 8 December 2015, Cabinet considered a report that set out the results of that consultation and recommended the way Intermediate Care services are provided in North Oxfordshire in the future. Intermediate Care is the support people need to avoid going into hospital or to help people get back home as quickly as possible.

Cabinet agreed to move to implementation of Model A: the Intermediate Care Unit in Chipping Norton continues and the full 14 bed service is provided by the Orders of St John Care Trust.

7. Adult Social Care: Short Term Community Services

(Cabinet 26 January 2016)

The current system of short term support social care in Oxfordshire had evolved piecemeal with services created in response to perceived problems and without a proper strategic consideration of the pathway as a whole. There were currently seven different services in place, and so it was difficult for professionals or members of the public to understand the most appropriate route that people should follow through them to meet their specific needs.

The pathway redesign proposed in the report before Cabinet brought together the functions of the seven current services into two new services: the Urgent Response and Telecare Service; and the Hospital Discharge and Reablement Service.

The report described the alternative methods available for purchasing the services and Cabinet approved the service model and procurement approach for the Urgent Response and Telecare Service.

8. Care Home Fees 2016

(Cabinet 15 March 2016)

The services that care homes provide within Oxfordshire play an important role in helping to meet the needs of vulnerable adults. Oxfordshire County Council makes a significant investment in care home services on an annual basis and it is the largest single purchaser within the County.

Cabinet considered a report that described the process the Council had undertaken to review the amount it pays for care homes and gave agreement to the Target Banding Rates to be applied for 2016-17.

Cabinet Member: Children, Education & Families

9. New Arrangements for Oxfordshire County Council's Children's Services

(Cabinet, 23 February 2016)

The Cabinet had before it an overview report together with a series of three supporting reports covering:

- The outcome of public consultation regarding proposals for change to early help services, including, children's centres and early intervention hubs
- Proposals for the future shape of Education and Learning Services
- Proposals for future Safeguarding and Corporate Parenting Services
- Proposals for future Children's Social Care services.

Cabinet received the outcome of the consultation exercise on the future of early help services along with the proposed alternative arrangements for Children's Services as outlined in the Cabinet Advisory Group report of September 2015 along with recommendations from the Director of Children's Services regarding future organisational arrangements for Children's Social Care; approved the proposed arrangements for Safeguarding and Corporate Parenting Services and the arrangements for Education Services; and agreed to receive a further detailed report on the implementation of the proposed changes. In addition Cabinet agreed that the Director for Children, Education & Families provide a future meeting of Cabinet with detailed proposals as to how the additional and retained funding arrangements agreed at full Council on 16 February 2016 be best utilised.

10. Progress Report on Looked After Children and Those Leaving Care

(Cabinet, 23 February 2016)

The Cabinet considered (CA8) a report which reviewed the performance and outcomes of Looked After Children and Care Leavers since April 2014 and identified key challenges moving forward, particularly around understanding the causes for and then addressing the growth in the looked after population.

Cabinet agreed that further analysis of the child in need and child protection populations be undertaken to isolate more specific risk factors for care and

what constituted an effective intervention; that a multi-agency group be established to devise a county-wide strategy to respond to the growing challenges nationally of Unaccompanied Asylum Seekers and Refugee families; and the Placement Strategy Board be tasked with measuring the impact and cost savings of the Placement Strategy for reporting up to Cabinet.

Cabinet Member: Environment

11. Oxfordshire Minerals & Waste Development Scheme

(Cabinet, 26 January 2016)

The County Council must prepare and maintain a Minerals and Waste Development Scheme, setting out the programme for production of the Minerals and Waste Plan. The original Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Development Scheme came into effect in May 2005 and a number of revisions had been made since then, most recently in December 2014. The timetable for preparation of Part 1 of the Plan - the Core Strategy in the most recent revision was now out of date. In addition, a more specific timetable was needed for the preparation of Part 2 of the Plan - the Site Allocations Document. A further revision of the Development Scheme was therefore now required. Cabinet had before them a draft Scheme which they approved to have effect from 4 February 2016.

12. Compulsory Purchase Orders for Acquisition of Lands Required for Delivery of Schemes

(Cabinet, 26 January 2016)

The Council's Major Infrastructure Delivery Team is managing the delivery of a number of major highway improvement schemes. Some of these schemes require additional land to enable delivery of the proposed improvements which will reduce congestion, improve movement, access and safety and encourage use of sustainable transport.

Cabinet considered a report that detailed various schemes which are at an early stage of development, but which are considered, subject to approvals, to require additional land. The report requested the delegation by Cabinet to the Director of Environment and Economy in consultation with the Executive Cabinet member to exercise Compulsory Purchase powers for the purchase of land for these schemes, in the event that the land required cannot be purchased by negotiation.

Cabinet gave approval to the delegation in respect of the following schemes:

- Loop Farm, north Oxford (City Deal)
- London Road pedestrian / cycle bridge, Bicester (Local Growth Fund)
- Science Vale Cycle enhancement project (Local Growth Fund)
- Didcot, Northern Perimeter Road (phase 3)
- A34 Lodge Hill Interchange (southbound slip roads) –

- Access to Culham Science Centre, phase 1 – (B4015 to A415 link)
- Science Bridge, Didcot
- Worcester Street, Oxford City Centre
- Charbridge Lane level crossing, Bicester
- Network Rail Electrification – Steventon

13. Proposals on the Future of Subsidised Bus Services

(Cabinet, 15 March 2016)

Cabinet considered a report setting out the availability of bus usage data, and noted the limits of that data and that it did not impact upon the methodology of the decision made by Cabinet. Cabinet gave approval to seek comments from members of the public, from 16 March 2016 to 14 April 2016, in relation to that data and to receive a further report to review the responses received..

Cabinet Member: Finance

14. 2015/16 Financial Monitoring & Business Strategy Report

(Cabinet, 15 December 2015 and 23 February 2016)

Cabinet considered two reports that focussed on the management of the 2015/16 budget. Parts 1 and 2 included projections for revenue, reserves and balances. Capital Programme monitoring was included at Part 3.

In December parts 1 and 2 included projections as at the end of October 2015. Cabinet approved virement requests and the supplementary estimate of £0.6m relating to the cost of the Transport Safeguarding Assurance Framework project; Cabinet noted the Treasury Management lending list; in relation to reserves Cabinet approved the temporary use of Environment & Economy reserves and the transfer of £0.3m to a new Commercial Reserve to support the development of the Children, Education & Families trading arm and approved changes to the Capital Programme.

In February, 2016 Parts 1 and 2 included projections as at the end of December 2015. Cabinet noted the Treasury Management lending list; approved an increase of £0.935m for the A34 Milton Interchange scheme; approved the full budget of £11.165m for the Eastern Arc Phase 1: Access to Headington project and to proceed to detailed design; Noted the changes to the Capital Programme and approved the allocation of the un-ringfenced grant for Emergency Services Mobile Communications Programme to the Fire and Rescue Service.

IAN HUDSPETH

Leader of the Council

March 2016

This page is intentionally left blank

**AUDIT &
GOVERNANCE
COMMITTEE
ANNUAL REPORT
2015**

Contents

Section	Page
Chairman's Introduction	3
Role of the Audit and Governance Committee	4
Key Activities	5
Membership, Meetings & Attendance	10
Annex	
1 – Audit and Governance Committee Functions (extract from the Council's Constitution)	11
2 – Audit Working Group Terms of Reference	13

Chairman's Introduction

As the Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee I am very pleased to present this annual report which sets out the role of the Audit & Governance Committee, and summarises the work we have undertaken both as a Committee, and through the support of the Audit Working Group in 2015.

The Committee operates in accordance with the good practice guidance produced by the Chartered Institute of Public Finance Accountancy (CIPFA) in 2013.

The Committee continues to be well supported by Officers, providing a high standard of reports and presentations. In particular I should like to thank the Internal Audit and the External Audit teams.

I should like to take this opportunity to give my personal thanks to all the officers, Geoff Jones, Chairman of the Audit Working Group, my Vice Chairman Cllr Sandy Lovatt and without exception, all fellow Committee members who have contributed and supported the work of the Committee in such a meaningful and positive way throughout the past year.

COUNCILLOR DAVID WILMSHURST
Chairman, Audit & Governance Committee

Role of the Audit and Governance Committee

The Audit and Governance Committee operates in accordance with the “Audit Committees, Practical Guidance for Local Authorities” produced by the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) in 2013. The Guidance defines the purpose of an Audit Committee as follows:

1. Audit committees are a key component of an authority's governance framework. Their function is to provide an independent and high level resource to support good governance and strong public financial management.
2. The purpose of and Audit Committee is to provide to those charged with governance independent assurance on the adequacy of the risk management framework, the internal control environment and the integrity of the financial reporting and annual governance processes. By overseeing internal and external audit it makes an important contribution to ensuring that effective assurance arrangements are in place.

The key functions of the Audit and Governance Committee are defined within the Council's Constitution; the relevant extract is attached as Annex 1 to this report. In discharging these functions the Committee is supported by the Audit Working Group, their terms of reference are attached as Annex 2 to this report.

Key Activities

In this section the activities of the Committee in 2015, including the Audit Working Group, are summarised under the headings of the key functions.

Internal Control

The 2014/15 Annual Governance Statement was agreed by the Committee, and included six areas for action to improve existing governance arrangements. The Committee actively monitors progress with the implementation of these actions. The six key areas are:

Data Quality
Commercial Services Board
Business Continuity
Hampshire IBC Partnership for Finance and HR Services
Strategic Risk Register
Supported Transport for Children

In response to Internal Audit and Risk Management reports the Committee has looked in detail at the following areas:

CEF Transport
Residential and Home Support payments
Adult Social Care Client Charging
Adult Social Care new IT system
Direct Payments
Disposal of ICT Equipment
Hampshire Partnership

During 2015, the Committee continued receiving cyclical presentations from the "Corporate Leads" who monitor the adequacy and effectiveness of the key governance processes. During the presentations the Leads set out their framework for monitoring and reviewing the key system, and the assurance it provides.

The Committee receives regular progress reports from the Chief Internal Auditor, including summaries of the outcomes from Internal Audit work. Through the Audit Working Group, the Committee monitors the progress with the implementation of management actions arising from audit reports.

Key Areas of Focus in 2016

- Health and Social Care Integration;
- Hampshire Partnership;
- Major Programmes;

Risk Management

The Committee through the Audit Working Group has continued to undertake a cyclical review of the Directorate Risk Registers, and receive the quarterly risks management reports from the Chief Internal Auditor.

Overall the reports received have demonstrated the process for reporting and escalating risks is being maintained; however, it was noted several of the high risks escalated to CCMT appeared to have unachievable target dates for reducing the level of risk. The Committee has recommended to CCMT closer scrutiny and challenge on risk mitigation plans and target dates for reducing risks to acceptable levels.

The Corporate Risk Register has been updated and will be subject to regular review by the AWG during 2016.

A review of the Risk Management Strategy has been undertaken and this is due to be reported to the Committee in April 2016.

Key Areas of Focus in 2016

- Risk Management Strategy
- Corporate Risk Register

Internal Audit

We approved the Internal Audit Strategy for 2015/16, and the quarterly Internal Audit Plans, which gives members the opportunity to challenge and influence the plan where the Committee has identified areas of concern.

The reports of the Chief Internal Auditor to both the Audit and Governance Committee and also the Audit Working Group has enabled emerging issues arising from Internal Audit activity to be considered on a timely basis, including where appropriate working with the Senior Officers to seek assurance that matters are being dealt with promptly and effectively.

The annual review of the effectiveness of the system of internal audit, commissioned annually by the Committee will report in April 2016.

The Committee has continued to monitor the resourcing of Internal Audit, and was very pleased to note that from January 2016, the team is fully resourced. Based on the evidence of the reports presented to the AWG and the Committee, the team continues to provide an effective challenge and therefore assurance on the key risk activities.

During 2015, the Internal Audit structure was split to provide capacity for risk management and for the management of the assurance mapping process, focussing of the critical services across the Council. A compliance function has also

been developed. The Committee agreed with the revised structure, which is designed to provide a wider coverage and therefore provide the Committee with greater assurance that has previously been provided from the Internal Audit Service. The structure and the assurance mapping procedure have been developed in 2015/16, and are expected to be fully operational in 2016/17.

Key Areas of Focus in 2016

- **Embedding the assurance reporting procedure.**
- **Compliance Reviews**

External Audit

The Council's external auditors, Ernst and Young, attended all the committee meetings in 2015, providing regular updates on their work plan and any matters arising. In addition they have provided the Committee with sector updates for consideration that highlight key themes, issues and priorities for local government. These have been well received and are very helpful to the Committee.

The external auditors have an open invitation to attend the Audit Working Group. They do not routinely attend, but do receive all the papers.

The Committee also met with the external auditors in a private session and are satisfied they are free to carry out their duties without restrictions. We are also assured that if identified they would bring any material issues to the attention of the Committee.

Key Areas of Focus in 2016

- **Maintaining a strong working relationship with Ernst and Young**

Anti-Fraud and Corruption

The Audit Committee receives regular updates from the Chief Internal Auditor on any reported matters of suspected fraud, including investigations. In 2015 there have been several instances of potential minor fraud reported.

The Council is now working in collaboration with the Investigations Team in Oxford City Council who provides our counter-fraud service.

We received a report on Whistleblowing from the Monitoring Officer, that highlighted there have been very few cases. Overall the Council has a strong system of internal control so it is not unexpected there is very little fraud identified; however nationally statistics show that fraud is on the increase, so it is important that we all remain vigilant.

Key Areas of Focus in 2016

- **Fraud risk assessment**
- **National Fraud Initiative data matching**

Annual Accounts Process

The 2014/15 Accounts were prepared on time and presented to the Committee for comment. We received the External Auditors report in September 2015 when it was very pleased to note that high standards had been maintained with no material issues reported.

Key Areas of Focus in 2016

- **Hampshire IBC Partnership**

Treasury Management

The Committee receives reports from the Treasury Management Team three times a year, exercising its stewardship role. The Committee:

- Reviewed the Treasury Management Strategy;
- Received the mid-term performance report; and,
- Received the annual report.

There were no material issues to note.

The committee members attended an industry update briefing presented by Arlingclose in January 2016 covering new legislation and potential risks; to help inform the review of the 2016 Treasury Management Strategy.

Key Areas of Focus in 2016

- **Continued scrutiny over the Treasury Management process.**

Governance

Committee agreed the Annual Governance Statement 2014/15 that explained how the County Council had complied with the code of corporate governance.

During 2014/15 the Committee reviewed the Corporate Governance Framework and the Code of Corporate Governance; and, contributed to the governance and constitution review.

The Committee also received the following reports, the annual report of the Monitoring Officer; the annual report of the Local Government Ombudsman; the use of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (RIPA); and, the Fire and

Rescue Service Annual Statement of Assurance there were not material issues or concerns.

In December 2014, Council received a report from the Independent Remuneration Panel on councillors' allowances. During the debate on that item, Council endorsed the Panel's view that overcoming obstacles to wider democratic representation required solutions other than simply revised allowances. Council therefore asked this Committee to develop potential actions that this Council could take that might encourage a wider demographic representation from the May 2017 elections onwards. The Committee established a cross-party Councillor Profile Working Group comprising Councillors Hards, Bartholomew and Constance to consider overcoming the obstacles and the potential options which may encourage greater diversity of representation. The Group's findings, and recommendation to consider adopting several actions was agreed by the Committee at the meeting on 13 January 2016.

The Committee has not received any reports in respect of investigations into allegations of misconduct under members' code of conduct. The Committee has not granted any dispensations from requirements relating to interests as set out in the code of conduct for members.

The Committee is responsible for the work of the Appeals & Tribunals Sub-Committee a panel of members that is chaired by a member of the Audit & Governance Committee. They carry out a range of appeals and tribunals:

Type of appeal	Number in 2014-15
Member Appeals:	
• Appeal against dismissal	1
• Appeal against redundancy selection	1
• Raising concerns at work appeals	2
• Disciplinary and Capability appeals	0
Job Evaluation formal appeals	0
Home to School Transport Appeals	68 24 appeals upheld (wholly or in part) 28 appeals refused 16 appeals withdrawn

Membership, Meetings & Attendance

Audit and Governance Committee

The Audit and Governance Committee comprises of nine elected members representing the three main political parties and a Co-opted Member, Dr Geoff Jones.

The Audit Working Group, chaired by Dr Jones, comprises three elected members from the Committee, plus officers. Papers for the Audit Working Group are circulated in advance to all members of the Audit and Governance Committee. All members of the Committee can attend the working group meetings.

Officers

The Audit and Governance Committee continues to be well supported by Officers, providing reports either in accordance with the Committee's work programme, or at the request of the Committee. In 2015 the Chief Finance Officer, the Head of Law and Governance & Monitoring Officer, and the Chief Internal Auditor routinely attended the meetings. These same officers also attended the Audit Working Group meeting.

External Audit

The External Auditors, Ernst and Young, have attended all the Audit and Governance Committee meetings.

Meetings

The Audit and Governance Committee met six times in 2014 and the Audit Working Group met six times. Work programmes are used by both the Audit Committee and the Audit Working Group to ensure requirements of the Committee are fulfilled. The programmes are reviewed with officers at each meeting and added to when appropriate to ensure ad-hoc investigations instigated by the Committee are reported.

ANNEX 1 - Audit & Governance Committee Functions

The following are the functions of the Audit & Governance Committee extracted from the Constitution – Part 2 Article 8 Section 1(a).

- (1) The functions relating to elections specified in Section D of Schedule 1 to the Functions Regulations.
- (2) The functions in relation to the designation of particular officers for certain purposes specified in Paragraphs 39, 40, 43 and 44 in Section I of Schedule 1 to the Functions Regulations.
- (3) The functions in relation to the approval of the statement of accounts etc. specified in Paragraph 45 in Section I of Schedule 1 to the Functions Regulations including the Annual Governance Statement (including Statement on Internal Control).
- (4) To monitor the risk, control and governance arrangements within the Council, together with the adequacy of those arrangements and those of others managing Council resources:
 - to ensure compliance with relevant legislation, guidance, standards, codes and best practice, whether external or internal;
 - to provide assurance on the effectiveness of those arrangements both generally and for the purposes of the Annual Governance Statement, including arrangements for reporting significant risks; and
 - to ensure coordination between internal and external audit plans to maximise the use of resources available as part of a total controls assurance framework;and to draw to the attention of the appropriate scrutiny committee any issues which in the Committee's view would benefit from a scrutiny review or further investigation.
- (5) To consider and comment on the Council's External Auditor's annual work plan, the annual audit letter and any reports issued by the Audit Commission or the Council's External Auditor. Where issues affect the discharge of executive functions, to make recommendations as appropriate to the Cabinet, and where any issues affect the discharge of non-executive functions, to make recommendations to the appropriate Council Committee.
- (6) To systematically monitor:
 - the performance and effectiveness of Internal Audit Services processes within the Council, including undertaking an annual review using key performance indicators e.g. client satisfaction, percentage of plan completed, percentage of non-chargeable time;
 - the strategic Internal Audit Services Plan and annual work plan, advising on any changes required to ensure that statutory duties are fulfilled;
 - resourcing for the service, making recommendations to the Cabinet and Council on the budget for the service;

- arrangements for the prevention and detection of fraud and corruption; and
- the system for Treasury Management

and to draw to the attention of the appropriate scrutiny committee any issues which in the Committee's view would benefit from a scrutiny review or further investigation.

- (7) To promote high standards of conduct by councillors and co-opted members.
- (8) To grant dispensations to councillors and co-opted members from requirements relating to interests set out in the code of conduct for members.
- (9) To receive report from member-officer standards panels appointed to investigate allegations of misconduct under the members' code of conduct.
- (10) To advise the Council as to the adoption or revision of the members' code of conduct.
- (11) To implement the foregoing in accordance with a programme of work agreed by the Committee annually in advance, and to report to the Council on the Committee's performance in respect of that programme.
- (12) The Committee will appoint an Appeals & Tribunals Sub-Committee which will have the following responsibilities and membership:

Responsibilities:

- (i) The determination of appeals against decisions made by or on behalf of the authority as specified in Paragraph 2 of Schedule 2 to the Functions Regulations.
- (ii) To hear and determine appeals in cases where the relevant procedure rules require this function to be performed by a formally constituted committee or sub-committee.
- (iii) To hear and determine appeals in other cases under the relevant procedure rules.

Membership:

The Appeals & Tribunal Sub-Committee will meet as needed and its membership will be:

- (i) A member of the Audit & Governance Committee (or substitute)
- (ii) Two other members of the Council (one being a Cabinet member in the case of Fire Discipline issues)

ANNEX 2 - Audit Working Group Terms of Reference

Membership

The Audit Working Group shall comprise of:-

the independent member of the Audit and Governance Committee who will chair the Group, together with three members of the Audit and Governance Committee, one of whom shall be the Chairman of the Committee. There will also be up to three named members of the Audit and Governance Committee who will deputise as required.

The Chief Finance Officer, the Monitoring Officer and Head of Law and Governance, and the Chief Internal Auditor, or their representatives shall attend the Group meetings.

Members of the Group and their deputies should have suitable background and knowledge to be able to address satisfactorily the complex issues under consideration and should receive adequate training in the principles of audit, risk and control.

All members of the Audit and Governance Committee can attend Audit Working Group Meetings as observers.

Role

The Audit Working Group shall:

act as an informal working group of the Audit and Governance Committee in relation to audit, risk and control to enable the Committee to fulfil its responsibilities effectively in accordance with its terms of reference (Part 2 Article 8 Section 1a of the Constitution);

routinely undertake a programme of work as defined by the Audit and Governance Committee;

consider issues arising in detail as requested by the Audit and Governance Committee;

receive private briefings on any matters of concern;

at least annually hold a private session with the External Auditors not attended by any officers, and a further private session on Internal Audit matters with the Chief Internal Auditor only.

Reporting

The Chief Finance Officer will report to the Audit and Governance Committee on matters identified by the Group following consultation with the Chairman and members of the Group.

Meeting

The Group shall meet regularly in cycle with the Audit and Governance Committee.

The Group may invite any officer or member of the Council to attend its meetings to discuss a particular issue and may invite any representative of an external body or organisation as appropriate.

Confidentiality

The Group will meet in private to allow full and frank consideration of audit, risk and control issues.

All matters discussed and papers submitted for the meetings including minutes of the previous meeting must be treated as confidential. Papers will be circulated in advance to all members of the Audit and Governance Committee for information whether attending the Group or not.

Where any other member wishes to inspect any document considered by the Group and believes that s/he has a 'need to know' as a County Councillor, the procedure in the Council's Constitution relating to Members Rights and Responsibilities (Part 9.3) shall apply.

UpdatedFebruary 2015

Review Date.....February 2016

Officer Responsible Ian Dyson, Chief Internal Auditor
Telephone 01865 (32)3875
lan.dyson@oxfordshire.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Division(s): N/A

COUNCIL – 5 APRIL 2016

CONSTITUTION REVIEW

Report by the Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer

Introduction

1. Under the Constitution, the Monitoring Officer is required to monitor and review the operation of the Constitution to ensure that its aims, principles and requirements are given full effect. This includes making recommendations to Council on any necessary amendments. The Monitoring Officer is authorised to make any changes to the Constitution which are required to:
 - Comply with the law;
 - Give effect to the decisions of Council (or Cabinet, Committees etc.);
 - Correct errors and otherwise for accuracy or rectification.
2. Other changes will only be made by Full Council, following a recommendation of the Monitoring Officer.
3. This report seeks Council's approval to a potential amendment to a Council Procedure Rule. Full Council gave preliminary consideration to this at its meeting in December 2016 and asked that the Audit & Governance Committee give consideration to the proposal. The Committee did so at its meeting in January 2016 and expressed itself to be fully supportive of the change.

Amendment for clarity - treatment of motions

4. The Council Procedure Rules (Part 3.1 of the Constitution) govern how motions proposed at Full Council shall be handled. Rule 13.5.1 (ii)(a) sets out that in the case of a non-executive function, Full Council will (except at the February or budget-setting meeting) "debate and determine the motion" unless the motion if carried would lead to certain outcomes. One of these is that any such approved motion would "involve additional expenditure". It is considered that this is too restrictive as in one sense, any motion that asks envisages action being undertaken as a result will involve some additional expenditure and in theory could preclude many proposed motions.
5. It is therefore proposed that the wording be amended to say "additional **significant** expenditure". However, to do so immediately begs the question as to what 'significant' means. Following consultation with group leaders, it is suggested that a reasonable level for 'significant' would be £10,000. This would provide sufficient flexibility for motions below that threshold not to be 'ruled out' if challenged on the basis of current wording.

6. Full Council is therefore asked to approve the change in definition and to the financial level being £10,000.

Legal and procedural implications

7. There are no legal implications. The procedural/constitutional implications are outlined in the report.

RECOMMENDATION

8. **Council is RECOMMENDED to agree the proposed change to the Council Procedure Rules outlined at paragraph 5 of this report.**

NICK GRAHAM

Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer

Contact Officer: Glenn Watson 01865 815270

Background Papers: None

March 2016