



County Council

18 May 2021

Agenda

Declarations of Interest

The duty to declare.....

Under the Localism Act 2011 it is a criminal offence to

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

Whose Interests must be included?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

List of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests:

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

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

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

To: **Members of the County Council**

Notice of a Meeting of the County Council

Tuesday, 18 May 2021 at 10.00 am

Spiceball Leisure Centre, Banbury, Oxon



Yvonne Rees
Chief Executive

May 2021

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

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

AGENDA

- 1. Election of Chairman for the 2021/22 Council Year**
- 2. Election of Vice-Chairman for the 2021/22 Council Year**
- 3. Apologies for Absence**
- 4. 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.

5. Minutes (Pages 1 - 68)

To approve the minutes of the meetings held on 23 March 2021 and 7 April 2021 (CC5) and to receive information arising from them.

6. Constitution Changes To Reflect Return to Physical Meetings (Pages 69 - 72)

Report by the Director of Law & Governance (CC6)

The Government have confirmed that The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020 have not been extended to apply to meetings from 7 May onwards. These regulations have allowed the virtual meetings held in the past 12 months.

This report sets out for information proposed temporary changes to the Constitution necessary for the effective running of physical meetings during the restrictions brought about by the corona virus pandemic.

Council is RECOMMENDED to:

- (a) **Note the amendments to the Constitution that the Monitoring Officer has made to ensure the safe return to physical meeting whilst covid restrictions remain;**
- (b) **Agree that the Director of Law and Governance in consultation with the Chairman of the Council be authorised to make changes to the meetings process and, as necessary, the Constitution in the light of practical experience of meetings during covid restrictions and in the light of changing circumstances; and**
- (c) **That the position be reviewed before the Council meeting on 14 September 2021.**

7. Officer Scheme of Delegation

Report by the Monitoring Officer (CC7) **REPORT TO FOLLOW**

At its Annual Meeting, Council is required to agree the officer scheme of delegation within the Council's Constitution. The Scheme of Officer Delegation is contained in Part 7.2 of the Council's Constitution. The Scheme itself gives delegated authority to the Head of Paid Service, directors and other chief officers whose titles and/or areas of responsibility are set out in Part 2, Article 13 of the Constitution.

8. Appointments

Members are asked to:

- (a) elect the Leader of the Council;
- (b) note the names, addresses and electoral divisions of the people appointed to the Cabinet by the Leader of the Council for the coming year and their respective portfolios;
- (c) note the Office of the Leader of the Opposition.

At the conclusion of the Council's proceedings all members are asked to remain in their seats in the Council chamber while committees meet for the purpose of electing Chairman and Deputy Chairman.

9. Review of Political Balance (Pages 73 - 76)

Report by the Director of Law & Governance (CC9)

The report reviews the political balance on committees and appoints members to them. (ANNEXES TO FOLLOW).

Council is RECOMMENDED to:

- (a) ***to confirm the political balance on committees shown in Annex 2 to the report;***
- (b) ***to appoint to committees the councillors and co-opted members shown in Annex 3, subject to any changes reported at the meeting.***

APPOINTMENTS OF CHAIRMEN AND DEPUTY CHAIRMEN OF THE COMMITTEES

- *At the conclusion of the Council's proceedings all members are asked to remain in their seats in the Council Chamber while Committees meet for the purpose of electing their chairmen and deputy chairmen;*
- *The Monitoring Officer will ask the members on each committee to stand in turn and the relevant members are asked to stand/sit as appropriate:*
 - *Audit & Governance Committee (+ 3 sub-committees)*
 - *Planning & Regulation Committee*
 - *Remuneration*
 - *Education Scrutiny Committee*
 - *Performance Scrutiny Committee*
 - *Joint Health & Overview Scrutiny Committee*
- *The Monitoring Officer will seek nominations for Chairman;*
- *The Chairman of each Committee will seek nominations for Deputy Chairman.*

Pre-Meeting Briefing

There will be a pre-meeting briefing on **Monday 17 May 2021 at 12.15 pm** for the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Group Leaders and Deputy Group Leaders

This page is intentionally left blank

OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting held on Tuesday, 23 March 2021 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 3.20 pm.

Present:

Councillor Les Sibley – in the Chair

Councillors:

John Howson	Mike Fox-Davies	Charles Mathew
Sobia Afridi	Stefan Gawrysiak	Glynis Phillips
Jamila Begum Azad	Mark Gray	Susanna Pressel
Hannah Banfield	Carmen Griffiths	Laura Price
David Bartholomew	Pete Handley	Eddie Reeves
Dr Suzanne Bartington	Jane Hanna OBE	G.A. Reynolds
Tim Bearder	Jenny Hannaby	Judy Roberts
Maurice Billington	Neville F. Harris	Alison Rooke
Liz Brighthouse OBE	Steve Harrod	Dan Sames
Paul Buckley	Damian Haywood	Gill Sanders
Kevin Bulmer	Mrs Judith Heathcoat	John Sanders
Nick Carter	Hilary Hibbert-Biles	Emily Smith
Mark Cherry	Ian Hudspeth	Roz Smith
Dr Simon Clarke	Tony Ilott	Lawrie Stratford
Yvonne Constance OBE	Bob Johnston	Dr Pete Sudbury
Ian Corkin	Liz Leffman	Alan Thompson
Arash Fatemian	Lorraine Lindsay-Gale	Emma Turnbull
Neil Fawcett	Mark Lygo	Michael Waine
Ted Fenton	D. McIlveen	Liam Walker
Nicholas Field-Johnson	Kieron Mallon	Richard Webber
Mrs Anda Fitzgerald-O'Connor	Jeannette Matelot	

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.

7/21 MINUTES

(Agenda Item 1)

The minutes of the Meeting held on 9 February 2021 were approved and signed as an accurate record of the Meeting, subject to the following amendment:

Minute 90/21 – Councillors voting for the Motion ~~(60)~~ **(48)**.

8/21 OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS

(Agenda Item 4)

Council thanked staff for their ongoing commitment and hard work throughout the pandemic.

Council paid tribute to those members that would no longer be standing in the next election.

The Council held a Minute's silence at 12.00 noon to mark the National Day of Reflection to pause and reflect on the past 12 months and to pay tribute to all those who had died from COVID.

Council paid tribute and held a minute's silence in memory of former County Councillor Ray Jelf, Member for the Deddington Division 2002 – 2003, 2005 – 2009.

9/21 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda Item 6)

Council received the following Petitions and Public Address:

Petitions

Mr Mark Hull, presented a petition asking the Leader of Oxfordshire County Council to write to the Chair of Thames Water asking Thames Water to:

1. notify all relevant authorities of the locations where untreated sewage was expected to be released, in time for them to warn river users of the possible presence of human waste in the river.
2. commit to installing before 2030 sufficient treatment capacity for the needs expected then in all waters receiving Thames Water's wastewaters, so that all untreated sewage discharges cease by 2030.
3. support Oxford City Council's request that a location on the river Thames in Oxford receive Designated Bathing Water Status.

Mr Ruff presented a Petition requesting that Oxfordshire County Council give urgent and independent consideration to the following schemes to improve residents' parking, reduce traffic speeds, and make roads safer for residents, pedestrians, and cyclists. For the avoidance of doubt, there should be proper public consultation with residents on the design and timing of all schemes and Council officers should proceed with them as quickly as possible:

Residents' parking schemes:

1. Residents' parking schemes introduced – urgently – for the following roads (in alphabetical order) where properties do not already benefit from off-road parking: Beargarden Road Berrymoor Road Broughton Road Crouch Street Gilkes Yard Hornbeam Close Westbeech Court West Bar Street.

No cut-throughs, traffic calming, and active travel alternatives:

2. Safety measures at the Broughton-Bath Road junction to slow traffic and improve visibility, together with improved pedestrian crossings on West Bar Street for students and staff at Banbury College, and visitors to our GPs' and vets' surgeries;
3. The introduction of safer, segregated cycle ways across Banbury town centre with a view to better connecting residents to the town centre and train station; and
4. A 20 mph zone from Banbury Cross to Queensway including Bath Road, Beargarden Road, West Bar Street, Broughton Road, and Crouch Street to ensure greater safety for pedestrians and cyclists;
5. Re-routing bus services to avoid Bath Road given the easy access of bus stops on the Broughton and Warwick Roads already;
6. No cut-through restrictions and/or a properly planned one-way system on Bath Road and Crouch Street to end rat-running without disadvantaging residents;
7. Consideration of relocating any new residents' parking spaces on Beargarden Road to the opposite side to improve visibility for pedestrians and motorists.

Ms Lidia Arciszewska presented a petition of some 400 signatures requesting to reduce the speed limit, exclude aggregate lorry traffic and facilitate cycling on Lower Road, Long Hanborough.

Mr Charlie Maynard presented a Petition requesting that the Council commits to a feasibility study to define and protect a rail route along the A40 from Wolvercote junction to Witney, for this work to be completed by 2021 year-end and be included in the fifth Local Transport Plan. Additionally, if the application for a £50,000 grant from the DFT's Restoring Your Railways Ideas Fund was successful, they requested that the Council committed to providing £8,000 of the £16,667 of match-funding required to fund preparation of a Strategic Outline Business Case.

Public Address

Mr Jamie Hartzell spoke in support of the Motion by Councillor Susanna Pressel. He urged the Council to introduce the workplace parking levy in Jericho and Walton Manor, in order that there was the money to pay for the transport system that they needed and wanted – a system that reduced the attractiveness of commuting by car, and brought less congestion; less carbon emissions, less air pollution; safer streets; and an adequate, affordable public transport system so people could still easily get around - by bus, train, foot and bicycle.

He believed that the main employers in the area, Oxford University and Oxford University Press were already sympathetic to the workplace parking levy, and therefore should not prove hard to introduce.

Mr David Dickie spoke on behalf of 'Clean Air for Henley' in support of the Motion by Councillor Stefan Gawrysiak. He explained that Henley had become an Air Quality Management Area in 2003, and that 18 years later, it still suffered from Nitrogen Dioxide exceedances of the 40 micrograms per cubic metre legal limit. The latest severe example of this was the limit was exceeded 18 days out of the first 22 in December 2020 despite being in Covid times.

In August 2020 Henley had installed a particulate monitor to measure carbon particles mainly given off by diesel engines. New emerging medical research in many areas of the body showed that, as carbon particulates could not dissolve in the body, they were capable of inflicting even more damage to our health than NOx. The unreviewed particulate results indicated Henley was not meeting WHO guidelines. It had been acknowledged since 2003 that Henley's air pollution was almost entirely down to traffic. They were therefore very dependent on Oxfordshire County Council making decisions on traffic control. The 20-mph zone in Henley was a step in the right direction. Announcements in Bath and Oxford on eliminating high polluting vehicle were more substantial and welcome. For the sake of the lungs of the young children of Henley, he urged Council to pass the HGV restriction motion.

Ms Amanda Chumas spoke in support of the Motion by Councillor Stefan Gawrysiak. She referred to the substantial increase in the number of commercial vehicles using the road and particularly a dramatic increase in the number of HGVs. Because of their length, 13.6m (excluding the cab), the 44 tonners could not turn into New Street without swinging wide into the lane of oncoming traffic before turning – thereby bringing everything to a standstill.

The aggregate trucks, although not as long are very heavy when laden. They invariably flout the 20-mph speed limit and take the corner at speed, often with wheels clipping or riding over the pavement. As a consequence, the tarmac surface of the road on that corner is literally rutted with grooves that successive HGV wheels have made and the kerbstones and pavement are gouged and broken making it dangerous for pedestrians who cross at this point as it was a blind corner. The narrow pavements outside the Bull and Toy shop in Bell Street and in Thameside and the narrow foot path (strictly single file only) over the bridge were all equally dangerous.

motivated by section 1 (1) Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, she started a Campaign to prevent HGVs using Henley purely as a river crossing. Such trucks should be mandated to stay on the SRN. The Campaign's petition had attracted 2375 signatures online and another 390 had signed a hardcopy. In addition, they had built up a body of enthusiastic volunteers and a Campaign Organisation and were committed to see this through. She urged Council to support the resolution, so that they could start the necessary studies and initiate the TRO.

Mr Jamie Clarke, Parent at St Ebbes School, Oxford spoke in support of the Motion by Councillor Damian Haywood. He welcomed that Oxfordshire

County Council had embraced the idea of School Streets and encouraged a modal shift amongst school kids to walk and cycle to school. However, with just six schemes planned for the County as a whole (far less than the of the 48 schemes planned in Hackney, 12 in Birmingham and 14 in Calderdale) it was clear that without a clear time based plan with appropriate personnel capacity and budget to roll out further schemes, most children in Oxfordshire would continue to go without the benefits of a school street. They would instead continue to be subjected to dirty congested streets outside their school and having to dodge cars doing dangerous manoeuvres on a daily basis. He felt that Councillor Haywood's motion would change this by ensuring council officers had the time and resourcing to deliver a much needed second wave of Schools Streets. As the County Council itself recognised, the implementation of School Streets had never been more relevant, as it was known that School Streets worked and were popular. Their success had been independently verified by academic research by Edinburgh Napier University, which found in a 16 school study that School Streets resulted in a reduction in the number of motor vehicles, an increased use of active travel and improved road safety in areas with a school street.

Also, significantly, parents wanted them. In South Oxford where he lived the problems were acute. In a survey of local parents at St Ebbe's Primary School, 63% of parents supported a School Street with only 20% opposed. A similar survey at New Hinksey Primary School saw 86% support for the introduction of a scheme. They had however struggled to get a School Streets scheme set up over the last year, there simply hadn't been the staffing or resources to make it happen despite lots of school and parent willingness to support the schemes rollout. He urged Council to support the motion to turn the positive words into amazing actions for the children of Oxfordshire.

Ms April Jones, Parent at New Hinksey School spoke in support of the Motion by Councillor Damian Haywood. She had children at New Hinksey Primary School for 6 years. In that time, the school had been constantly trying to persuade parents not to drive right up to the school at drop off and pick up times. The school was on a narrow no through road, where manoeuvring was difficult and dangerous. Requests came regularly in the school newsletter, and governors had on occasion resorted to standing in the street in hi vis jackets and turning cars back.

Most parents who felt they had to drive complied cheerfully, and parked in the neighbourhood, walking the rest of the way. But even now, when social distancing requirements made cars around school even more dangerous, there were some people who continued to drive right up to the gates. She was unable to see them changing their behaviour without the formal structure of an official School Streets scheme. This was what the school needed to achieve safe surrounding streets - staff and governors did not have the time or resources to continually enforce it themselves.

She urged the Council to support the motion so that they could move away from being a car-based society to ensure the safety of children and protect them from dangerous traffic, air pollution, and from unhealthy inactive lifestyles.

Mr Tony Fox, local resident spoke in support of the Motion by Councillor Stefan Gawrysiak. He referred to the volume of HGV traffic and the noise, pollution and infrastructure-damaging vibration that emanated from the juggernauts in Henley, and the danger and inconvenience that pedestrians were subjected to. He further referred to the narrow pavements which made pedestrians feel vulnerable walking along with trucks passing within inches. He had sent more than 150 photographs to OCC over the last couple of months) which indicated how trucks had to mount pavements in order to negotiate streets that were totally unsuited to this form of transport. He had also included a map obtained from the OCC's own Freight Quality Partnership Lorry Route Map (produced in 2005 in collaboration with Halcrow) which clearly showed Henley as a town, .."unsuitable for through lorry traffic". On the same map "Lorry Routes for Through Traffic Movements" (A40, M40, M4, A34 and A404) were clearly marked along with "Routes for Local Access only" (including A4130 and A4074).

Comparisons had been drawn between Henley and the problems experienced by towns such as Burford where vehicle weight limits had led to increases in traffic in other villages by what is referred to as 'displacement'. This would not be the case if a similar ban were introduced for Henley. In fact, the smaller villages on the routes around Henley would benefit because the only reason for many of the HGVs to pass through them is to get to the Thames crossing. 44 Tonne long distance freight trucks and heavy aggregate trucks should be mandated to stay on the SRN which was built to take them. He urged the Council to support the Motion.

10/21 QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

(Agenda Item 7)

Mr Andrew Siantonas had given written notice of the following question to Councillor Yvonne Constance

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

Given the recent government announcement of £3 billion to invest on buses in England, what plans does the County Council have to ensure these people

again have access to public transport either by restoring the 17 bus or by providing other acceptable services.

Councillor Constance replied:

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

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

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

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

The following Supplementary Question was asked at the Meeting:

Thank you for your reply. I agree that Banbury Road is very well served with buses. However, many of the people who live 800 metres from the bus routes are in bungalows and flats designed for older people and people with physical difficulties which is why the 17 was so useful for them.

I recognise the challenging timetable in which to produce a comprehensive plan and that it is still early to make specific commitments, but can I ask if urban areas like Wolvercote and Summertown will be considered for enhanced service provision or will the focus be on rural areas?

Councillor Constance replied:

Thank you for your question. You draw attention to a very important problem, mostly in rural areas. There is a significant recognition by Government that funding is needed to be able to restore frequent and reliable transport systems. I cannot answer your question, but we are required to deliver the enhanced partnership by the end of June, and the fully developed plan on how we would spend our allocation from the National Bus Strategy money by October. However, your question is noted, and I will ensure that you are informed about the programme by October.

Mr Gregory O'Broin had given written notice of the following question to Councillor Yvonne Constance:

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

-

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

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

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

Councillor Constance replied:

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

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

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

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

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

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

The following Supplementary Question was asked at the Meeting:

We note the answers that have been provided and do not believe they fully address the matters raised. However, we will take our supplementary questions forward to a meeting with OCC officials later this week and therefore, we will not present them at this forum. Thank you for the opportunity."

11/21 QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

(Agenda Item 8)

37 questions with Notice were asked. Details of the questions and answers and supplementary questions and answers will be set out in the Annex to the minutes.

In relation to Question 6, Councillor Constance undertook to notify parish and town councils in advance of the works starting.

In relation to Question 7, Councillor Lindsay-Gale undertook to send Councillor Fenton a full list of schools which were significantly under roll for next year.

In relation to Question 12, Councillor Constance undertook to provide Councillor Bartington with a written answer in relation to point 5 of the written response and in particular what quality control was in place in terms of audit and implementation.

In relation to Question 13, Councillor Constance undertook to provide Councillor Bartington with a written answer as to whether there was any possibility of extending the timescale for Witney.

In relation to Question 21, Councillor Reeves gave an assurance (as far as he was able) to Councillor Fatemian that works would start on 10 May 2021 as planned.

12/21 REPORT OF THE CABINET

(Agenda Item 9)

Council received the report of the Cabinet.

In relation to paragraph 3 of the report (Question from Councillor Webber to Councillor Lindsay-Gale) Councillor Lindsay-Gale undertook to provide Councillor Webber with a written response with specific details about what

discussions Oxfordshire had to produce a settlement to remove the High Needs Block deficit.

In relation to paragraph 4 of the report (Question from Councillor Webber to Councillor Constance) Councillor Constance undertook to raise the issue of prioritising actions to address the Climate Emergency, by ensuring that the quantifying by best estimate all carbon generating activities as well as any ameliorating measures were given high prominence in the vision document, rather than in Appendix 2.

In relation to paragraph 8 of the report (Question from Councillor Hanna to Councillor Bartholomew) Councillor Bartholomew undertook to provide Councillor Hanna with a written response regarding the new Grove School and whether there was any risk that the Department of Education intervention would have a detrimental impact on the agreed timeline and delivery of the Grove Airfield School by 2023.

In relation to paragraph 8 of the report (Question from Councillor Phillips to Councillor Bartholomew) Councillor Bartholomew undertook to provide Councillor Phillips with a written response in relation to the Capital Programme Monitoring Report on the number of projects that had received an early warning notice which had incurred additional costs and whether they had exceeded the contingency budget.

13/21 GOVERNANCE REVIEW

(Agenda Item 10)

Under the Constitution, the Monitoring Officer was required to monitor and review the operation of the Constitution to ensure that its aims, principles and requirements were given full effect. This included making recommendations to Council on any necessary amendments. The Council had before it a report which sought the approval of one change. It further sought approval for a proposed way forward for reviewing the Constitution.

RESOLVED: (on a Motion from Councillor Nick Carter, seconded by Councillor Tony Ilot and carried nem con) to approve:

- (a) the proposed amendment (at paragraph 8) to bring the definition of a Key Decision into the main body of the text with the addition of consultation arrangements for Key Decisions taken by officers;
- (b) the proposal that the Monitoring Officer should bring forward proposals to the Audit & Governance Committee, after the May 2021 County Council elections, in the 4th cycle of the meetings for that Committee, for achieving a full review of the structure and content of the Constitution.

14/21 CHANGES TO CONSTITUTION OF THE PENSION FUND COMMITTEE

(Agenda Item 11)

As part of an Independent Governance Review of the Pension Fund, Hymans Robertson recommended changes to the constitution of the Pension Fund Committee. The main driver for the recommended changes was to improve the representation of Scheme Employers on the Fund, whilst maintaining the majority position of the County Council as the Administering Authority. This was consistent with best practice guidance from the LGPS Scheme Advisory Board. The changes also resulted in a reduction of 2 in the total membership which should facilitate ensuring all Committee members had the requisite skills and knowledge to undertake their responsibilities on the Committee and improve the effectiveness of the Committee. The Pension Fund Committee at its meeting supported the proposals and recommended that these should be in place before the formation of the new Pension Fund committee following the May elections. Council had before it a report which sought approval to the changes outlined above.

Councillor Kevin Bulmer moved and Councillor Nick File-Johnson seconded that the recommendations set out in the report and on the face of the agenda be adopted.

Following debate, the Motion was put to the vote and was carried by 46 votes to 14, with 2 abstentions.

RESOLVED: (by 46 votes to 14, with 2 abstentions) to agree the changes to the constitution of the Pension Fund Committee as follows:

- 5 County Council Representatives selected in accordance with the political balance of the Council. These would form the only voting members of the new Committee
- 2 Academy School Representatives – non-voting
- 1 Oxford Brookes University Representative – non-voting
- 1 District Council Representative – non-voting
- 1 Scheme Member Representative – non-voting.

15/21 HEALTH SCRUTINY ARRANGEMENTS FOR OXFORDSHIRE

(Agenda Item 12)

In 2020 both Oxfordshire Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Oxfordshire's Council approved in principle Terms of Reference for a new health overview scrutiny committee which would scrutinise system-wide health issues across the Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West (BOB) area.

Council had before it a report which sought approval of revisions to those Terms of Reference, which were proposed jointly at a meeting of HOSC Chairs and scrutiny officers in the relevant 5 BOB local authorities on 5

February 2021. The revised Terms of Reference were approved by the Oxfordshire Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 12 March 2021.

Councillor Arash Fatemian moved and Councillor Ian Hudspeth seconded that the recommendations set out in the report and on the face of the Agenda be adopted.

Following debate, the Motion was put to the vote and was carried by 48 votes to 13, with 2 abstentions.

RESOLVED: (by 48 votes to 13, with 2 abstentions) to approve:

- (a) the revisions to the draft Terms of Reference for a health scrutiny committee for health system-wide issues across the Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West (BOB) area;
- (b) a delegation from Council to enable the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Oxfordshire Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to make minor changes to the Terms of Reference after 23 March 2021 should other BOB councils request them as part of their own approval process.

16/21 INTERIM ARRANGEMENTS FOR TAKING EMERGENCY DECISIONS IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING THE COUNTY COUNCIL ELECTIONS

(Agenda Item 13)

Council had before it a report which sought approval to a temporary variation to the delegated powers of the Chief Executive to aid effective decision making in the period between the retirement of councillors following the elections in May and the Annual Council meeting on 18 May 2021.

RESOLVED: (on a Motion by Councillor Les Sibley, seconded by Councillor John Howson and carried nem con) to agree a temporary variation to Part 7.1 of the Constitution Specific Powers and Functions of Particular Officers with effect that from 10 May to 18 May 2021 paragraph 6.3 (c) is to be read as follows:-

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

17/21 MEMBERS CODE OF CONDUCT - DECISION NOTICE

(Agenda Item 14)

Council had before it a report which notified Full Council of a decision by the then Interim Monitoring Officer on the outcome of a Member Code of Conduct complaint, following the meeting of a Members' Advisory Panel in December last year.

RESOLVED: (on a Motion by Councillor Les Sibley, seconded by Councillor John Howson and carried nem con) to note the decision of the Interim Monitoring Officer with regard to a Members' Code of Conduct Complaint concerning Cllr Liam Walker.

18/21 MOTION BY COUNCILLOR DEBORAH MCILVEEN

(Agenda Item 15)

Councillor Deborah McIlveen moved and Councillor Mark Cherry seconded the following Motion:

“This Council notes that the National Domestic Abuse Helpline received over 40,000 calls and contacts during the first three months of the Covid-19 lockdown [BBC July 2020].

Domestic Violence is common and overwhelmingly impacts women and girls globally, nationally and in Oxford as well as children and men. Domestic violence impacts on workplaces and communities and is a significant cost to the public purse.

This Council recognises that:

- The Covid pandemic, lockdowns and restrictions make it more difficult for survivors to seek help;
- Local authorities have a duty of safety to their employees and residents using services and are working to stop domestic violence.

This Council resolves to:

- Review the Corporate Domestic Violence Policy that applies to service delivery and employment for Oxfordshire County Council, support implementation with training and monitor and review annually.
- Work with partner agencies, communities and trade unions to promote measures to increase the safety of those experiencing domestic violence.
- Provide information on how to help friends, family and colleagues experiencing domestic abuse.
- Campaign and lobby for increased sustainable funding from central government for organisations working with victims and survivors, especially services for BAME communities that are underfunded.”

During debate, in which several members gave emotional personal testimonies, seven members, by standing in their places requested that the vote be recorded in the Minutes (Council Procedure Rule 17.4.1). Accordingly, the Motion was put to the vote. Voting was as follows:

Councillors voting for the Motion (63):

Afridi, Azad, Banfield, Bartholomew, Bartington, Bearder, Billington, Brighthouse, Buckley, Bulmer, Carter, Cherry, Clarke, Constance, Corkin, Fawcett, Fatemian, Fenton, Field-Johnson, Fitzgerald O'Connor, Fox-

Davies, Gawrysiak, Gray, Griffiths, Handley, Hanna, Hannaby, Harris, Harrod, Haywood, Heathcoat, Hibbert-Biles, Howson, Hudspeth, Ilot, Johnston, Leffman, Lindsay-Gale, Lygo, Mallon, Matelot, Mathew, McIlveen, Phillips, Pressel, Price, Reeves, Reynolds, Roberts, Rooke, Sames, Gill Sanders, John Sanders, Sibley, Emily Smith, Roz Smith, Stratford, Sudbury, Thompson, Turnbull, Waine, Walker and Webber.

Councillors voting against the motion (0), Councillors abstaining (0).

RESOLVED: (unanimously):

This Council notes that the National Domestic Abuse Helpline received over 40,000 calls and contacts during the first three months of the Covid-19 lockdown [BBC July 2020].

Domestic Violence is common and overwhelmingly impacts women and girls globally, nationally and in Oxford as well as children and men. Domestic violence impacts on workplaces and communities and is a significant cost to the public purse.

This Council recognises that:

- The Covid pandemic, lockdowns and restrictions make it more difficult for survivors to seek help;
- Local authorities have a duty of safety to their employees and residents using services and are working to stop domestic violence.

This Council resolves to:

- Review the Corporate Domestic Violence Policy that applies to service delivery and employment for Oxfordshire County Council, support implementation with training and monitor and review annually.
- Work with partner agencies, communities and trade unions to promote measures to increase the safety of those experiencing domestic violence.
- Provide information on how to help friends, family and colleagues experiencing domestic abuse.
- Campaign and lobby for increased sustainable funding from central government for organisations working with victims and survivors, especially services for BAME communities that are underfunded.

19/21 MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE

(Agenda Item)

Following the Vote on the preceding item, Councillor Eddie Reeves indicated that he wished to move a procedural Motion (Council Procedure Rule 14.1.) to enable the Meeting to finish.

The Council adjourned for 10 minutes to allow the Chairman to seek advice from the Monitoring Officer. Following the adjournment, the Monitoring officer advised that to end the meeting Council Procedural Rule 14.1(x) (to suspend a specified Council Procedure Rule or part thereof) to suspend and

therefore alter the specified cut off time by which the meeting should conclude (i.e. by 3.30 p.m.) referred to in Council Procedure Rule (CPR) 5.1.(iii) would need to be moved, which would then in effect end the meeting and mean that the remaining business on the Agenda would be considered dropped in accordance with Council Procedural Rule 13.5.8.

Accordingly, Councillor Eddie Reeves moved and Councillor Damian Haywood seconded Council Procedural Rule 14.1(x) (to suspend a specified Council Procedure Rule or part thereof) to suspend and therefore alter the specified cut off time by which the meeting should conclude (i.e. by 3.30 p.m.) of the Meeting at Council Procedural Rule 5.1(iii).

The Motion was put to the vote and was agreed by 59 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

RESOLVED: (by 59 votes to 2, with 1 abstention) Council Procedural Rule 14.1(x) (to suspend a specified Council Procedure Rule or part thereof) to suspend and therefore alter the specified cut off time by which the meeting should conclude (i.e. by 3.30 p.m.) of the Meeting at Council Procedural Rule 5.1(iii).

20/21 MOTIONS BY COUNCILLORS: RICHARD WEBBER, EDDIE REEVES, STEFAN GAWRYSIAK, SUSANNA PRESSEL, DAMIAN HAYWOOD AND ARASH FATEMIAN
(Agenda Item 16)

Following the Motion without Notice, these Motions were considered dropped in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13.5.8.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing

This page is intentionally left blank

QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Questions	Answers
<p>1. COUNCILLOR MARK CHERRY</p> <p>I have usually reported streetlights faults inquiries in Banbury Ruscote via a FixMyStreet report, but in cases like Beaumaris Close and Lincoln Close, where Oxfordshire County Council, Cherwell District Council and then eventually Sanctuary Housing have taken ownership, will the Cabinet member for Highways Delivery look at totally overhauling the current adoption of streetlights system by Oxfordshire County Council? This is even more prevalent in wards like Banbury Ruscote with nearby housing developments like Banbury Rise Bloor homes housing developments.</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR EDDIE REEVES, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY DELIVERY</p> <p>If the member has specific suggestions for how the existing system can be improved, I would always welcome these. However, the highway adoptable street lighting cannot be separated from the rest of the highway assets and the adoption process must consider all aspect of the public highway i.e. Carriageway, footway, drainage, public utilities, landscaping and trees etc.</p> <p>The areas referred to are on existing or established roads, which have had private development built adjacent to them. The private development to which you refer are the responsibility of the landowner, developer or management company. The Developer or landowner must request the roads for adoption and the County Council must be satisfied that they can be adopted. (I am sure that all members would agree that we do not want to adopt highways that are of sub-standard quality where it is a developer's responsibility.) When adoption is processed, it is done so for the areas of highway in their entirety i.e. the footway, carriageway, drainage and street lighting.</p> <p>All Oxfordshire County Council streetlights have identification numbers and a County Council freephone sticker number attached. This helps to easily identify assets that are the County's responsibility. When reporting faults on FixMyStreet, these would be easily identifiable as all the streetlights, managed by Oxfordshire County Council, are on the mapping database.</p>
<p>2. COUNCILLOR KIERON MALLON</p> <p>Can the Leader of the Council tell me how many Liberal Democrat member's sit on the arc leadership executive?</p>	<p>COUCILLOR IAN HUDSPETH, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>I can confirm that as of present there are four Liberal Democrat Leaders who are part of the Arc Leadership Group (remembering that not all councils are part of this group) and three of those are currently members of the Arc Leadership Group Executive.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>3. COUNCILLOR SOBIA AFRIDI</p> <p>Following the recent serious flood incidents over Christmas and early February, residents across my division in South Oxford were adversely affected and are very anxious that the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme is started urgently. At present, commencement is dependent on the County Council completing work on the A423 Kennington Bridge. It was the survey of the bridge to accommodate the flood channel that uncovered the need for its replacement. The revised plan for a bridge with wider span between supports enables a better design for the culvert and, therefore, works are essential for the Flood Alleviations to be successful. Can the Cabinet tell me when this work on the bridge is going to start and provide assurance that they are doing all they can to ensure it does not slow progress on flood prevention in our area?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>The County Council is working closely with the Environment Agency due to the relationship between the Kennington Bridge works and the Oxford Flood Alleviation scheme. Both organisations are progressing the projects through the normal stages related to such large-scale infrastructure improvements. The County Council is nearing completion of the Preliminary Design Stage of the project. Detailed Design will follow this with construction expected early 2023 through to early 2026. The projects are both very complex and require a variety of steps and approvals along the way. The project teams are progressing the project as quickly as is sensible.</p>
<p>4. COUNCILLOR MARK CHERRY</p> <p>You will note the recent speed limit changes on the A422 Stratford Road by the entrance to Bloor Homes housing developments from 40MPH to 30MPH. In essence, what the residents of trinity close need is a 20MPH speed limit and signage from the entrance to the traffic lights on Warwick Road. This would make it safer for North Oxfordshire Academy school and the environment.</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR EDDIE REEVES, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY DELIVERY</p> <p>Thank you for the question and for bringing this to my attention. I acknowledge the need for a reduction in speed on the A422 Stratford Road past the North Oxfordshire Academy School as well as a reduction in speed limits in certain areas in Banbury, including in my own division, and Cllr Mallon's, which have a high concentration of schools.</p> <p>As well as welcome additional investment in the Budget to progress 20 mph zones, individual schemes can progress more quickly if there is local funding for</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>Can the Cabinet Member look into a timescale for facilitating a 20MPH speed limit including signage, noting that Banbury Ruscote lost out on Active Travel funding in 2020?</p>	<p>them, whether from Councillors' Priority Fund monies or other funding pots.</p> <p>In general, the following steps are required to be followed to progress a 20-mph scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check that 20mph is acceptable from a transport planning / place perspective • Undertake speed surveys to understand compliance of existing speed limit and level of measures likely to be required for 20mph • Feasibility work to identify measures to ensure self-enforcement of 20mph • Local engagement, co-design and buy-in from the local community, including informal consultation • Formal consultation of TROs • Report and decision at Cabinet Member Decision meeting • Detailed design of measures if approved • Implementation of scheme <p>A strategy for introducing 20mph across the county will be formulated as part of the Local Transport & Connectivity Plan and officers from the Infrastructure Locality Team can help to investigate any opportunities for third party funding to progress a scheme on the A422 more quickly.</p>
<p>5. COUNCILLOR KIERON MALLON</p> <p>How many miles of road is this Council responsible for and how many potholes and defects were repaired across Oxfordshire last year?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR EDDIE REEVES, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY DELIVERY</p> <p>We are responsible for 4973km (3090m) of roads in the County. On top of this, we also maintain 2600km (1616m) of Public Rights of Way.</p> <p>Below is a breakdown of the potholes and overall defects repaired in the last Financial Year. As we are so close to year end – we've also included this years' numbers for information.</p> <p>As we are near the end of the current financial year, I have included data for both the current and previous years.</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>Last financial year (2019 Apr-2020 Mar) we repaired 42,198 safety defects of which 32,823 where carriageway pothole repairs</p> <p>So far this year (2020 Apr -2021 Mar) we have repaired 41,704 safety defects of which 30,412 where carriageway pothole repairs.</p>
<p>6. COUNCILLOR HILARY HIBBERT-BILES</p> <p>Can the Cabinet member update the Council on the Park and Charge scheme generally and, more particularly, can she tell us how many EV charging points it will consist of and how many Council car parks will benefit from the scheme?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>The Park and Charge project is targeted at car parks where there is a need to support local residents who don't have access to off-road parking and are unable to install their own charger. Working with district council colleagues, the sites have been selected that best meet where this need is highest. The chargers will be available for use by local residents overnight to provide a reliable and reasonably priced charging system as well as providing EV charging to the general car park user during the day. The project is funded by Innovate UK and we are working with a number of commercial partners to deliver this.</p> <p>The project is progressing well and the first (pilot) car park in Bicester is planned to open towards the end of April 2021. This will be a soft launch to start with a more formal, public launch to take place during May. After this the remaining planned car parks are due for charge point installations between June and December this year.</p> <p>Overall, the plans are that 24 car parks across Oxfordshire will benefit from the installation of charge points with 140, twin socket charge points being installed in total (280 EV car parking spaces).</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>I just hope that Councillor Constance will notify the Town and Borough Town Councils when this work will be done in advance so that they can let the local residents know.</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Yes, certainly the commitment has been made by West Oxfordshire District Council and they have allocated the car parks that will get EV charging. We will make sure to let them know.</p>
<p>7. COUNCILLOR TED FENTON</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member tell me how many parents and children were offered their first preference of a secondary school place for September 2021?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LINDSAY-GALE, CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION & CULTURAL SERVICES</p> <p>I can confirm that 6,321 Oxfordshire children were offered a first preference school on 1 March 2021. This represents almost 9 in 10 of Oxfordshire children in secondary transfer.</p>
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Does she know how many of our secondary schools are significantly under-rolled for the coming year?</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Thank you, Councillor Fenton, yes, I know how many schools have spare places. It is 13 which is not many. I can send you a full list of the exact numbers and if there are other Councillors who are interested, I send a link to everybody.</p>
<p>8. COUNCILLOR ANDA FITZGERALD-O'CONNOR</p> <p>How does Oxfordshire perform in terms of recycling rates relative to other counties in England and what percentage of household waste was recycled in Oxfordshire last year?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) is a Waste Disposal Authority (WDA). The District and City councils are responsible for collection of household waste (Waste Collection Authorities WCA's) and the county is responsible for disposing of it. OCC are also responsible for the provision of Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs) across the county.</p> <p>As a WDA, we are responsible for the submission of data to the Environment Agency, and the recycling rates that we report are countywide figures, incorporating data from all the WCAs, as well as the HWRCs.</p>

Questions	Answers												
	<p>OCC has had the highest County Council Waste Disposal Authority recycling rate for 7 years running. In 2019/20 (the last full set of data available). Oxfordshire recycled 58.8% of household waste. The national average was 45.5%. The top 5 WDAs are detailed below.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="913 435 1989 895"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="913 435 1543 512">Waste Disposal Authority</th> <th data-bbox="1543 435 1989 512">Recycling, Composting and Reuse Rate 2019/20</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="913 512 1543 588">Oxfordshire County Council</td> <td data-bbox="1543 512 1989 588">58.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="913 588 1543 665">Devon County Council</td> <td data-bbox="1543 588 1989 665">56.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="913 665 1543 742">Surrey County Council</td> <td data-bbox="1543 665 1989 742">56.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="913 742 1543 818">Cambridgeshire County Council</td> <td data-bbox="1543 742 1989 818">55.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="913 818 1543 895">Buckinghamshire County Council</td> <td data-bbox="1543 818 1989 895">53.9%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>While we are pleased with these figures, we know we can do better. Around half the residual (general waste bin) could have been recycled using our current systems. If all this was recycled, we could have a recycling rate of around 80% and save around £2million/year. We are working with residents encourage them to recycle more of their waste and have developed the waste wizard to help them identify which bin to use, or where they can donate the item (www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/wastewizard).</p> <p>As well as recycling a good proportion of our waste, residents are also very good at not producing it in the first place. For several years we have had amongst the lowest County Council kg/head household waste figures. (While we are ranked 8 amongst WDAs, we are not directly comparable with urban authorities – Oxfordshire’s rural nature means we have a lot of garden waste that adds to our figures, and therefore are 3rd when looking at County Council WDAs).</p>	Waste Disposal Authority	Recycling, Composting and Reuse Rate 2019/20	Oxfordshire County Council	58.8%	Devon County Council	56.6%	Surrey County Council	56.0%	Cambridgeshire County Council	55.4%	Buckinghamshire County Council	53.9%
Waste Disposal Authority	Recycling, Composting and Reuse Rate 2019/20												
Oxfordshire County Council	58.8%												
Devon County Council	56.6%												
Surrey County Council	56.0%												
Cambridgeshire County Council	55.4%												
Buckinghamshire County Council	53.9%												

Questions	Answers																						
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="913 252 1541 363">Waste Disposal Authority</th> <th data-bbox="1541 252 1986 363">Household waste collection (kg/head) 2019/20</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="913 363 1541 403">Western Riverside Waste Authority</td> <td data-bbox="1541 363 1986 403">282.49</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="913 403 1541 443">North London Waste Authority</td> <td data-bbox="1541 403 1986 443">325.32</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="913 443 1541 483">West London Waste Authority</td> <td data-bbox="1541 443 1986 483">326.90</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="913 483 1541 523">East London Waste Authority</td> <td data-bbox="1541 483 1986 523">365.44</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="913 523 1541 563">Hertfordshire County Council</td> <td data-bbox="1541 523 1986 563">403.08</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="913 563 1541 603">Greater Manchester WDA (MBC)</td> <td data-bbox="1541 563 1986 603">405.81</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="913 603 1541 643">Buckinghamshire County Council</td> <td data-bbox="1541 603 1986 643">410.69</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="913 643 1541 683">Oxfordshire County Council</td> <td data-bbox="1541 643 1986 683">414.51</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="913 683 1541 722">Kent County Council</td> <td data-bbox="1541 683 1986 722">425.84</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="913 722 1541 762">Surrey County Council</td> <td data-bbox="1541 722 1986 762">426.24</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Waste Disposal Authority	Household waste collection (kg/head) 2019/20	Western Riverside Waste Authority	282.49	North London Waste Authority	325.32	West London Waste Authority	326.90	East London Waste Authority	365.44	Hertfordshire County Council	403.08	Greater Manchester WDA (MBC)	405.81	Buckinghamshire County Council	410.69	Oxfordshire County Council	414.51	Kent County Council	425.84	Surrey County Council	426.24
Waste Disposal Authority	Household waste collection (kg/head) 2019/20																						
Western Riverside Waste Authority	282.49																						
North London Waste Authority	325.32																						
West London Waste Authority	326.90																						
East London Waste Authority	365.44																						
Hertfordshire County Council	403.08																						
Greater Manchester WDA (MBC)	405.81																						
Buckinghamshire County Council	410.69																						
Oxfordshire County Council	414.51																						
Kent County Council	425.84																						
Surrey County Council	426.24																						
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Thank you for your comprehensive reply, but I would like to know what impact did lockdown 2020 have on waste and recycling management?</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>The figure that I have from officers is, (and I don't think it is for the whole period of course only up to December where we have records) Recycling increased by 8%, so considering that the tips were largely closed it does indicate that living at home, eating at home, gardening at home does produce a quite considerable increase in recycling and it demonstrates the great need for local recycling centres.</p>																						
<p>9. COUNCILLOR PETE HANDLEY</p> <p>The Corporate Plan noted by members last month refers to there being, at least, 18,071 carers in Oxfordshire and there being difficulties in recruiting and retaining staff owing to the high cost of living locally. Does the Cabinet member agree with me</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LAWRIE STRATFORD, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE & PUBLIC HEALTH</p> <p>Thank you for the question, recruiting and retaining high quality staff is extremely important for us in Oxfordshire. We are doing some great work with OCPA in recruiting staff and I agree with you that increasing the number of key worker housing opportunities is part of the response. We are working closely with planners and developers to maximise this.</p>																						

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

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

Questions	Answers																														
	<p>for the future of traffic management systems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supporting international opportunities: through collaboration with the Department of International Trade, other local authorities and trade organisations, iHub staff regularly represent the UK as best practice in innovation and have contributed in developing the reputation of Oxfordshire as a key destination for new technology developments and building partnerships across the globe, for example with the Barcelona Smart Cities and Data teams. <p>This is only a summary of the projects being delivered and moving forward Llewelyn Morgan (Head of Innovation) and the team will provide more updates. In the meantime the Oxfordshire County Council Innovation HUB 2020 Brochure can be accessed here: https://issuu.com/occihub/docs/occ_ihub_2020_q4</p>																														
<p>11. COUNCILLOR KIERON MALLON</p> <p>What is the average cost of a repair broken down by the various methods employed by the Council's contractor and how are we working with our contractor to drive down unit costs and improve the duration of each repair?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR EDDIE REEVES, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY DELIVERY</p> <p>The table below provides as summary of the average of the different defect repair costs.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="913 954 2063 1268"> <thead> <tr> <th>Repair Types</th> <th>2019-20 No. Defect Repair (Actuals)</th> <th>% Defect Repair</th> <th>2019-20 Repair Cost (Actuals)</th> <th>% Repair Cost</th> <th>Average Cost per Defect</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Non-cut repair</td> <td>15,095</td> <td>30%</td> <td>£ 943,058</td> <td>25.4%</td> <td>£ 63</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Cut repair</td> <td>14,972</td> <td>30%</td> <td>£1,503,846</td> <td>40.5%</td> <td>£100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Dragon Patch</td> <td>20,081</td> <td>40%</td> <td>£1,266,802</td> <td>34.1%</td> <td>£ 63</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTALS</td> <td>50,148</td> <td></td> <td>£3,713,706</td> <td></td> <td>£74.05</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Each repair method has a slightly different application, and this is explained.</p>	Repair Types	2019-20 No. Defect Repair (Actuals)	% Defect Repair	2019-20 Repair Cost (Actuals)	% Repair Cost	Average Cost per Defect	1. Non-cut repair	15,095	30%	£ 943,058	25.4%	£ 63	2. Cut repair	14,972	30%	£1,503,846	40.5%	£100	3. Dragon Patch	20,081	40%	£1,266,802	34.1%	£ 63	TOTALS	50,148		£3,713,706		£74.05
Repair Types	2019-20 No. Defect Repair (Actuals)	% Defect Repair	2019-20 Repair Cost (Actuals)	% Repair Cost	Average Cost per Defect																										
1. Non-cut repair	15,095	30%	£ 943,058	25.4%	£ 63																										
2. Cut repair	14,972	30%	£1,503,846	40.5%	£100																										
3. Dragon Patch	20,081	40%	£1,266,802	34.1%	£ 63																										
TOTALS	50,148		£3,713,706		£74.05																										

Questions	Answers
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="907 252 2063 435">1. Non-cut Pothole Repair A Non-cut Pothole repair is the simplest pothole repair method. The affected area is swept clean and bonded before new material applied to the hole. If the extent of the deterioration is limited to within the pothole, and there are no underlying structural issues, this type of repair can last as long as any other.<li data-bbox="907 475 2051 659">2. Cut Repair A square/rectangle is saw cut around the pothole with the material excavated and removed. A full depth repair is then made. This is more durable than a non-cut repair, however, there is no advantage where the defect is limited to the surface layers only within a pothole.<li data-bbox="907 699 2063 954">3. Dragon Patch A Dragon Patch tends to be used on more rural parts of the network. It is used along a predetermined route to maximum output of the machine and deliver value for money. The Dragon Patcher not only repairs potholes and failed areas but is also applied to the areas around a pothole which are about to fail, or defects which are likely to form potholes (preventative maintenance as opposed to solely reactive). <p data-bbox="907 994 2063 1137">We are committed to driving down the costs of repairing defects and are currently undertaking a full defect review which considers policies, process, scheduling and repair methods. It is anticipated that this will not only reduce costs but will also increase efficiency and customer satisfaction.</p> <p data-bbox="907 1177 2074 1281">This year we have proactively increased the number of 'cut' defect repairs undertaken rather than defaulting to 'non-cut' and have already noticed a reduction complaints and concerns.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>12. COUNCILLOR SUZANNE BARTINGTON</p> <p>At November 2018 Full Council, members voted unanimously in support of a cycling motion which included six strategic active travel commitments for Oxfordshire. Since that time national Govt has increased commitment to active travel spending, including most recently the Emergency Active Travel Schemes and achieving modal shift to active travel for short trips is a key Council policy priority. However recent capital schemes whilst welcome in principle have frequently failed to adhere to best practice design standards at implementation phase which risks negating the intended outcomes. Please could a progress update be provided specifically on point (v) of the relevant motion - 'Establish a framework to oversee quality control of all active travel infrastructure projects in accordance with the Oxford Cycling Design Standards, from inception through planning to implementation, ensuring all proposals are audited for safety and encouragement of active travel'.</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>The Active Travel Hub (ATH) was established in 2020 with the role of accelerating our promotion of active travel, developing and influencing policy, and bringing forward plans for projects that will see a step increase in the levels of walking and cycling. The Oxfordshire Streets Design Guide is nearing completion with the finalised version anticipated to be presented to Cabinet for approval in May 21. The ATH is currently developing an update of both the Oxfordshire Walking Design Standards (OWDS) and Oxfordshire Cycling Design Standards (OCDS) which is set out as an ATH priority for 2021/2. Within the review of current standards, we also intend to review current OCC processes and procedures to ensure that all new proposals meet OWDS and OCDS from first inception to delivery.</p> <p>Regarding our capital programme delivery, we acknowledge to date that we may not have met all of OCC's standards but are now addressing this through using the guidance/identified above and aligning our designs to the Government Circular LTN1/20 where possible. We are ensuring that our designers are trained in Oxfordshire Wide Walking and Cycling Standards.</p>
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Thank you, Councillor Constance for your response. It is over 2 years since we agreed this cycling motion and it is important that all elements are delivered. In relation to point 5, your answer refers to quality control of the scheme, but I want to understand what is happening to ensure audit of</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>The only answer I can give you is that I will enquire and let you know.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>implementation? because we have seen numerous instances where these schemes have failed at implementation stage.</p>	
<p>13. COUNCILLOR SUZANNE BARTINGTON</p> <p>Investment in Emergency Active Travel schemes in Bicester and Witney are welcome, however the Witney scheme has multiple challenges arising from the deadline for expenditure of funds due to the OxLEP source which is a barrier to undergoing a full design process in accordance with LTN 120, including overcoming issues with land permissions and ensuring overall scheme quality. Please could the Cabinet Member clarify why DfT funding (with a longer timescale) was allocated to Oxford components only?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>The total value of the OCC DfT Active T2 submission was approximately £4.5m, the total amount awarded was £2.9m (125% of the original allocation). Prior to DfT award Officers were not confident that OCC would receive the full £4.5m and so sought to identify opportunities for additional funding to help close any shortfall. Consequently, officers were successful in realising an award of £1.4m capital funding from OXLEP on the premise that it would be spent/allocated fully by the end of March 21. The Bicester and Witney schemes were more advanced in their development and with greater assurances that they could be delivered within the financial envelope and required timescales, the decision was made that these should progress using the LEP funds.</p> <p>Subsequently, the £2.9m DfT funding was awarded and is being used to deliver both the Oxford Active Travel capital programme and complementary measures including cycling and activation programmes across Oxford, Bicester and Witney (in line with DfT requirements). It should be noted that the extended timescales for DfT funded schemes did not materialise until later due to recognition of delayed notification and the need for extensive consultation was identified.</p>
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Yes, thank you Councillor Constance for clarifying the difference in funding streams for the Active Travel tranche 2 in Oxford, Bicester and Witney, specifically now that the Witney scheme is clearly LEP funded. Is there any possibility of extending the timescale for consultation to achieve the March</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>The information that I have from officers is that the OxLEP scheme is probably most time limited now so that the Witney funding must be completed. The Department has agreed to some delay in the delivery of the Active Travel Funding, but I don't see that is an opportunity for LEP funding. I will enquiry and let you know.</p>

Questions	Answers
deadline?	
<p>14. COUNCILLOR SUZANNE BARTINGTON</p> <p>At November 2020 Full Council members unanimously agreed to a six-point plan for increasing tree cover in Oxfordshire. Please could an update be provided on progress towards delivering this motion, specifically whether a doubling of tree cover by 2045 has now been considered in terms of viability and whether progress has been made towards a Trees and Woodland Strategy?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recognise the critical role of existing tree preservation and planting for effective climate action and consider developing a Trees and Woodland Strategy. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The current tree policy (attached) highlights how we manage the County Council's trees and how we try to preserve them. Options for developing a Tree and Woodland Strategy are currently being considered. 2. Set a target for increased tree cover in Oxfordshire, and explore the viability of doubling coverage by 2045 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. This has not been addressed because there is no specific funding to replace trees that have been removed. There are opportunities to increase canopy cover using planning policy on new developments and funding opportunities for private landowners to create new woodland. Planting trees on the OCC estate and highway networks does increase maintenance costs and therefore funding for tree planting must take into account future maintenance costs. 3. Undertake a survey to identify existing tree cover and suitable sites for new trees (with consideration for habitat protection, land-use and biodiversity) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. We are working towards a large data capture exercise as part of our new four-year cyclical inspection programme for Highway trees. Combining our new tree management software with other data sets available to OCC should enable OCC to create a priority planting map to target areas of low canopy cover; air quality/pollution; social deprivation; schools; and population

Questions	Answers
	<p>densities.</p> <p>4. Work collaboratively with District, Town and Parish Councils, civic and commercial partners to deliver tree planting initiatives, considering maintenance responsibilities.</p> <p>a. Not currently progressing this but may be able to in future relating to the new Local Authority Tree Planting Fund.</p> <p>5. Influence developer schemes to ensure tree planting is undertaken, supported by relevant planning agreement contributions.</p> <p>a. This is a focus for District Councils as the Local Planning Authority. More Oxfordshire County Council resources would be required, in terms of staff, in order to provide better early engagement to enable clear ambitions for developments and clear directions for developers who would like the County to adopt new tree lined roads.</p> <p>6. Write to the SoS for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs to request additional local authority funding to support tree-planting and maintenance.”</p> <p>a. See point 4.</p>
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>This is regarding the trees ambition, particularly with regard to doubling tree cover in Oxfordshire by 2045, which I was really hoping as an authority we would buy into as an ambition, particularly giving our Net-Zero commitment and progress in that regard. So, I just wanted to clarify will funding be sorted to enable that and will that ambition be</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>We have made it clear right through this ambition for tree planting that it will not be a commitment made by the County. But we are certainly expecting and requiring where we can, developers to increase tree planting and where we have an opportunity to do so we are placing trees that a removed, we are maintaining trees, there is a new focus on tree planting and tree management but at the moment there is no funding to do a major tree planting operation. Parish Councils are being encouraged both by ourselves and the Woodland Trust and I have seen</p>

Questions	Answers
explored?	a number of parish schemes that are rolling through effectively and planting and adopting trees in and around parishes which might be a very good way to extend the tree planting scheme in Oxfordshire.
<p>15. COUNCILLOR CHARLES MATHEW</p> <p>OCC announced in 2018/19 its intention to introduce a zero-emission zone in Oxford City, which would be the first totally zero zone in <i>any</i> UK city: will the Cabinet Member report on any progress on this project which was stalled by lockdown in 2020?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>Proposals for a Zero Emission Zone (ZEZ) in Oxford form part of the current Local Transport Plan. The ZEZ is to be rolled out in phases, starting in August 2021 with the creation of a ZEZ Pilot in a small area of Oxford city centre (previously referred to as the Red Zone). This would make Oxford one of the first places in Britain to introduce a ZEZ. The intention is to then introduce the full Zero Emission Zone (previously referred to as the Green Zone) in spring 2022, subject to the outcomes of a separate consultation on the full zone.</p> <p>An informal consultation on the previous (Red Zone) proposals took place during January 2020 and a formal consultation had been planned for March 2020, but this was postponed due to Covid-19. It was picked up again at the end of last year when ZEZ Pilot proposals were published as part of a period of formal consultation on the scheme between November 2020 and January 2021. The ZEZ Pilot scheme was approved for implementation at the Cabinet meeting on 16 March 2021.</p> <p>The Pilot scheme will operate via a road charging scheme with a range of discounts proposed including for residents and businesses in the Pilot area, Blue Badge holders, care and health workers' vehicles and for students arriving/leaving at the beginning and end of university term.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>When will this pilot be in the rest of Oxford City and the other major candidates?</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>The pilot scheme will go live in August this year and we will extend it, once we have established how the charging works, how the enforcement works, how the exemptions work which is the point of the pilot. We plan to extend it to the whole of Central Oxford, the Green Zone in the original mapping of our ambitions in this scheme. We intend to extend it by Spring next year.</p>
<p>16. COUNCILLOR PETE HANDLEY</p> <p>How many adults with learning difficulties and people aged 65+ are supported by adult social care and does the Cabinet member agree with me that we must do everything we can to make adult social care an attractive and sustainable long-term career?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LAWRIE STRATFORD, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE & PUBLIC HEALTH</p> <p>At the 1st March 2021 this council was supporting 1681 adults with a learning disability with on-going care and 3494 older people. We additionally support 909 people with a physical disability or mental health problem.</p> <p>Supporting our most vulnerable citizens is a primary responsibility of the council and its therefore imperative that we do everything to recognise and value the role staff providing the support ply. I would like to go on record in saying how grateful I am to all the staff working across Oxfordshire in Social Care, you do a wonderful job each and every day and we are extremely grateful.</p>
<p>17. COUNCILLOR NICK CARTER</p> <p>Can the cabinet member update on plans for achieving ultrafast full fibre broadband in our market towns?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR IAN CORKIN, CABINET MEMBER FOR COUNCIL BUSINESS & PARTNERSHIPS</p> <p>As you may be aware, the current focus of government intervention schemes is the final 20% (F20) of premises in the hardest to reach rural areas. Our market towns do not fall into this definition and are therefore excluded from these schemes. This is generally because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The vast majority of residents already have superfast speeds available. As a consequence, current Department of Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) programme rules exclude them as they are not considered F20.

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

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

Questions	Answers
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Thank you Councillor Corkin for a very full answer. You may be aware that I was the Cabinet Member responsible when the County launched its broadband programme, so I am delighted to note the successful conclusion of the programme. My supplementary question is will he be kind enough to pass on my warmest congratulations to Craig Bower and his team whose work has never been anything less than usually impressive.</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Yes, Councillor Carter I certainly will do that. That team has performed miracles within the County, so I am very happy to do that and they are now focused on the next generation of ultra-fast, so hopefully we will be adding a nought to the end of all the speeds very soon.</p>
<p>18. COUNCILLOR MICHAEL WAINE</p> <p>Could the Cabinet Member tell me what support/advice was given to schools for their return on 8th March with regard to COVID testing and the wearing of masks?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LINDSAY-GALE, CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION & CULTURAL SERVICES</p> <p>Advice and support given to schools regarding 8th March's wider opening of schools is in line with DfE guidance.</p> <p>Throughout the pandemic the LA Education Covid Cell has shared the DfE guidance with all schools via emails, briefings and through Schools News. A weekly frequently asked Questions (FAQ) is published. Governors/Trustees, in addition, receive pertinent communications via 'Governor Hub'.</p> <p>The Education Covid Cell has been available to schools for advice and support 7 days a week since 1st September closing only on Christmas Day and News Years Day. Heads can contact the team for bespoke support and advice regarding all Covid matters including isolation periods, infection control and testing. Each week the Team deliver 4 HT briefings for primary, special, secondary and independent schools. Monthly meetings for EY and Governors are also held.</p> <p>Testing has been the focus of additional briefings weekly for 6 weeks for schools. During this time secondary schools' staff have moved from 'one site' testing (in secondary) to 'home testing'. Home testing for primary staff has been in place</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>throughout the Spring term. Students in secondary move as of the 15th March to 'Home Testing'. Household bubbles can now access home testing.</p> <p>School leaders have prepared thoroughly for the wider return of pupils to school and their dedication is to be commended.</p>
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Would the Cabinet Member join the Education Scrutiny Committee in thanking our Oxfordshire Schools and their Leaders for all their dedication in maintaining learning and safeguarding over the past year and our safety county team for supporting them so efficiently.</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Thank you very much Councillor Waine, yes of course I would, I think our teachers have been phenomenal over the last year. I can give you some figures actually which will prove how efficiently and caringly they have made our schools safe for our children because the attendance figures for last week were 95%, which is really incredible, so I thank them all very much from all of us.</p>
<p>19. COUNCILLOR MICHAEL FOX-DAVIES</p> <p>Will the Cabinet Member please report on achievements by this Council towards meeting its target of net zero carbon in our own estate by 2030?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>OCC's own estate net-zero carbon target includes emissions from highway assets (streetlighting and traffic signals), fleet (approximately 500 vehicles), staff travel, and approximately 120 corporate buildings' heating and electricity. The full scope of our target can be found in our Greenhouse Gas reporting.</p> <p>Corporate emissions have declined 50.8% between the baseline year of 2010/11 and 2019/20, from 26,510t CO₂e to 13,051t CO₂e. From 2018/19 to 2019/20, corporate emissions decreased 8%, exceeding our current annual target of 6%.</p> <p>In 2019/20, emissions from fleet reduced 7% and from staff travel reduced 16%. Emissions from highway assets reduced by 11%. Emissions from buildings' electricity dropped 11%, while emissions from heating increased by 11% (this was lower than the 17% increase that would have been expected due to cold weather in this year).</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>The 2019/20 figures cover the period to the end of March 2020, so they do not reflect reductions due to COVID-related changes, which are now being incorporated into our work practices. Emissions from this period will be reported in our next round of emissions reporting this summer. Digital by default meetings and service digitalisation contribute not only to a reduction in staff travel but also help partner organizations and residents curb emissions.</p> <p>The council's LED conversion programme has now converted 31.5% of streetlights, contributing to nearly 813t CO₂e and 245,000 kWh savings last year. The programme aims to have all 59,631 lanterns fitted with LED equipment by 2025/26.</p> <p>The council has secured £2.13m from Public Sector Decarbonisation Fund for heat decarbonisation and energy efficiency measures across 7 council buildings and 4 maintained schools. This Programme will be delivered across 2021. These measures will translate into 200t CO₂e savings realisable from beginning 2022. Other measures carried out to reduce estate emissions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Heating control project at Speedwell House b. 42 PV panels installed in Ron Groves House in Kidlington c. Benson Library off the gas grid with solar panels, battery storage and heat pump <p>OCC has an 'electric by default' fleet replacement policy. The fleet now has 21 EVs, served by a network of 44 EV charging points at 17 council sites. The goal is to replace all cars with EVs by 2024 and all vans by 2028.</p> <p>We are looking at opportunities to use our own estate to trial innovative technologies such as building energy flexibility through Project LEO (Local Energy Oxfordshire) and Vehicle to Grid charging.</p> <p>Since October 2020, the council is buying certified green grid electricity for council buildings and maintained schools.</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>Alongside our commitment to reduce own estate emissions, we are working to lead the way to a zero-carbon county. We are undertaking a wide programme of work including our zero-carbon-focussed travel strategies – such as the review of the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan, the Oxford Zero Emissions Zone, and Connecting Oxford – and our work on electric vehicle charging strategy and commitment to active travel. We are working in partnership to support planning for zero-carbon development and infrastructure through a new approach to the Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy and Oxfordshire Plan 2050, and to champion the environmental principles of the Arc. We are now in our twentieth year as lead funder of the Community Action Group project supporting Oxfordshire voluntary groups taking action to tackle climate change.</p> <p>We are partnering in a range of innovation programmes to ensure Oxfordshire can benefit from new technologies and approaches to decarbonisation. Examples include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Project LEO (Local Energy Oxfordshire), the national demonstrators trialling smart grid and flexibility; b. Park n Charge, which is trialling new business models to accelerate the roll out of Electric Vehicle charging for residents without access to off-street charging. <p>Further details of our commitment and plans for Countywide emissions can be found in our Climate Action Framework 2020 Climate Action Framework (oxfordshire.gov.uk)</p>
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Thank you very much for that full and comprehensive answer to the Cabinet Member. Just a quick supplementary, could you outline or give an idea of what progress the County Council</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>The recent report went to Performance Scrutiny. We have exceeded the target expected by reducing carbon emissions in the County as opposed to our own estate by 12% which is a significant achievement, though we do recognise that a significant part of that is the result of last years heavy switch to renewable sources</p>

Questions	Answers
is making towards supporting the target for Oxfordshire of net zero by 2050?	of energy, there are a numbers of days even weeks last year during the summer that no fossil fuel was used at all. There is steady progress in Oxfordshire and thank you for your question.
<p>20. COUNCILLOR LIAM WALKER</p> <p>Are the public health team in Oxfordshire aware of any venues that are offering a private vaccine service and if so, what action is being taken to stop them?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LAWRIE STRATFORD, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE & PUBLIC HEALTH</p> <p>The COVID-19 vaccination is only available through the NHS to eligible groups and it is a free vaccination.</p> <p>We are not aware of any venues offering a private service.</p>
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Yes, thank you Councillor for your response. It is reassuring to know there is no venues in Oxfordshire doing private vaccines. But what would you say to Councillors or members of the public that might become aware of possible venues in Oxfordshire or perhaps in the West Midlands doing private vaccines?</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Personally, I would discourage that sort of activity. The vaccination programme has been incredibly successful across the country but does recognise appropriate priorities for those in need. Thank you for the question.</p>
<p>21. COUNCILLOR ARASH FATEMIAN</p> <p>Can the Cabinet member for Highways advise when the long overdue - and very welcome - improvements to Bankside will be made, benefitting both residents in my division and those across Banbury?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR EDDIE REEVES, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY DELIVERY</p> <p>I can confirm that the scheme is due to commence on 10 May. Residents will, I hope, be pleased with the result and I thank him and Councillor Mallon for helping push these important works along over several years.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Can I thank Councillor Reeves for the reply, it is very welcomed news. Given that we have been waiting for such a long time for those improvements and that it is causing traffic in other areas of Banbury as residents now avoid that road, can I ask him please to give a personal commitment that the works will start on 10 May and can I also put on record my thanks to Councillor Reeves but also ask him to thank his predecessor Councillor Walker for their work in getting this done.</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Thank you, Councillor Fatemian for the supplementary. I am very happy to give as full a commitment as I can in the circumstances. I understand that the works were scheduled, for some time between late April and early June and the start date has been given as the 10 May which is welcome insofar as it is towards the front end of that set of parameters. As to thanking Councillor Walker, I am more than happy to do that, all I can say is come back Liam all is forgiven.</p>
<p>22. COUNCILLOR ARASH FATEMIAN</p> <p>After reading the budget in detail, I welcome the investment in Oxfordshire for the next four years and am glad that was passed in Council with a majority of councillors across all parties. Does the Leader agree with me that the lack of any budget amendments from the Liberal Democrat party, is a) neither liberal, being in fact regressive and b) not democratic, by not allowing the residents of Oxfordshire to hear policy ideas debated, tested, and possibly adopted, as in previous years, in a debate. Especially as during the budget debate a number of councillors from that party seemed to indicate they are in favor of a larger (4.99%) increase in council tax, than that passed (2.99%), yet refused to formally table this. Does the leader also agree that as such, this is a gross dereliction of public responsibility and hopes that the public</p>	<p>COUCILLOR IAN HUDSPETH, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>The budget setting process gives all parties the opportunity to put forward proposals highlighting their priorities are for the future year especially ahead of an election. The lack of any alternative proposals normally shows that the proposed budget by the Conservative Independent Alliance is approved by the Liberal Democrat group. This did not happen at this year's budget as they voted against the budget that contained</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> £200,000 for the roll out of 20 mph speed limits £200,000 for additional drainage and vegetation clearance £4 million for social services £1 million for youth services £150,000 for apprenticeships. <p>By voting against I can only conclude that the Liberal Democrats do not support these key policies for Oxfordshire's residents.</p> <p>I am sure that The Liberal Democrat's election leaflets will contain references to</p>

Questions	Answers
will hold them accountable at the ballot box on May 6th?	voting against these important proposals.
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Can I thank Councillor Hudspeth for his reply. Can I ask Councillor Hudspeth, if like me, he was very surprised that the Liberal Democrat Party are against £4m for Social Services, they are against an extra £1m for Youth Services, they are against £150,000 for apprenticeships, they are against £200,000 for the roll out of 20mph speed limits and they are against £200,000 for additional drainage and vegetation clearance and as per my original question does he agree that their attitude in the budget process was a gross dereliction of public responsibility?</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Thank you very Councillor Fatemian for your question. I think it is important that at all opportunities political parties say what they are putting forward and put forward their proposals. I was surprised, like you that the Liberal Democrats were against funding for 20mph, against funding for youth services, against additional funding to adult social care, against funding for drainage schemes and potholes and it will be interesting to see what they are going to put in their leaflets when they come out, because if they are true to their word, they will make sure that the population know what they voted against so that people can make a good decision on 6 May.</p>
<p>23. COUNCILLOR ROZ SMITH</p> <p>Concerning the County's loss of £1.6m in the Parking Procurement case. Did the terms of reference of the Independent Review include examining the effectiveness of Portfolio Holders in their role?</p>	<p>COUCILLOR IAN HUDSPETH, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>As was set out by the Corporate Director for Customers, Organisational Development and Resources at the Audit and Governance Committee on 3rd March 2021, the terms of reference for the review were broad in scope. They included the full remit of all relevant and related activity, decision making, process design, control and compliance, management and leadership, communications, any constitutional or procedural issues, judgement and decision making.</p> <p>These terms were not limited to one service area or element of the process. Likewise, the terms were not limited to the role of officers and portfolio holders participated in the investigation.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Thank you Councillor Hudspeth for your answer and thank you for confirming that all aspects of the Council's involvement which lost of over £1.6m were covered in the Terms of Reference for the Independent Review including leadership and communications. We were informed at the Audit and Governance Committee on 3 March 2021 that there had been seismic failings. What specifically were there portfolio areas that had the failings and which portfolio holder Cabinet Members covered those particular areas of failure?</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Thank you very much for the question. The report goes into the detail of what happened throughout the process, it has been an independent report and that is made clear. We have been open and transparent to have an independent report and the full details are there for everybody to see.</p>
<p>24. COUNCILLOR PAUL BUCKLEY</p> <p>As a member of Audit and Governance Committee which considered the issue of the County's loss of £1.6m in the parking procurement case, please would the leader explain to Council which councillors have had access to the report of the Independent Review?</p>	<p>COUCILLOR IAN HUDSPETH, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>The report of the Independent Review is a confidential document. It has been fully reviewed by the council's monitoring officer, the commissioning officer (Corporate Director of Customers, Organisational Development and Resources), the Director of Human Resources and the Corporate Director, Commercial Development, Assets and Investment. Cabinet, and the portfolio holders, have accepted in full the thematic findings, recommendations and the action plan arising from the report.</p> <p>The report has not been released more widely (to officers other than those listed, or to members) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was of critical importance that the Council's investigation was as wide ranging and comprehensive as possible in order to properly identify and understand where there were failings, and who or what was responsible for those failings. In order to ensure that this was the case, witnesses (who were not legally obliged to provide evidence to the investigation) were given appropriate assurances that their evidence would be treated confidentially.

Questions	Answers
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evidence gathered from those witnesses is set out in detail within the report that has been withheld from disclosure. That evidence is clearly attributable and includes the personal data not only of the witnesses, but of various other third parties. The information provided sets out the key themes from the investigation to allow the Council to address these failings moving forward. These have been clearly set out in a report to Audit and Governance Committee and are supported with a comprehensive action plan. • It is accepted that the Audit and Governance Committee needs to have access to certain information for them to undertake their functions and the monitoring officer is satisfied that the information being provided to the Committee is adequate to meet that requirement. The information provided to the Audit and Governance Committee (and put into the public domain) draws out the key themes and findings from the investigation. • There is a clear public interest in information gathered by the investigation, as well as in ensuring that the Council properly and fully addresses any failings identified to avoid further issues occurring moving forward. This is why the Council has already disclosed information into the public domain, including the information that is contained in the public papers of the Audit and Governance Committee. It is the view of the monitoring officer that this disclosure meets the public interest.
<p>25. COUNCILLOR LIZ LEFFMAN</p> <p>On what date were you first informed of the compensation claim from Marston Holdings, what advice did you give officers at that point, what actions did you take when you were informed?</p>	<p>COUNILLOR DAVID BARTHOLOMEW, CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE</p> <p>I was first informed of the claim and settlement on Thursday 30th January 2020. After expressing my surprise that such a settlement could be reached without reference to the relevant Cabinet Member (Cllr Constance), or myself as Cabinet Member for Finance, I stated that a full investigation should be undertaken.</p> <p>I emailed the Chief Executive (copying the Leader) on Friday 31st January 2020,</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>making clear my great concern. She replied stating the need to understand how a fundamental service failure had occurred and what needed to be done to prevent it occurring again.</p> <p>I raised the issue with senior officers and all Cabinet colleagues at Informal Cabinet on Tuesday 4th February 2020, repeating my request for a full investigation. The Chief Executive recognised the seriousness of the issue and confirmed this would happen. An independent investigation was commissioned and commenced in March 2020.</p> <p>I informed the Chairman of Audit & Governance about the issue at the earliest opportunity on Thursday 20th February 2020. Officers advised me that no public comments should be made until the independent report had been finalised, lest such comments jeopardise the report. I pressed officers on progress of the report on a regular basis. The investigation was expected to take a period of months due to its complexity and the task of tracking down previous employees to contribute. Delivery of the report was also delayed by complications arising from the pandemic.</p> <p>(Note that the publicly available February Cabinet report included an update on the budget position relating to the monthly position in December 2019. This report (annex C) set out a net £0.4m overspend in community operations with a £1.8m pressure on the parking account due to the 'combination of an historical downturn in parking income, increased running cost and parking enforcement procurement costs).</p>
<p>26. COUNCILLOR JANE HANNA</p> <p>Please could the Cabinet Member list the dates between April 2017 and March 2020 of each request for a school place made by officers of this authority that was not met by a school or academy</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LORRAINE LINDSAY-GALE, CABINET MEMBER FOR EDUCATION & CULTURAL SERVICES</p> <p>Where a local authority considers that an Academy will best meet the needs of any child, it can ask the Academy to admit that child, but it has no power to direct it to do so. There is an expectation in the School Admissions Code 2014 that a local authority and an academy will usually come to an agreement, but if there is a</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>and the date when the matter was escalated to the Secretary of State with a request for an Order to be made?</p>	<p>refusal to admit a child, the relevant local authority can ask the Secretary of State to intervene. The Secretary of State has the power under an Academy's Funding Agreement to direct the Academy to admit a child and the ESFA (Education and Skills Funding Agency) acts on behalf of the Secretary of State in these matters. If after considering the case, the ESFA decides that it would be reasonable to issue a direction, a "minded to direct" letter is sent to the relevant school. Schools normally admit a child on receiving such a letter and it is rare for the ESFA to issue a formal direction. No formal directions were issued between April 2017 and March 2020. On each occasion that a case was referred to the Secretary of State by Oxfordshire County Council, the ESFA decided that it would be appropriate to issue a "minded to direct" letter in order to ensure that a place was offered at the relevant school.</p> <p>Between April 2017 and March 2020, there were 12 requests to the Secretary of State/ESFA to direct the admission of students who had been referred for action under the Fair Access Protocol. Of these requests 2 were rejected by the ESFA and 1 was discontinued because of the issuing of an EHCP (Education Health and Care Plan). The date of each referral and its outcome will be made available confidentially to the Cllr Hanna as they contain individual pupil level information.</p> <p>The referrals to the EFSA were all made following an initial unsuccessful referral to a Fair Access Panel. Each secondary phase Fair Access Panel meets 8 times per academic year and the Primary Fair Access Panel meets as necessary during the academic year.</p>
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Thank you for the reply. Have the Government published the dates for the changes urgently needed to the Admission Code with the view to protecting children needing places at Academies in the same way as there are protections for children seeking admissions to Local Authority schools?</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in this issue Councillor Hanna. Frustratingly, no they haven't not yet, we are all waiting for it, and we all appreciate that it is an issue which really much get looked at and rectified because it has caused considerable problems, not just to this Council but to many.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>27. COUNCILLOR GLYNIS PHILLIPS</p> <p>Can I please have an update on progress with implementing a safe pedestrian and cycle crossing at the end of Collinwood Road in Risinghurst? Can the Cabinet member confirm that officers are actively seeking s106 funding from the Thornhill Park development to fund this much needed and long overdue safe crossing?'</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>A feasibility study for a new toucan crossing of the A40 at Collinwood Rd has been completed by the county. As previously stated, there is currently no further funding to deliver the measure, however county officers will actively pursue suitable opportunities to secure funding for its delivery including through development contributions. This includes ongoing discussions regarding the Thornhill Park site.</p>
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>I need to register my continued disappointment about the lack of progress in implementing a safe crossing on this stretch of the A40. My question is where is this crossing on the Cabinet Member's list of priorities?</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Thank you, Councillor Phillips, as you know the issue is not a question of understanding the need and the great need for that pedestrian crossing, the issue is funding. It is not on my agenda because I don't have a source of funding for it, but officers have reassured you in the answer that they continue to look for the possibility of raising funds through local developments. The Thornhill Park site is live, and officers are looking into it. We do not have the deep pockets to fund that scheme for you.</p>
<p>28. COUNCILLOR LIZ LEFFMAN</p> <p>In November it was announced that a new Speeding Task Force was to be set up in partnership with Thames Valley Police. Can the Cabinet member for Highways please provide us with a progress report?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR EDDIE REEVES, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY DELIVERY</p> <p>We can confirm that senior level meetings between Thames Valley Police (TVP) and the County Council are taking place to ensure a strong partnership in relation to speeding across the county. A key initiative that TVP are undertaking is a revamp and enhancement of the community SpeedWatch programme. This is looking at new systems and improved ways of working with the community. A trial was planned for last autumn but has been delayed due to COVID but will be progressed as soon as is possible.</p>

<p>Questions</p>	<p>Answers</p>
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Thank you for the answer Councillor Reeves, but I am asking this question because members of the SpeedWatch Team, several SpeedWatch teams in my division are wondering when they are going to be included in the discussion, could you let us know when you are going to be contacting local SpeedWatch Teams and asking for their views?</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>The simple answer is that the Thames Valley Police announced this last week. I have communicated to all my Parish Councils that Thames Valley has revived the scheme; they have reauthorized it. It is a very new decision we have not worked with Thames Valley yet to establish how best to roll this out. I suspect it will be done at Parish Council level and if officers are involved in this as opposed to Thames Valley, we will certainly inform the Parish Councils.</p>
<p>29. COUNCILLOR PETE SUDBURY</p> <p>There is increasing evidence that mandatory cycle lanes demarcated only by painted lines do not increase safety, and that advisory lanes, (those marked by dashed lines) increase risk to cyclists compared to no lanes at all. In contrast, protected lanes, demarcated by a kerb or with the lane stepped up, very significantly reduce risks of injury, with the latter being the safest.</p> <p>These differences are not trivial: a study by TfL, examining 2,876 cyclist injuries found protected lanes reduced the chance of injury by 40-65%, whereas advisory lanes increased it by 34% and mandatory "line only" lanes made no difference, even when episodic protection (e.g. regularly spaced blocks or posts) was in place. In the light of this, would the Cabinet Member think it appropriate to consider such measures as awareness campaigns for cyclists and motorists around the risks of non-protected lanes, changing its policy on</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>Advisory cycle lanes have been used for many decades within Oxford (with the first lanes in the city being installed in 1982) and elsewhere in the county, with mandatory lanes also provided in a smaller number of locations, and have typically been well received by the public, and in particular by cyclists. While it is true that before and after studies carried out by the County Council showed little if any change in the number of reported cycle accidents where either advisory or mandatory lanes have been provided, equally there has been no local evidence of cycle safety being compromised by their provision. The recently updated Department for Transport guidance (Local Transport Note 1/20) acknowledges the limitations of advisory and mandatory cycle lanes but recognises there are locations where other options are not viable. Our aspiration (as set out in our Cycling Design Standards, 2017) is to provide stronger segregation for cyclists where funding and site constraints permit, but where this is not currently possible, existing advisory and mandatory lanes will be retained and new ones provided, noting that the ongoing monitoring of reports of cycle accidents throughout the county shows no basis for removing either advisory and mandatory cycle lanes, a measure that would likely be highly unpopular with cyclists.</p>

Questions	Answers
new cycle lanes to include only protected lanes and removing or upgrading all unprotected lanes?	
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>In 2019 the last year pre-Covid ,20% or road casualties were cyclist which is a vastly disproportionate risk compared to the number of miles they do. Is the County Council seriously ignoring a large piece of evidence that suggests ways in which that might be reduced?</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>I don't know how you understand or conclude that we are ignoring. We are working across the County to increase the road space, cycleways and access for cyclist throughout Oxford City, throughout the market towns and across the County where possible. We expect to see very much reduced statistics for accidents with cyclists. We are making it as safe and accessible as we can do.</p>
<p>30. COUNCILLOR SUSANNA PRESSEL</p> <p>We were promised a low-traffic neighbourhood in Walton Street. We bid for and got government money to promote active travel in Jericho. Why is the County Council now proposing measures which bear no resemblance whatsoever to a low-traffic neighbourhood and which will not encourage more walking and cycling?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>The consultation proposals have been developed following engagement and feedback from those in the local community. The proposed measures, put to consultation, allow only pedestrians and cyclists to making certain movements and are specifically intended to restrict through traffic from motor vehicles passing through the area. We therefore disagree that the proposals would not create an environment that encourages walking and cycling. Should the measures be implemented, this would be done as a trial with surveys being undertaken to assess the schemes performance.</p>
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>In her answer the Cabinet Member claims the proposal will restrict through traffic. Please can she tell me how it will restrict through traffic travelling north?</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Certainly, it will have a greater effect in traffic travelling south, the issue of traffic going north I think is one that we will have to examine more closely. The intention is that we stop through traffic through the Walton Street area. I note your question, and more than that I can't say at this stage, as you know, the issue will come to me for decision, but the point that you make is noted.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>31. COUNCILLOR SUSANNA PRESSEL</p> <p>The City Council is planning to make all its vehicles electric by 2030. A quarter of them will be electric by 2023. How does this compare with the County Council?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>The County Council has a strong track record on carbon emissions reduction. We are committed to moving to electric vehicles, in tandem with reducing overall car travel, in the County and on our own estate. In our own fleet, we are working to phase out petrol and diesel vehicles, ensuring, where feasible, all new vehicle acquisitions are zero tailpipe emission by default on renewal.</p> <p>In 2019 we agreed an Ultra-Low Emission Vehicles Policy statement 2019 setting our commitments for the council's owned or leased fleet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transition out cars starting immediately, aiming for the majority of vehicles to be zero emission by 2024. • Begin to transition out vans, starting immediately, whilst recognising the market is less developed, aiming for transition of the majority of vehicles to be complete by 2028. • Actively explore alternatives, and innovative solutions (electric, hydrogen etc.) to reduce emissions from heavy good vehicles and specialist vehicles (fire engines, minibuses), bringing forward business cases as they become financially and operationally viable. <p>We are currently operating 21 Electric Vehicles including 9 cars, 9 vans, and 3 minibuses / Multi-purpose Vehicles. These EVs have been added to fleet over the past 24 months. We have installed 44 EV chargepoints across 19 council buildings to support charging of existing EVs and enable uptake of further EVs in our fleet. We are also engaging with new technologies such as vehicle to grid charging. The council has just agreed a new strategic management approach to fleet, which will further support emissions reduction from fleet by transition to electric and offer opportunities to look at shared fleet.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>In her answer the Cabinet Member says that she is committed to reducing overall car travel, please can she tell me how this will be achieved and over what timescale?</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>We are working with a well performed programme towards congestion management with the Workplace Parking Scheme, and at the moment we are still intending to get to a consultation on that scheme by the end of this year. We are also working through our local transport and connectivity plan; the vision statement is out for consultation at the moment until next week. We are looking across the County to reduce the dependence on car transport, we are looking for digital connectivity, we are looking to persuade people out of car, on to buses, on the bicycles and to walking where possible. The necessity to reduce car travel is at the forefront of our lines at shaping all policy. I personally regard congestion as the major problem in Oxfordshire.</p>
<p>32. COUNCILLOR SUSANNA PRESSEL</p> <p>We were promised that when we left the EU an extra £350m a week would be available for public services like the NHS. How much of this do we expect to come to Oxfordshire?</p>	<p>COUNILLOR DAVID BARTHOLOMEW, CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE</p> <p>Queries relating to central government decisions on NHS funding are outside the remit of this Council.</p>
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Presumably the Chancellors recent budget factored this bonanza into the calculations. Can the Cabinet Member please identify examples of this £350m a week being spent in Oxfordshire if he can't do so for the NHS?</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>I am unaware of any schedule that details the hypothecation of Brexit savings to the NHS or Oxfordshire. As I have already said these issues are beyond the remit of this Council.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>33. COUNCILLOR LIZ LEFFMAN</p> <p>The current Eynsham Park & Ride plans do not take account of a future Witney to Oxford railway line and paragraph 63 of the planning application explicitly states that longer term measures such as re-opening the Witney to Oxford railway line have been discounted. Now that the leader has given his support in a letter to the Witney to Oxford Transport Group for their application to the Department for Transport for funding for a feasibility study, will he now confirm that if the application is successful, the line will no longer be discounted?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>I'm sure that Cllr Leffman will agree with me that its vital we improve public transport and cycling facilities along the A40 corridor to give the residents of West Oxfordshire the opportunity to get out of their cars. This is exactly why we are investing £175 million to provide improved public transport and cycling facilities on the A40. We have based this on many reports dating back to the turn of the century when all options including a rail link has been considered.</p> <p>Oxfordshire County council is part of the North Cotswold Line Task Force working with 4 other County councils, Network rail and Great Western Railway to deliver 4 trains per hour to Hanborough station providing another public transport option. I 've supported the feasibility study on the understanding that it will not delay or detract from the groups work as its vital we deliver improved services on the North Cotswold line.</p> <p>If the bid for funding is successful and a feasibility study produced then it will be taken into consideration in the future, but any rail line would be a very long term project and I cannot delay these vital projects that will give the residents of West Oxfordshire real travel options within the next few years.</p>
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Thank you for your reply Councillor Constance, you have just said that you want to get people of their cars and yet we are building a Park and Ride at Eynsham and we are not making provision for a railway line, which might very well be the transport of the future between Witney and Oxford. Having heard what Charlie Maynard had to say, would she agree that we do need to include such a provision in our plans and that not to do so would be very</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>The first thing to deal with is the Park and Ride at Eynsham, which is of course a scheme we are able to deliver now to manage traffic as it is. It would be madness to ignore that possibility in the hope that we will get people out of cars in 5 or 6 years-time. I do refer to our plan in the new transport strategy to reduce car use and one of those ideas for instance is to have smaller parking pods along radial roads so that people would be able to cycle to them, possibly even walk to them to pick up a bus, that is an ambition I have stated publicly quite frequently. The issue was the train from Oxford to Witney, though Witney to Carterton is one that is already been answered in this meeting, it was not included in the Oxford Rail</p>

Questions	Answers
short-sighted?	Corridor Study by agreement with all parties including I believe the Growth Board group that sat on it and it is simply not within the consideration of the Country's transport strategy at the moment.
<p>34. COUNCILLOR JANE HANNA</p> <p>Can the leader provide an update on action since the County Council unanimous support for the December 8th Motion on OX12 including what he has done to influence a positive commitment within BOB to acceptable health and social care provision for the residents at the heart of the OX12 population pilot and whether he can make public his correspondence to the Prime Minister, the Select Committees for Health and Social Care, Housing, Communities and Local Government to urge the vital importance of safeguarding local democracy and scrutiny as non-elected decision-makers implement policy across Oxfordshire.</p>	<p>COUCILLOR IAN HUDSPETH, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>Since the December meeting I have been only able to attend 1 meeting of the Chairman's group when I raised the issue of how best we can influence local decision making for areas such as the OX12 group. The input was welcomed as it highlights the fact that future decisions regarding healthcare within the ICS framework should always be made at the appropriate level based upon the overall strategy for the ICS. We have also seen the publication of the NHS white paper which helps further clarify the expectations of the relationships between the NHS and local government.</p> <p>HWB Board recently have received a presentation on the work we are going to do across NHS and local authorities focused on the life stage of Ageing Well to develop a truly integrated community service strategy to ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing independence and health and wellbeing outcomes for our population; • Working with our population to make best use of our people, our systems and our assets. <p>This piece of work will include defining and agreeing the role of community- based beds in this.</p>
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>The Leader hasn't answered my question. As Chair of Health & Wellbeing November 2018 which confirmed OX12 as the pilot for future planning of services across Oxfordshire on a population-based</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Thank you very much for the supplementary, I disagree, I have answered the question absolutely because of course you asked me to raise the issue of OX12 at the ICS Chairs meeting, which I did, and I am quite happy to find the details where it was discussed, if it was minuted. But I certainly put it forward because we were</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>approach. Can he provide the dates and minutes of the meeting of Chairs that took place as this does not bode well for a local population approach which respects and treats residents well? Can he also answer the second part of my question - has he and can he share the public correspondence asked for by Council in December to Government and national scrutiny bodies about the rising powers of unelected bodies?</p>	<p>discussing more generally all the local issues across all of the ICS area and that is key to understand because it is not just about OX12 it is about Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire and West Berkshire so we have got to look at all those individual cases, and that was brought forward at the meeting to be discussed to make sure that there is real local input into those decision makings. It is about where the decisions are made - at a place level or a system level and that is one of the key things working through the ICS. I always make sure local decisions are made at the appropriate level wherever that level sits and of course I will happily share other emails and letters with you as well.</p>
<p>35. COUNCILLOR JENNY HANNABY</p> <p>Can the cabinet member provide information on when they were first aware that Oxfordshire County Council's care home in Kidlington, run by the Order of St John, was in crisis and at risk of closure, and the earliest date that the 28 residents and their families were consulted about the closure of the home and what good practice was followed, given many would have been shocked and their well-being at risk with expectations that they would have been able to stay in their home. Can the cabinet member give reassurances that the decision on the closure of the care home in Kidlington will now go to property for consideration of the use of Oxfordshire County Council's asset and best value for Oxfordshire's residents?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LAWRIE STRATFORD, CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE & PUBLIC HEALTH</p> <p>Thank you for your question. The council along with our partner 'The Order of St Johns Trust' work closely to ensure that our services are modern, fit for purpose and delivering value for money. The Glebe residential home built in the 1970s has struggled to deliver a service that is attractive to people in 2020 due to limitations of the building and the reducing number of people needing this type of support. Less people need this support due to the increased alternatives available to help people remain in their own homes or through alternative accommodation support such as Extra Care Housing, live in support etc.</p> <p>We fully recognise the anxiety that any change can cause individuals and their families, and we have worked closely with families and OSJT to make the transition as smooth as possible. I'm pleased to say that all individuals have now moved safely to their new homes the majority to other OSJT homes.</p> <p>Finally, the decision about the future use of the Glebe will be made following usual procedures led by the council's property department.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>It is regrettable that there are any residential home closures in Oxfordshire, but does he agree that the building could be put to good use for the community unlike the Day Centre in Wantage which has been left to deteriorate badly with no discussions on what to do with it.</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Thank you for the supplementary Councillor Hannaby, yes, I agree any building that can be used should be. I think the answer originally given that it will be referred to our property section who will make the best use of the facility and it is always valued especially in smaller places like Kidlington.</p>
<p>36. COUNCILLOR JANE HANNA</p> <p>Given the BBC Today extremely troubling coverage on 12th March about the placement market for children in care, how many of Oxfordshire's children have experienced multiple moves and/ or moves out of Oxfordshire in the last twelve months; what is the highest weekly cost that the Council has paid; and what are Oxfordshire County Council's average costs for a placement for a vulnerable child and how far have these increased since 2013?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR STEVE HARROD, CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN & FAMILY SERVICES</p> <p>In 2019-20:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 11% of children we care for experienced 3 or more placement moves in the year. - 36% of children we care for were placed out of county and more than 20 miles from their coming into care address. We recognise that this is not good enough and our placement sufficiency strategy addresses the need to create more local placements, reflected in the council's investment in in-house foster care; the re-provision of Maltfield through a new build and the commissioning of more local residential placements. <p>The highest weekly cost for a placement this financial year was a bridging placement at £10,000 per week. The young person later moved to a longer- term placement which cost £5532 per week.</p> <p>In 2019/20 – the average cost of a placement for children we care for was approx. £1,050.</p> <p>In 2013/14 – the average cost of a placement for children we care for was approx. £850.</p>

Questions	Answers
	This is an increase of 23.5% over 6 years, an average of 3.9% per annum. The increase is due to a mix of price inflation and the changing placement mix (e.g. more IFA and residential placements than in 2013).
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>I welcome the Cabinet Member agreeing that this is not good enough, but given how shocking these statistics are and as Corporate Parent does he agree as a minimum there should be an urgent and full report on the impact on children in our care and on the finances of the County caught up in all of this?</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Thank you for your question, Councillor Hanna. I agree that you have highlighted a problem there. One of the other issues you might have alluded to in terms of Corporate Parenting is that I am very disappointed that there are so few elected members who attend the Corporate Parenting Panel which is now called Guardians for Us. We had one just yesterday and there were only three or four members on there. So, I would like to see a lot more involvement of elected members in those panels and then we might be in a position to be able to lobby for greater funding, so thank you for your question.</p>
<p>37. COUNCILLOR JENNY HANNABY</p> <p>Given restoring Grove Station has been an aspiration of Oxfordshire County Council since 1979 and since requests for funding or calls for action by all of Wantage Constituency MPs since then, most recently the bid for £50,000 during 2020, have all been unsuccessful, what reassurances can be given to the expanding populations in the Grove and Wantage settlements and wider area that the small sum needed of £85,000 to guarantee that the `determine' stage will at least start during 2021 has been or will be found?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE, CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>A funding bid has been submitted to the Government's 'Restoring Your Railways' Ideas Fund for Grove Station, backed by David Johnston MP. We expect to hear the outcome of this bid in May – our ability to progress the scheme at this time is dependent on that bid being successful.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p data-bbox="152 215 622 247">SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p data-bbox="152 288 887 507">David Johnston MP was unsuccessful in the last bid. Should that happen again, will the County step in and fund the very small amount to allow the business case for Grove Station to continue since it is an aspiration of the County and a necessity of the residents of Grove and Wantage.</p>	<p data-bbox="904 215 1352 247">SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p data-bbox="904 288 2078 767">Thank you for drawing attention to this very live and possible successful bid which is being sponsored by the Conservative MP in Wantage. You speak of it being unsuccessful, we were advised not to submit in the second round because we were at that stage involved in a massive study which was led by Oxfordshire County Council officers into the rail corridor study for the whole of Oxfordshire and its influence in the region from Oxford to Cambridge. That is now complete and has been part of the background information we have now been able to supply to Government to the Department for Transport one week ago. The bid was submitted on 12th in time and it will probably be the most developed bid that DfT will see in this programme. The issue is due to be considered along with 88 other bids and we do recognise that levelling up is a priority now for Government. But this is far from an unsuccessful bid and there is much to hope for. I agree with you that a Grove Station is one of Wantage's great necessities.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

MINUTES of the meeting held on Wednesday, 7 April 2021 commencing at 10.00 am and finishing at 2.45 pm

Present:

Councillor Les Sibley – in the Chair

Councillors:

John Howson	Stefan Gawrysiak	Glynis Phillips
Sobia Afridi	Mark Gray	Susanna Pressel
David Bartholomew	Pete Handley	Eddie Reeves
Dr Suzanne Bartington	Jane Hanna OBE	G.A. Reynolds
Tim Bearder	Jenny Hannaby	Judy Roberts
Maurice Billington	Neville F. Harris	Alison Rooke
Liz Brighouse OBE	Steve Harrod	Dan Sames
Paul Buckley	Damian Haywood	Gill Sanders
Kevin Bulmer	Mrs Judith Heathcoat	John Sanders
Nick Carter	Hilary Hibbert-Biles	Emily Smith
Mark Cherry	Ian Hudspeth	Roz Smith
Dr Simon Clarke	Tony Ilott	Lawrie Stratford
Yvonne Constance OBE	Bob Johnston	Dr Pete Sudbury
Ian Corkin	Liz Leffman	Alan Thompson
Arash Fatemian	Lorraine Lindsay-Gale	Emma Turnbull
Neil Fawcett	Mark Lygo	Michael Waine
Ted Fenton	D. McIlveen	Liam Walker
Nicholas Field-Johnson	Kieron Mallon	Richard Webber
Mrs Anda Fitzgerald-O'Connor	Jeannette Matelot	
Mike Fox-Davies	Charles Mathew	

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

21/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

(Agenda Item 1)

Apologies were received from Councillors Hannah Banfield and Laura Price.

22/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST - SEE GUIDANCE NOTE

(Agenda Item 2)

Councillor Jenny Hannaby declared a personal interest in relation to Motion 7 by Councillor Reeves as Chairman of the Wantage Hospital League of Friends in the event that there was discussion on hospitals.

Councillor Fatemian sought advice from the Monitoring Officer on whether in relation to Motion 8 by Councillor Pressel he had a non-pecuniary prejudicial interest by reason of his employers being based in the Eastern Arc. The Monitoring Officer advised that Councillor Fatemian was not affected to any greater degree than any other member and in her opinion at this time it did not constitute a prejudicial interest. It was for Councillor Fatemian to decide whether he should abstain or not.

23/21 OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS

(Agenda Item 3)

Council noted the statement from the Chairman concerning the business to be conducted.

24/21 MOTION BY COUNCILLOR RICHARD WEBBER

(Agenda Item 6)

With the consent of Council Councillor Webber moved his motion amended at the suggestion of Councillor David Bartholomew as shown below in strikethrough and bold italics:

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

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

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

Council commits to ensuring that, in future, in the interests of transparency and good governance, any breaches of procedure are made known to members of the Audit and Governance Committee as soon as they are known to the Executive, and that committee members are allowed to see any

reports relating to such breaches of procedure (redacted as necessary), following any reasonable request from members of that committee and assuming there is no legal reason why such documents should be with-held.

The motion as amended was seconded by Councillor Buckley.

Following a debate, the motion as amended was agreed unanimously by 59 votes for, with none against and no abstentions,

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 17.4.1 seven councillors called for a named vote

Councillors voting for the motion (59)

Afridi, Bartholomew, Bartington, Bearder, Billington, Brighthouse, Buckley, Bulmer, Carter, Cherry, Clarke, Constance, Corkin, Fatemian, Fawcett, Fenton, Field-Johnson, Fitzgerald O'Connor, Fox-Davies, Gawrysiak, Gray, Handley, Hanna, Hannaby, Harris, Harrod, Haywood, Heathcoat, Hibbert-Biles, Howson, Hudspeth, Ilott, Johnston, Leffman, Lindsay-Gale, Lygo, Mallon, Matelot, Mathew, McIlveen, Phillips, Pressel, Reeves, Reynolds, Roberts, Rooke, Sames, Gill Sanders, John Sanders, Sibley, Emily Smith, Roz Smith, Stratford, Sudbury, Thompson, Turnbull, Waine, Walker and Webber.

Councillors voting against the motion (0)

Councillors abstaining on the motion (0)

It was accordingly:

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

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

The timeline provided to the Audit and Governance Committee meeting on this matter shows that the Portfolio Holder and the Chair of Audit and Governance were both aware of the breach and cost of out of court settlement in February 2020, and as an independent report was in progress, the Audit Working Group was informed in December 2020.

Council commits to ensuring that, in future, in the interests of transparency and good governance, any breaches of procedure are made known to members of the Audit and Governance Committee as soon as they are

known to the Executive, and that committee members are allowed to see any reports relating to such breaches of procedure (redacted as necessary), following any reasonable request from members of that committee and assuming there is no legal reason why such documents should be with-held.

25/21 MOTION BY COUNCILLOR EDDIE REEVES

(Agenda Item 7)

Councillor Reeves proposed and Councillor Mallon seconded the following motion:

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

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

This Council is encouraged that Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (OUHFT) and the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group (OCCG) have listened to the strong representations of residents, Councillors and community groups (notably, Keep the Horton General) in recent years and those of Victoria Prentis MP and this Council welcomes steps taken by both OUHFT and OCCG to develop a masterplan for the Horton without delay.

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

Councillor Cherry proposed and Councillor Phillips seconded the following amendment shown in bold italics and strikethrough:

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

Local efforts to retain acute services at the Horton have been welcomed by Councils at all tiers in recent months and by community groups and residents alike. This Council’s position has always been that the Horton’s future should be as a fully functioning General Hospital complementing the world-

class services at both the John Radcliffe Hospital and Churchill Hospital so as to build on Oxfordshire's enviable reputation – both nationally and internationally – as a centre for excellence in healthcare. That remains unequivocally the case today.

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

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

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

Following debate, the amendment was lost by 29 votes to 27 with 3 abstentions.

The substantive motion was then put to the vote and carried by 47 votes for with none against and 12 abstentions.

RESOLVED: (47 votes for, none against, 12 abstentions)

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

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

This Council is encouraged that Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (OUHFT) and the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group (OCCG) have listened to the strong representations of residents, Councillors and community groups (notably, Keep the Horton General) in recent years and those of Victoria Prentis MP and this Council welcomes steps taken by both OUHFT and OCCG to develop a masterplan for the Horton without delay.

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

26/21 MOTION BY COUNCILLOR SUSANNA PRESSEL

(Agenda Item 8)

Councillor Pressel proposed and Councillor John Sanders seconded the following motion:

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

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

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

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

Council requests that the Corporate Director Environment & Place considers expanding the WPL scheme and developing a business case for Connecting Oxford that covers a much wider area and not just the "eastern arc".

Following debate, the motion was lost by 30 votes against to (28) 29 votes for.

27/21 MOTION BY COUNCILLOR STEFAN GAWRYSIAK

(Agenda Item 9)

With the consent of Council, Councillor Gawrysiak moved his motion as amended at the suggestion of Councillor Hibbert-Biles as shown below in bold italics:

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

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

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

The motion as amended was seconded by Councillor Webber.

Following debate, the motion as amended was carried by 40 votes for, with 3 against and 15 abstentions.

It was accordingly:

RESOLVED: (40 votes for, 3 votes against and 15 abstentions)

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

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

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

At 1.15pm there was a short adjournment with the meeting reconvening at 1.25 pm.

28/21 MOTION BY COUNCILLOR DAMIAN HAYWOOD

(Agenda Item 10)

Councillor Haywood proposed and Councillor Lygo seconded the following motion:

“It is a sad reality that up and down the country, roads around schools have become plagued with a surge of traffic concentrated over a 50-minute period at drop off and pick up times. This results in increased risks of collisions with vulnerable road users and other motorists, unlawful parking, traffic jams, road rage. People on foot and cycling are left with the feeling that roads are no place for them. This has implications for everyone especially children.

Statistics from the Department of Transport reveal that 14% of children killed on Great Britain’s roads in 2018 were during the morning school run (7-9am) and 23% after school between 3-5pm. Furthermore, Kings College London found that children are exposed to levels of NO₂ five times higher when travelling to school in the morning than while at school.

For the past 30 years, children have been progressively removed from the roads which have been abandoned to motor vehicles. This created a vicious circle: traffic makes the roads unsafe so parents will drive their children everywhere.

It’s time to create a virtuous circle by supporting families to switch to active travel by making it easier for parents and children to get to school in more environmentally friendly ways by restricting non-essential vehicles from roads surrounding schools at the start and finish of the school day. This Council asks the Corporate Director Environment and Place to develop a rolling programme of school streets across the County.”

Following debate, the motion was carried by 43 votes for, none against and 7 abstentions.

RESOLVED:

It is a sad reality that up and down the country, roads around schools have become plagued with a surge of traffic concentrated over a 50-minute period at drop off and pick up times. This results in increased risks of collisions with vulnerable road users and other motorists, unlawful parking, traffic jams, road rage. People on foot and cycling are left with the feeling that roads are no place for them. This has implications for everyone especially children.

Statistics from the Department of Transport reveal that 14% of children killed on Great Britain’s roads in 2018 were during the morning school run (7-9am) and 23% after school between 3-5pm. Furthermore, Kings College London found that children are exposed to levels of NO₂ five times higher when travelling to school in the morning than while at school.

For the past 30 years, children have been progressively removed from the roads which have been abandoned to motor vehicles. This created a vicious circle: traffic makes the roads unsafe so parents will drive their children everywhere.

It's time to create a virtuous circle by supporting families to switch to active travel by making it easier for parents and children to get to school in more environmentally friendly ways by restricting non-essential vehicles from roads surrounding schools at the start and finish of the school day. This Council asks the Corporate Director Environment and Place to develop a rolling programme of school streets across the County.

29/21 MOTION BY COUNCILLOR ARASH FATEMIAN

(Agenda Item 11)

Councillor Fatemian proposed and Councillor Fox-Davies seconded the following motion:

“This Council was profoundly disappointed to hear the view of Liberal Democrat MP Layla Moran who, when asked on BBC Question Time (18 February) about curbs on free speech in our universities, claimed that it “should not be a priority right now” only days after moderate academics had written compellingly about professional attacks suffered by them.

As a county with a number of first-class schools and colleges, excellent public libraries and two leading universities, and with a great many residents employed by this Council and others in the Education profession, this Council:

- i) Publicly deplores the position held by the MP for Oxford West and Abingdon;
- ii) reaffirms in the strongest possible terms that it believes in freedom of speech everywhere, particularly in our schools, colleges, public libraries and universities;
- iii) believes that students – whether at school, college or university – should be taught how to think, not what to think;
- iv) offers reassurance to students, teachers and academics throughout this county that we will continue to work with our schools, public libraries and other educational institutions to ensure that views can be expressed without fear of retribution or persecution;
- v) asks the Leader to write to all local MPs, schools, public libraries and higher and further education establishments in Oxfordshire clearly outlining this Council's stance;
- vi) asks the Leader to write to the MP in question, inviting her to reconsider the insensitive implications of her remarks, which serve only to condone abuse, rather than promote open, liberal and diverse debate.”

Following debate, the motion was lost by 25 votes against to 23 votes for.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing

Division(s): N/A

COUNCIL – 18 MAY 2021

CONSTITUTION CHANGES TO REFLECT RETURN TO PHYSICAL MEETINGS

Report by Director of Law & Governance

RECOMMENDATION

Council is RECOMMENDED to:

- (a) Note the amendments to the Constitution that the Monitoring Officer has made to ensure the safe return to physical meeting whilst covid restrictions remain;**
- (b) Agree that the Director of Law and Governance in consultation with the Chairman of the Council be authorised to make changes to the meetings process and, as necessary, the Constitution in the light of practical experience of meetings during covid restrictions and in the light of changing circumstances; and**
- (c) That the position be reviewed before the Council meeting on 13 July 2021.**

Executive Summary

1. The Government have confirmed that The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020 have not been extended to apply to meetings from 7 May onwards. These regulations have allowed the virtual meetings held in the past 12 months.
2. Legal moves to allow for the continuation of remote attendance at formal meetings were unsuccessful and physical meetings are now necessary for all formal meetings by which is meant Full Council and the Committee/Board meetings of the Council that must be held in public.
3. Whilst the covid restrictions remain in place it is necessary to ensure that meetings are held in a covid secure way to ensure the safety of all participants and attendees. In some instances, this has meant that meetings are being held at alternative venues including Full Council meetings at Spiceball Leisure Centre, and other meetings at Council Chamber, Bodicote House and Town Hall, Oxford City Council, Oxford.
4. The special procedures and protocols this Council adopted for virtual meetings in the Constitution (OCC - Part 3.1a Virtual Meeting Procedure Rules and CDC – Part 5 Virtual Meetings Procedure Rules) fall as meetings are no longer virtual.

5. This report sets out for information proposed temporary changes to the Constitution necessary for the effective running of physical meetings during the restrictions brought about by the corona virus pandemic.

The Changes

6. The virtual Procedure Rules covered notice of and summons to a meeting, voting and public participation.

Notice and Summons to a meeting

7. These arrangements will revert to that set out in the Constitution and more particularly under Part 8. Access to Information Procedure Rules.

Voting

8. With the return of physical meetings voting will revert to the rules set out in the Constitution. However, the section of Part 3.1, Council Procedure Rules that sets out the process for electronic voting has been disappplied to meetings of Full Council held at Spiceball Leisure Centre. Electronic voting will not be available at Spiceball and the method of voting in place during virtual meetings, namely the roll call of councillors will continue.
9. There is no provision for a Division bell at meetings of Full Council held at Spiceball Leisure Centre so Council Procedure Rule CPR 17.9 that relates to the Division bell has been disappplied to meetings held there.

Public Participation

10. Only Members of the Committee are required to attend and vote in person. Due to the limited space available to ensure distancing restrictions can be upheld public attendance will be limited. Meetings will continue to be livestreamed and where hybrid facilities are available speakers will be encouraged to attend and speak virtually. The OCC Constitution has been amended to disapply Council Procedure Rules 10.1.2(iv) and 10.2(iv) that relates to the physical presence of petitioners and speakers.
11. In order to manage the limited space available members of the public wishing to attend meetings in person whether to observe or speak will be asked to apply in person. The changed deadlines (4 working days before the meeting) for speakers introduced during virtual meetings will continue to apply to such requests to allow time to maximise public attendance so far as the limited space allows. Council Procedure Rule 10 has been amended to reflect the continuing amended deadline for speakers and virtual attendance the following rules have been amended:

Article 3 Rule1(b) (ix) Petitions
Article 3 Rule 1(c) Speakers

12. It should be noted that there is a legal requirement to allow physical public attendance and as such the requirement to apply in advance to observe a

meeting can only be encouraged and not enforced. However, public seating will be severely limited and members of the public turning up on the day may not be able to access the meeting.

13. In addition, Council Procedure Rule 21 relates to the requirement for a member of the public to leave the room in the event of a public disturbance and for clearance of the room. For those meetings held with hybrid capability where the public is attending virtually Rule 21 has been extended to include leaving the room to include removal from the virtual meeting.
14. It is proposed that changes be delegated to the Director of Law & Governance. This will allow the Constitution and meetings processes to be amended in the light of practical experience. It also allows the Council to respond quickly to changing circumstances as the Country continues to move through the lockdown road map.

Additional Support and Guidance for Physical Meetings during Covid.

15. Physical meetings during covid will feel very different to meetings held in the past. New venues, new room layouts in County Hall and covid safe requirements all contribute to a very different experience. All Members will have received a document setting out Guidance for Physical Meetings to support them, officers and members of the public to ensure the holding of safe and effective meetings whilst covid restrictions remain in place.

ANITA BRADLEY

Director of Law & Governance

Contact officer: Glenn Watson, Principal Governance Officer, 07776 997946.

May 2021

This page is intentionally left blank

Division(s): N/A

COUNTY COUNCIL – 18 MAY 2021

REVIEW OF POLITICAL BALANCE ON COMMITTEES

Report by the Director of Law & Governance

1. The Council is required by the Local Government & Housing Act 1989 to review the political balance on its committees on an annual basis. A note is attached (**Annex 1**) which summarises how the rules operate. This note also outlines the provision for co-opted members.
2. A schedule will be circulated separately (**Annex 2**) showing the initial arithmetical product of the rules for the Council's committees. The figures in brackets show the adjustments which are necessary to achieve the balance across and within committees to comply with the rules.
3. A further schedule (**Annex 3**) will be circulated separately showing the group nominations which have been received, together with the names of co-opted members where relevant. These nominations will be put forward on the basis of the adjusted memberships of the respective bodies as referred to in paragraph 2 above.
4. At its meeting on 23 March 2021 County Council agreed to amend the make up of the Pension Fund Committee as set out below and this is reflected in the Annexes:
 - 5 County Council Representatives selected in accordance with the political balance of the Council. These would form the only voting members of the new Committee
 - 2 Academy School Representatives – non-voting
 - 1 Oxford Brookes University Representative – non-voting
 - 1 District Council Representative – non-voting
 - 1 Scheme Member Representative – non-voting.

RECOMMENDATIONS

5. **The Council is RECOMMENDED:**
 - (a) **to confirm the political balance on committees shown in Annex 2 to the report;**
 - (b) **to appoint to committees the councillors and co-opted members shown in Annex 3, subject to any changes reported at the meeting.**

ANITA BRADLEY

Director of Law & Governance

Background Papers: Nil

Contact Officers: Sue Whitehead, Principal Committee Officer
Tel: 07393 001213
May 2021

Local Government & Housing Act 1989 - Political Balance

General Description of the Rules

1. For most local authority committees and sub-committees and for certain other appointments, the 1989 Act requires the Council to allocate seats to political groups in accordance with the groups' proportionate strength on the Council as a whole.
2. The political balance requirement applies only where political groups have been set up, but where it does apply the allocation to committees has to be reviewed annually. A review is also required on the formation of a new political group or if requested by a member newly joining a group.
3. A committee must review the allocation of seats on its sub-committees following any change in the committee's membership as a result of a 1989 Act review.

The Allocation

4. The allocation process depends on the proportionate strengths of the political groups and the nature of the committee, sub-committee or other body concerned. The following rules apply:
 - (i) Where a group has an overall majority on the Council, that group is entitled to a majority of the seats on each committee and sub-committee. For this purpose only, the calculation must include seats occupied by voting co-optees on a scrutiny committee or sub-committee concerned with education.
 - (ii) Each political group is entitled to its proportion of the total number of seats on all the committees added together, according to the ratio of the number of members of the group to the number of members of the Council.
 - (iii) Subject to (i) and (ii) above, each group is entitled to its proportion of the number of seats on each individual committee.
 - (iv) For sub-committees and some other bodies, a group is entitled to its proportion of the number of seats regardless of the total number of seats involved (but still subject to the majority rule in (i) above).
 - (v) The allocations of seats to political groups are rounded up or down to the nearest whole number. Where the allocations leave a seat or seats unfilled on a committee, sub-committee or other body those seats must be allocated to any independent members of the Council.
5. Except where a "no dissent" alternative (as described below) is adopted, application of these principles, "so far as reasonably practicable", is mandatory. Once the allocations have been agreed under this procedure, the appointment of individual members must then be made in accordance with the wishes of the respective groups.

Alternatives where "No Dissent"

6. The requirement to allocate seats according to political groups' proportionate strengths can be overridden by some other arrangement, either in relation to all committees, sub-committees and other bodies or in relation to any individual committee, sub-

committee or other body, provided that no councillor votes against the alternative arrangement when it is proposed.

Co-opted members on Committees

7. A number of Committees have co-opted members:

Audit & Governance Committee – One representative of the Business Community (nominee on Annex 3)

Pension Fund Committee –

- 2 Academy School Representatives - non-voting
- 1 Oxford Brookes University Representative - non-voting
- 1 District Council Representative - non-voting
- 1 Scheme Member Representative - non-voting.

Oxfordshire Joint Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee – Under Section 8(2)(a) of the Health and Social Care Act 2001 5 District Councillors are appointed by the District Councils. By agreement with all partners of the joint committee there are 3 non-voting co-opted members in order to assist it in its work.

Education Scrutiny Committee – Under the Localism Act 2000 there must be 4 voting co-optees who vote only on matters relating to education functions representing:

The Church of England – nominated by the relevant Diocesan Board of Education

The Roman Catholic Church – nominated by the Bishop of the relevant Diocese

Primary Schools Parent Governors – by advert and election process

Secondary and Special Schools Parent Governors – by advert and election process

This page is intentionally left blank