



County Council

2 November 2021

Agenda

If you wish to view proceedings, please click on this [link](#). However, that will not allow you to participate in the meeting.

Places at meetings are limited. If you still wish to attend this meeting in person, you must contact the Committee Officer by 9am on Wednesday 27 October 2021 and they will advise if you can be accommodated at this meeting and of the Covid-19 safety requirements for all attendees. Requests to speak should be sent to Deborah.miller@oxfordshire.gov.uk. You will be contacted by the officer regarding arrangements for speaking.

Please note that in line with current government guidance *all* attendees are strongly encouraged to take two lateral flow tests in advance of the meeting, one on the morning of the Meeting if possible.

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/lnsite/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, 2 November 2021 at 11.00 am

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



Yvonne Rees
Chief Executive

October 2021

Committee Officer: Deborah Miller

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

A buffet luncheon will be provided

AGENDA

1. Minutes (Pages 1 - 40)

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 14 September 2021 (**CC1**) and to receive information arising from them.

2. Apologies for Absence

3. Declarations of Interest - see guidance note

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

4. Official Communications

5. Appointments

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

6. Petitions and Public Address

7. Questions with Notice from Members of the Public

8. Questions with Notice from Members of the Council

9. Report of the Cabinet (Pages 41 - 46)

Report of the Cabinet Meetings held on 21 September 2021 and 19 October 2021 (CC9).

10. Members' Allowances (Pages 47 - 74)

Report by the Director of Law & Governance (CC10).

Each year, Full Council must adopt a Scheme of Members' Allowances to apply from 1 April of the following year. In particular it must set the amount of a Basic Allowance payable to all members and may make payments for Special Responsibility and Co-opted Members' Allowances. Accordingly, this report asks members to adopt a Scheme of Allowances to apply from 1 April 2022. Principally, Council's attention is drawn to the recommendations made by the Independent Remuneration Panel in November 2020. Consideration of these was deferred by Council in December 2020. In adopting a Scheme, the Council must have regard to the recommendations. However, it is the Council's choice whether to accept the Panel's recommendations in whole or in part, or not at all, or to determine any other Scheme. As such, options are set out in the report.

The Council is RECOMMENDED to adopt a Scheme of Members' Allowances for the financial year 2022/23, and in so doing to consider the following options, either:

- 1) ***To adopt the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel made in November 2020 and as set out in Annex 1 to this report; OR***
- 2) ***To adopt any particular recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel as the Council may determine; OR***
- 3) ***To agree alternative values for any of the allowances, as the Council may determine; OR***
- 4) ***If the Council does not wish to accept the Panel's recommendations at this time, in whole or in part, or to substitute alternative amounts, to agree a status quo Scheme of Allowances for 2022/23 for any unchanged aspect; AND***
- 5) ***That in any event, the Council adopts an annual index for a four year period (whereby if no other changes occur to a Scheme, then the***

Members' Allowances may increase in relation to that index for a period of no more than four years), and that this should relate (as in previous years) to the annual pay award for local government staff.

11. Committee Dates 2022/23 (Pages 75 - 78)

A schedule of meeting dates proposed for the 2022/23 Council Year is attached (CC11).

The schedule has been drawn up to reflect the various rules about frequency of meetings set out in the Council's Constitution and takes into account Bank Holidays and the summer period when meetings are traditionally avoided as far as practicable. Meeting dates for Committees reflect the dates in previous years as far as possible. Meeting dates are set to ensure linked committees follow in a timely manner for items to be considered by more than one committee.

In light of the shared working arrangements with Cherwell District Council (CDC) and to assist "twin hatted" councillors (Members who are both an Oxfordshire County Councillor and a Cherwell District Councillor), the calendar of meetings has also been prepared giving consideration to the calendar of meetings for CDC.

Attention is drawn to the following proposed change to previous patterns:

Move the April Meeting of Council so that it falls outside of the School Holidays.

Council is RECOMMENDED to agree the schedule of meeting dates for 2022/23 and in particular to agree to waive Rule 2.1 of the Council Procedure Rules to allow the April 2023 meeting of full Council to be held on 28 March 2023 to avoid the Easter School holiday.

MOTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

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

12. Motion by Councillor Eddie Reeves

"This Council supports the work undertaken by members and officers in developing an ambitious Libraries and Heritage Services Strategy, both under the previous administration and the present one.

This Council recognises the funding challenges that face local authorities in their provision of such services, which long predate the current Government and whose services may sometimes be characterised by an era of local government that has long since disappeared.

Given the importance of developer contributions for the provision of, and realisation of improvements to, such vital services, this Council calls on the Leader and Cabinet Member for Community Services to establish a Cabinet Advisory Group to ensure inter alia that the Council's strategy is:

- i. properly funded;

- ii. sensibly delivered against agreed key performance indicators; and
- iii. cognisant of the need to have the right libraries in the right places, rather than those in which they have historically been placed.

Without prejudice to its work, such a CAG could also advise the Leader and relevant Cabinet Member on:

- i. parts of the county and the country in which libraries have facilitated or hosted joint services, thereby increasing use of public libraries; and
- ii. the wealth and scope of College, University and other private library facilities that exist in Oxfordshire with a view to investigating the possibility of making such facilities – whether wholly or in part – more readily available to residents and, more particularly, adult learners, consistent with the Government’s Lifelong Learning Guarantee.”

13. Motion by Councillor Jane Hanna

“Government planned reforms to integrate health and care by April 2022 are being implemented across Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West (BOB) ahead of the Health and Care Bill 2021 and there are many non-elected new decision-makers and groups in place.

We believe Oxfordshire County Council must have freedom to work with partners to respond to the needs of our people, most especially as inequalities have worsened through the pandemic. County councillor democratic involvement at each local and regional level of decision-making is vital as well as ensuring local authority standards of accountability apply to new non-elected bodies.

Oxfordshire statutory committees of Health and Wellbeing and JHOSC are well established Oxfordshire committees. Their role must be core to understanding and tackling inequalities and helping build back sustainable local communities. New decision-making powers for health and care above Oxfordshire as place must be compelling and accountable. Proposed new powers for ministers to intervene in any local change need to be removed from the Bill. If joint health and care plans are to succeed locally government needs to deliver now on national workforce planning and on its failed pledges in 2017 and in 2019 to deliver a social care settlement fit for the 21st century.

Council calls on and supports the Chair of Wellbeing Board and Chair of HOSC writing to all Oxfordshire MPs seeking their active support for this Council’s position in Parliament and to seek wider support with local partners with view to influencing improvements to reforms.”

14. Motion by Councillor Brad Baines

“Oxfordshire County Council believes planning works best when developers and the local community work together to shape local areas and deliver necessary new homes; and therefore, calls on the Government to protect the right of communities to object to individual planning applications.

Oxfordshire County Council also calls on the Leader of the Council to write to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government to ask them to uphold this vital principle.”

15. Motion by Councillor Kieron Mallon

"This Council notes that Banbury FM wishes to secure a licence to provide a locally run radio station dedicated to North Oxfordshire.

This Council supports the need especially in times of emergency, to provide a genuinely local news outlet dedicated to an established geographical location and conurbation.

Whilst not pre-empting who the provider may be this council supports the aspiration for a local provider to operate the local DAB multiplex and secure a truly local FM community radio licence when they become available.

This Council requests that the leader of the Council writes to Ofcom and the Secretary of State for Digital, Cultural, Media and Sport (DCMS) to convey our support for a local provider to persuade Ofcom of the need for a community minded radio station in the Banbury and North Oxfordshire catchment area."

16. Motion by Councillor Ian Snowden

"This Council:

- (i) Acknowledges efforts that this Council has made to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and promote renewable energy;
- (ii) Recognises that large financial setup and running costs involved in selling locally generated renewable electricity to local customers make impossible for local renewable electricity generators,
- (iii) Recognises that making these financial costs proportionate to the scale of renewable electricity supplier's operation would create significant opportunities for local companies, community groups and councils to be providers of locally generated renewable electricity directly to local people, businesses and organisations, and
- (iv) Recognises that revenues received by local companies, community groups or councils that become local renewable electricity providers could be used to help improve the local economy, local services and reduce local greenhouse gas emissions;
- (iv) Notes that the Parliamentary Environmental Audit Committee has recommended that a Right to Local Supply for local energy suppliers be established to address this.

Council resolves to support the Local Electricity Bill, supported by a cross-party group of over 260 MPs, which, if made law, would establish a Right to Local Supply which would promote local renewable electricity supply by making the setup and running costs of selling renewable electricity to local customers proportionate to the size of the supply company. Council further resolves to ask the Leader of the Council to:

- inform the local media of this decision,
- write to other local MPs, asking them to support the Bill, and

- write to the organisers Power for People, info@powerforpeople.org.uk) expressing its support.”

17. Motion by Councillor Sally Povolotsky

“In 2018, at COP24, the UK Government signed up to ‘domestic institutional arrangements, public participation and engagement with local communities’ so localities can play their part in delivering the UK’s ‘Nationally Determined Contributions’ in the Paris Agreement.

In May 2021 the Rt. Hon. Alok Sharma MP, President of COP26, said collaboration would be a key objective of the COP26 climate summit; “Governments, business and civil society (sometimes called ‘non- state actors’ and including local government) need to work together to transform the ways we power our homes and businesses, grow our food, develop infrastructure and move ourselves and goods around.”

Despite these agreements and statements there is still no formal relationship for partnership working between Local and National Government on climate action.

This Council:-

- (a) notes that Cabinet has already adopted the recommendations of the ‘Pathways to Zero Carbon Oxfordshire’ report¹, the most detailed plan ever made for the decarbonisation of Oxfordshire's economy;
- (b) adds its voice to calls by the Local Government Association and others for a joint local and national government Task Force to work towards ‘net zero’ emissions, able to set appropriate regulations, benchmarks and targets and create long-term funding mechanisms to support local communities and economies to decarbonize; and
- (c) asks the Leader to write to Alok Sharma MP, President for COP26, the Prime Minister, and the Leadership Board of the LGA, informing them of our support for such a Task Force and asking for one to be established as soon as possible.”

¹<https://www.eci.ox.ac.uk/news/2021/0629-pathways-to-zero-carbon-oxfordshire.html>

18. Motion by Councillor Ian Middleton

“This Council recognises that meat and dairy production is a significant contributor to greenhouse gas emissions and global deforestation and that reducing consumption of these foods is a key part of tackling climate change and improving health outcomes.

The Government's independent Climate Change Committee, advises that meat consumption should be reduced by a fifth, and that public bodies should lead the way by promoting plant-based food options. Leading by example on this and food waste should be fundamental components of our commitment to cutting carbon emissions.

Furthermore, in the UK, only 18% of children consume the recommended 5 portions of fruit and vegetables per day, and most young people's diets lack fibre. Providing appealing plant-based school meals along with education on healthy, climate-positive food choices are excellent ways to address these problems.

Council asks Cabinet to:

1. Ensure that food provided at all council catered events and meetings is entirely plant-based, preferably using ingredients sourced from local food surplus organisations.
2. Ensure that council school meals services have plant based menus available as part of their regular offer on at least two days per week.
3. Work on outreach to schools and young people to actively influence and inform on food choices and their impact on the environment, health and animal welfare.
4. Encourage and empower students to make informed decisions about the food available in their school.
5. Inspire, promote and support initiatives surrounding food growing, preparation and waste avoidance, especially as part of school and community projects."

19. Motion by Councillor Richard Webber

"On 10 July 2018, Council passed a motion unanimously calling on the Leader of the Council to write to Thames Water, Defra, the Environment Agency and Ofwat, requesting that a second consultation on the proposed Oxfordshire Reservoir be undertaken due to incomplete information or errors on the information used to base their recommendations."

As information in the latest consultation remains incomplete, and what has been provided to support the proposal contains many errors, Council now confirms its position on the TW proposed Reservoir agreed at the Council meeting on the 10 July 2018 in that it remains opposed to the proposal, at least until the case for need has been clearly demonstrated by taking into account and answering the concerns of the whole scientific community.

To this end, Council will be including and taking full account of discussions with and opinions of all sources of independent scientific expertise including the Group Against Reservoir Development (GARD) when considering its response to Thames Water proposals."

Pre-Meeting Briefing

There will be a pre-meeting briefing at County Hall on **Monday 1 November 2021 at 1.00 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, 14 September 2021 commencing at 10.30 am and finishing at 3.35 pm.

Present:

Councillor John Howson– in the Chair
Councillor Susanna Pressel – Vice-Chair

Councillors:

Juliette Ash	Donna Ford	Calum Miller
Brad Baines	Andrew Gant	Jane Murphy
Hannah Banfield	Stefan Gawrysiak	Michael O'Connor
David Bartholomew	Andy Graham	Glynis Phillips
Robin Bennett	Kate Gregory	Sally Povolotsky
Felix Bloomfield	Jane Hanna OBE	Eddie Reeves
Liz Brighthouse OBE	Jenny Hannaby	G.A. Reynolds
Nigel Champken-Woods	Damian Haywood	Judy Roberts
Mark Cherry	Charlie Hicks	David Rouane
Andrew Coles	Tony Ilott	Geoff Saul
Yvonne Constance OBE	Bob Johnston	Les Sibley
Ian Corkin	Liz Leffman	Nigel Simpson
Imade Edosomwan	Nick Leverton	Roz Smith
Duncan Enright	Dan Levy	Ian Snowdon
Mohamed Fadlalla	Dr Nathan Ley	Dr Pete Sudbury
Arash Fatemian	Mark Lygo	Bethia Thomas
Neil Fawcett	Kieron Mallon	Michael Waive
Ted Fenton	Ian Middleton	Liam Walker
Nick Field-Johnson	Freddie van Mierlo	Richard Webber

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 and schedule of business, copies of which are attached to the signed Minutes.

48/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

(Agenda Item 1)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Tim Bearder, Councillor Kevin Bulmer, Councillor Michele Paule and Councillor Alison Rooke.

49/21 MINUTES

(Agenda Item 3)

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 13 July 2021 were approved and signed as an accurate record.

50/21 OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS

(Agenda Item 4)

Council welcomed Councillor Mark Cherry.

Council sent best wishes to the High Sherriff who had been unwell.

Council thanked staff for their contribution to Oxford Open Doors. County Hall had received over 850 visitors to the building throughout the weekend.

Council congratulated Marjorie Glasgow on her appointment as Lord Lieutenant and paid tribute to the outgoing Lord Lieutenant, Sir Tim Stevenson.

The Chair thanked Council for their contributions for his Charity walk, which had raised over £1000.

Council paid tribute and held a minute's silence in memory of former County Councillor Peter Fisher.

51/21 APPOINTMENTS

(Agenda Item 5)

Council AGREED the following appointments:

Horton Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Councillor Mark Cherry to replace Councillor Geoff Saul

Performance & Corporate Services O&S Committee

Councillor Ian Corkin to replace Councillor David Bartholomew.

Audit & Governance Committee

Councillor Eddie Reeves to replace Councillor Jane Murphy

52/21 PETITIONS AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

(Agenda Item 6)

Council received the following Petitions and Public Address:

A Petition on presented by Mr Peter West on behalf One Headington, 90 plus Headington businesses asking the County Council to shelve future

plans for the installation of Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN) barriers in Headington.

A Petition presented by Mr Gregory O'Broin on behalf of residents of Appleford requesting that the County Council redesign and move the elevated flyover road and bridge to provide adequate distance from Appleford dwellings, to move the short section of carriageway by 200 meters and to provide reasonable mitigation along its entire length.

Ms Joan Stewart addressed the Council in support of Agenda Item 20 Motion by Councillor Jane Hanna), on the basis that she believed that there were deep flaws in the Health and Care Bill, many of which would directly affect local democracy; would not improve Oxfordshire's healthcare; would not address the stark inequalities across the county, but instead would inflict lasting damage on local democracy and local accountability and did not merit the name 'integration'. She urged the Council to support the Motion.

53/21 QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

(Agenda Item 8)

20 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 1 (Question from Yvonne Constance to Councillor Tim Bearder) Councillor Enright undertook to ask Councillor Bearder to provide Councillor Constance with a written response on when Swindon and OCC would manage traffic away from works on A420 and not through it.

In relation to question 2 (Question from Councillor Yvonne Constance to Councillor Duncan Enright) Councillor Enright undertook to provide Councillor Constance with a written reply answering whether there was a start date for construction.

In relation to question 6 (Question from Councillor Andrew Coles to Councillor Tim Bearder) Councillor Enright undertook to notify Councillor Tim Bearder that the invitation to visit the residents of Burwell Drive was still open.

In relation to question 10 (Question from Councillor Eddie Reeves to Councillor Tim Bearder) Councillor Enright undertook to ask Councillor Tim Bearder to provide a written answer to Councillor Reeves as to whether the Cabinet Member would push through LTNs if the majority of residents vote against it.

In relation to question 11 (Question from Councillor Nick Field Johnston to Councillor Pete Sudbury) Councillor Sudbury undertook to consult with the Leader and provide a written answer to Councillor Field Johnson answering what the current status was with discussions with the 6 MPs.

In relation to question 15 (Question from Councillor Brad Baines to Councillor Tim Bearder) Councillor Enright undertook to ask Councillor Tim Bearder to provide a written answer detailing what the plans were for further school streets.

In relation to question 16 (Question from Councillor Brad Baines to Councillor Duncan Enright) Councillor Enright undertook to ask Councillor Tim Bearder to provide a written answer to Councillor Baines on what role the expanded green zone ZEZ will have in tackling congestion caused by visitors wanting to park at the Westgate.

54/21 REPORT OF THE CABINET

(Agenda Item 9)

Council received the report of the Cabinet.

In relation to paragraph 4 of the report (Question from Councillor David Bartholomew to Councillor Calum Miller) Councillor Miller undertook to provide a written answer quantifying the financial risks of the Kennington Bridge Scheme and explain how they will be catered for.

In relation to paragraph 4 of the report (Question from Councillor Yvonne Constance to Councillor Calum Miller) Councillor Miller undertook to provide a written answer outlining what the ambitions were for the Active Travel Fund.

In relation to paragraph 6 of the report (Question from Councillor Brad Baines to Councillor Tim Bearder) Councillor Duncan Enright undertook to pass on Councillor Baine's request to implement an active travel 'mini holland' in South Oxford.

In relation to paragraph 9 of the report (Question from Councillor Brad Baines to Councillor Liz Leffman) Councillor Leffman undertook to look again at the performance indicators and KPIs. She urged the scrutiny committees to let her know how they thought it could be improved.

In relation to paragraph 9 of the report (Question from Councillor Nick Field-Johnson to Councillor Liz Leffman) Councillor Leffman undertook to look at an opt-in service for members receiving paper copies of Committee Papers.

55/21 TREASURY MANAGEMENT 2020/21 OUTTURN

(Agenda Item 10)

Council had before it a report which set out the Treasury Management performance in the financial year 2020/21 in compliance with the CIPFA Code of Practice. The report included Debt and Investment activity, Prudential Indicator Outturn, Investment Strategy, and interest receivable and payable for the financial year.

Councillor Miller moved and Councillor Pressel that the report be noted. In moving the report the Cabinet Member for Finance, Councillor Miller thanked the Treasury Management Team for their work.

RESOLVED: (nem con) to note the Council's Treasury Management Activity in 2020/21.

56/21 REVIEW OF POLITICAL BALANCE ON COMMITTEES

(Agenda Item 11)

The Council was required by the Local Government & Housing Act 1989 to review the political balance on its committees on an annual basis and then in any circumstances set out in Regulations under the 1989 Act. Following the May 2021 elections and the subsequent formation of political groups on the Council, the political balance was formally reviewed at the Annual Council Meeting on the 18 May. Since that time, Cllr Mark Cherry had been confirmed as the duly elected member for the Banbury Ruscote Division. As a result, the Monitoring Officer has formally received notification from Cllr Cherry and from the Leader of the Labour & Co-operative Party Group, that Cllr Cherry has become a member of that Group.

Following the addition to the Labour & Co-operative Party Group, The Council had before it a report which set out a further review of political balance now needed to occur to reflect the relative proportion of each Group with regards to seats on the Council and given that more than a month had elapsed since the last review of political balance. The review also reflected that the Conservative-Independent Alliance Group now had one fewer member than previously.

RESOLVED: (on a Motion by Councillor John Howson, seconded by Councillor Susanna Pressel and carried nem con)

- (a) to note the revised political balance on committees shown in Annex 2 to the report;
- (b) to make the consequential appointments to the Committees named in paragraph 11 and as listed in paragraph 13 and Annex 3 (to follow), to give effect to the wishes of the respective Group Leaders.

57/21 DISPENSATION FROM ATTENDING MEETINGS

(Agenda Item 12)

Under the Local Government Act 1972 Section 85 (1), councillors who did not attend a meeting of the Council during a six-month period would cease to be a member of the Council unless the Council had approved a dispensation before the expiry of that period. Council had before it a report which sought approval to grant such a dispensation to Cllr Alison Rooke who, for reason of ill-health, was unlikely to be able to attend a meeting of the Council prior to April 2022.

Councillor John Howson moved and Councillor Susanna Pressel seconded that the recommendations set out on the face of the Agenda and the report be adopted. In moving the recommendation, Councillor Howson indicated that he would be writing to Councillor Rooke to send best wishes on behalf of Council. Councillor Leffman paid tribute to Councillor Rooke as Chair of their Group and added her very best wishes.

RESOLVED: (nem con)

- (a) approve a dispensation for Cllr Alison Rooke from the statutory requirement to attend a meeting of the Council within a six month period from the last noted attendance;
- (b) approve that the dispensation last up to and including 30 April 2022.

58/21 MOTION BY COUNCILLOR ANDREW GANT

(Agenda Item 13)

Councillor Andrew Gant moved and Councillor Kate Gregory seconded the following Motion:

“Council notes and approves that there has been a general move away from gender-specific job titles in recent decades. This has taken different forms in different contexts, but a common thread is that where a simple alternative to a gender-specific nomenclature exists, it has been widely adopted. Such an instance is the replacement of “Chairman” with “Chair”.

Council notes and approves that the vast majority of other councils have made this change, either formally or by natural evolution and habit.

Council regrets that its own working practices haven’t kept up with this shift, making it appear old-fashioned, reactionary, exclusive, out of touch and showing a damaging lack of awareness of changes in society as a whole. Council also believes it will be easier and more efficient for officers to work to one standard in preparing meeting agendas, etc

Council therefore:

Resolves that with immediate effect the chairs of council and all committees and other bodies will be referred to in writing and verbally as “Chair”. The word “Chairman” will not be used.

Resolves to ask the Monitoring Officer to incorporate this change in the constitution at the earliest opportunity and to change the currently in-use painted board in the Council Chamber at the earliest convenient opportunity (but not to alter the other, completed boards, which are a historical record).

Councillor Yvonne Constance moved and Councillor Donna Ford seconded the following amendment to the Motion as shown in bold italics and strikethrough below:

“Council notes and approves that there has been a general move away from gender-specific job titles in recent decades. This has taken different forms in different contexts, but a common thread is that where a simple alternative to a gender-specific nomenclature exists, it has been widely adopted. Such an instance is the replacement of “Chairman” with “Chair”.

Council notes and approves that the vast majority of other councils have made this change, either formally or by natural evolution and habit.

Council regrets that its own working practices haven’t kept up with this shift, making it appear old-fashioned, reactionary, exclusive, out of touch **among certain sections of the community** and showing a ~~damaging~~ **perceived** lack of awareness of changes in society as a whole. Council also believes it will be easier and more efficient for officers to work to one standard in preparing meeting agendas, etc

Council therefore:

Resolves that with immediate effect the chairs of council and all committees and other bodies will be referred to in writing and verbally as “Chair”. The word “Chairman” will not be used **unless the person in question politely so requests**.

Resolves **subject also to the outcome of the Council’s constitutional review**, to ask the Monitoring Officer to incorporate this change in the constitution at the earliest opportunity and to change the currently in-use painted board in the Council Chamber at the earliest convenient opportunity (but not to alter the other, completed boards, which are a historical record).

Following debate, the motion was put to the vote and was lost by 37 votes to 20.

The substantive Motion was then put to the vote and was carried by 38 votes to 20.

RESOLVED: (by 38 votes to 20)

“Council notes and approves that there has been a general move away from gender-specific job titles in recent decades. This has taken different forms in different contexts, but a common thread is that where a simple alternative to a gender-specific nomenclature exists, it has been widely adopted. Such an instance is the replacement of “Chairman” with “Chair”.

Council notes and approves that the vast majority of other councils have made this change, either formally or by natural evolution and habit.

Council regrets that its own working practices haven’t kept up with this shift, making it appear old-fashioned, reactionary, exclusive, out of touch and showing a ~~damaging~~ lack of awareness of changes in society as a whole.

Council also believes it will be easier and more efficient for officers to work to one standard in preparing meeting agendas, etc

Council therefore:

Resolves that with immediate effect the chairs of council and all committees and other bodies will be referred to in writing and verbally as "Chair". The word "Chairman" will not be used.

Resolves to ask the Monitoring Officer to incorporate this change in the constitution at the earliest opportunity and to change the currently in-use painted board in the Council Chamber at the earliest convenient opportunity (but not to alter the other, completed boards, which are a historical record).

59/21 MOTION BY COUNCILLOR DONNA FORD

(Agenda Item 14)

Councillor Donna Ford moved and Councillor Edie Reeves seconded the following Motion:

"This Council recalls the new administration's flagship policy document entitled '*A Fair Deal for Oxfordshire – Shaping our priorities*' (the Policy Document) that was approved by Cabinet on 20 July, having been considered at an extraordinary meeting of Performance Scrutiny on 16 July.

This Council notes that the administration has been in place for four months and notes the aim of the Policy Document as a statement of intent in respect of its prospective policies relative to those of the outgoing administration.

Accordingly, this Council resolves that the administration reports to members by the date of its next meeting with a schedule of policies under active consideration and/or implementation by the previous administration that have since been:

1. Continued in their entirety by the new administration without amendment or qualification.
2. Continued substantively but varied to reasonably reflect the incoming administration's own aims and objectives.
3. Changed substantively by the new administration, but reflecting the outgoing administration's original aims and objectives; and
4. Discontinued altogether.

This Council resolves to keep such schedule reasonably up-to-date during the new administration's term of office and further requests that the administration report to members by the date of this Council's next meeting with a clear set of key performance indicators in respect of its priorities in the Policy Document to ensure that there is reasonable ongoing scrutiny of its performance and delivery of election promises."

Following debate, the Motion was put to the vote and was lost by 38 votes to 20.

RESOLVED: Motion lost by 38 votes to 20.

60/21 MOTION BY COUNCILLOR HANNAH BANFIELD

(Agenda Item 15)

Councillor Hannah Banfield moved and Councillor Sally Povolotsky seconded the following Motion:

“Oxfordshire County Council condemns the use of ‘Fire and Rehire’ by any employers in the County of Oxfordshire and calls upon the Members of Parliament representing Oxfordshire’s residents (Anneliese Dodds, John Howell, Layla Moran, David Johnson, Robert Courts and Victoria Prentis) to support Barry Gardiner’s Private Member’s Bill and do all in their power to make this practice unlawful.

Oxfordshire County Council resolves not to procure any goods or services from companies that have sought to gain commercial advantage by using or threatening to use this unscrupulous practice.”

Councillor Kieron Mallon moved and Councillor Eddie Reeves seconded the following amendment to the Motion as shown in bold italics and below:

“Oxfordshire County Council condemns the use of ‘Fire and Rehire’ by any employers in the County of Oxfordshire and calls upon the Members of Parliament representing Oxfordshire’s residents (Anneliese Dodds, John Howell, Layla Moran, David Johnson, Robert Courts and Victoria Prentis) to support Barry Gardiner’s Private Member’s Bill ***or such other appropriate legislation*** and do all in their power to make this practice unlawful.

Oxfordshire County Council resolves, ***where lawful***, not to procure any goods or services from companies that have sought to gain commercial advantage by using or threatening to use this unscrupulous practice.”

Following debate, the amendment was put to the vote and was lost by 34 votes to 21, with 2 abstentions.

The substantive Motion was then put to the vote and was carried nem con.

RESOLVED: (nem con)

“Oxfordshire County Council condemns the use of ‘Fire and Rehire’ by any employers in the County of Oxfordshire and calls upon the Members of Parliament representing Oxfordshire’s residents (Anneliese Dodds, John Howell, Layla Moran, David Johnson, Robert Courts and Victoria Prentis) to support Barry Gardiner’s Private Member’s Bill and do all in their power to make this practice unlawful.

Oxfordshire County Council resolves not to procure any goods or services from companies that have sought to gain commercial advantage by using or threatening to use this unscrupulous practice.”

61/21 MOTION BY COUNCILLOR EDDIE REEVES

(Agenda Item 16)

Councillor Eddie Reeves moved and Councillor Jane Murphy seconded the following Motion:

“This Council notes that public services – locally and nationally – have been impacted immensely by the pandemic.

This Council acknowledges that the Government has spent more public money than any in the nation’s history to secure the livelihoods of hard-working people, and the futures of the public, private and voluntary sector organisations who employ them. Without prejudice to any outcome, this Council recognises that local government reform may be considered again in due course. In Oxfordshire, members can either work together to shape that reform or have it imposed from Whitehall.

This Council notes that analyses have been commissioned from EY (2016), PwC (2017) and Grant Thornton (2016-7) by local authorities across Oxfordshire in addition to options appraisals conducted by Councils themselves.

This Council further notes that a Government White Paper on devolution is expected imminently, pursuant to which more power and control of public finances may be tied to reform.

This Council restates its aim for Oxfordshire to be a beacon of local government excellence irrespective of its political leadership and notes that members have historically worked well together in the interests of residents.

Accordingly, this Council resolves to ask the Cabinet set up a Cabinet Advisory Group to review the evidence of recent years and, without prejudice to its findings, put forward a preferred view to the Leader should local government reform be mandated by Government, or the new administration wish to secure further powers and public money from Government that are contingent on reform.”

Following debate, the Motion was put to the vote and was lost by 34 votes to 20, with 1 abstention.

RESOLVED: The Motion was lost by 34 votes to 20, with 1 abstention.

62/21 MOTION BY COUNCILLOR GLYNIS PHILLIPS

(Agenda Item 17)

Councillor Glynis Phillips moved and Councillor Neil Fawcett seconded the following Motion:

“Local Government has endured central government cuts of more than 50% since 2010. Oxfordshire County Council staff have been at the forefront of continuing to provide a range of services and support during the COVID pandemic. Our staff have worked to keep our communities safe, our schools open, cared for vulnerable and older people and continued to safeguard children.

A 1.75% pay increase (2.75% for those on the lowest pay point) is not enough and with inflation at 3.8% this is real terms pay cut.

This Council asks the Leader of the Council to write to all Oxfordshire MPs requesting that they contact the Chancellor of the Exchequer to provide the necessary funding for a substantial and fairer pay offer.”

Councillor Eddie Reeves moved and Councillor David Bartholomew seconded the following Amendment to the Motion as shown in bold italics below:

“Local Government has endured central government cuts of more than 50% since 2010. Oxfordshire County Council staff have been at the forefront of continuing to provide a range of services and support during the COVID pandemic. Our staff have worked to keep our communities safe, our schools open, cared for vulnerable and older people and continued to safeguard children.

A 1.75% pay increase (2.75% for those on the lowest pay point) is not enough ***for our lower paid staff*** and with inflation at 3.8% this is real terms pay cut.

This Council asks the Leader of the Council to write to all Oxfordshire MPs requesting that they contact the Chancellor of the Exchequer to provide the necessary funding for a substantial and fairer pay offer ***to those members of staff who are (i) not already paid the Oxford Living Wage and/or (ii) who earn less than the median wage in Oxfordshire and cannot work from home.***”

Following debate, the amendment by Councillor Reeves was put to the vote and was lost by 35 votes to 19.

The substantive Motion was then put to the vote and was carried by 35 votes to 17.

RESOLVED: (by 35 votes to 17)

“Local Government has endured central government cuts of more than 50% since 2010. Oxfordshire County Council staff have been at the forefront of continuing to provide a range of services and support during the COVID pandemic. Our staff have worked to keep our communities safe, our schools open, cared for vulnerable and older people and continued to safeguard children.

A 1.75% pay increase (2.75% for those on the lowest pay point) is not enough and with inflation at 3.8% this is real terms pay cut.

This Council asks the Leader of the Council to write to all Oxfordshire MPs requesting that they contact the Chancellor of the Exchequer to provide the necessary funding for a substantial and fairer pay offer.”

63/21 MOTIONS BY COUNCILLOR BRAD BAINES, COUNCILLOR KIERON MALLON AND COUNCILLOR JANE HANNA

(Agenda Item 18)

The time being after 3.30 pm, these Motions were considered dropped in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13.5.8.

..... in the Chair

Date of signing

QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Questions	Answers
<p>1. COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE</p> <p>Residents in villages along the A420 still have no information from traffic management, nor any confidence that OCC is requiring any action by Swindon Borough Council to divert traffic away from the A420 during the SBC works for next 18 months on the A420. The Question was raised at July Council meeting, and we have seen no action and heard of no developments with SBC.</p> <p>In addition to current works, SBC is about to open 1 million sq. ft distribution space at Symmetry Park (to be occupied by Amazon?) and is now starting the EIP for redevelopment of 675 sq. ft at the Honda site into distribution space, as well as starting a Review of their Local Plan. What confirmation can the Cabinet Member give me that the OCC will ensure the we residents know that Oxfordshire’s interests are being properly considered and actioned in these programmes?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR TIM BEARDER, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Officers in the Network Management Team have been in contact with colleagues at Swindon Borough Council regarding the refurbishment of the roundabouts on the A420 just over the border. As works progress, Swindon has installed traffic management to allow for the controlled passage of vehicles through the site. At the same time, Highways England have been operating night-time closures of the M4 and diverting traffic along the strategic diversion route of the A420 and A34. Both sets of works are causing delays on the approaches to the roundabout and these are being controlled by manually operated traffic lights. I can confirm that there are no roadworks on the A420 junction with Highworth Road. We did grant a permit for some limited works in March 2021, but these are completed. We have no Permits pending in the system for works for a roundabout in the system for Highworth Road (Shrivenham) and the A420, but we have had some very preliminary conversations with Carla Homes representatives about the potential works. However, there is currently no S278 agreement in place and any works would not start until 2022 at the earliest. A decision on the granting of a Permit would take into account other works on the A420 to ensure that any disruption was mitigated as far as possible. The Statement of Common Ground between Oxfordshire County Council and Swindon Borough Council refers to the Swindon Borough Local Plan 2016 Examination and does not refer to ongoing or proposed roadworks. Decisions on these are made under the Oxfordshire Permit Scheme. Officers from the County Council will be meeting soon with operational staff from Highways England to look at the Strategic Diversion Routes within the County (date to be confirmed). The A420 – Swindon to Oxford, is part of the strategic diversion network and is part of the County Councils Freight Strategy for Oxfordshire as a link between large towns. This strategy is being reviewed under LTCP5.</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>I can confirm that the planning application for the Symmetry Park distribution building and the EIA scoping opinion request for the Swindon Honda Site to which you refer, were both subject to consultation by Oxfordshire County Council (OCC). OCC objected to the Symmetry Park application in our capacity as Lead Local Flood Authority. Our response to the Honda EIA scoping opinion highlighted the need to consider mitigation for highway safety and capacity issues along the A420. I am also able to confirm that OCC are routinely consulted by Swindon Borough Council (SBC) where planning applications are deemed to impact upon our County or immediately about the County Boundary. Whilst our consultation responses must be considered by SBC, as Local Planning Authority they are ultimately the decision maker. In terms of SBC Local Plan Review, OCC is considering and preparing a formal response to the current Regulation 19 consultation which will be reviewed by the inspector examining the plan; relevant members are being consulted as part of this process. We are also preparing a response to the Swindon Draft Local Transport Plan Refresh and have involved members in this process. Officers currently attend biannual planning liaison meetings with SBC and are seeking to set up additional liaison meetings for senior officers and members.</p> <p>I also note that, in February 2021, the Government issued a press release that said the Oxford to Cambridge Arc was: 'An ambitious plan to unleash the economic and cultural potential of the Oxford-Cambridge Arc, to transform it into one of the <u>world's premier growth corridors</u>' I note that this is a project you enthusiastically supported while you were running Oxfordshire's roads. If you and your friends in the Conservative government continue to promote an ambition to turn us into the world's premier growth corridor it is little wonder your residents feel like they are living in one! I will not abandon them to this unwelcome ideology that I don't think local people don't want.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Councillor Enright will be aware of the local outrage about the traffic management on the A420 at the boundary with Swindon. When will Swindon and Oxfordshire County act to manage the traffic away from the works on the A420 not through it? Currently they attempt to manage vastly congestion traffic through the works on their side of the A420 which only spins traffic into all the surrounding villages.</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER (response by Councillor Duncan Enright)</p> <p>Thank you, Councillor Constance and thank you for keeping a close eye on the work that is going on there, you will be aware of some of the strategic measures which are beginning to be put in place not least the study of the traffic area between Swindon and Oxford which is going to have some impact on the A420. However, I will ask Councillor Tim Bearder to provide a written response.</p>
<p>2. COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE</p> <p>Residents along the A420 past Faringdon have been assured for years that traffic lights would be installed at the Great Coxwell junction to manage the increased traffic from many new developments in the area. There is now real concern that development on Land South of STEEDS may result in loss of that the Inspector's decision on appeal to require 35% affordable houses, may result in the loss of s.106 contribution (of £854,000) threaten delivery of these much-needed traffic lights.</p> <p>What plans does County Council have to fund the Great Coxwell traffic lights if the 'Steeds S.106 funding' is lost?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR DUNCAN ENRIGHT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRAVEL AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY attachments</p> <p>The S106 was signed shortly after the Inquiry concluded and prior to the Appeal Decision report being published. It includes within it the requirement for the developer to deliver the Coxwell Road/A420 junction improvements (i.e. introduction of traffic lights), prior to occupations of dwellings on the site (see paragraph 3.2, p.52, Eighth Schedule). I have attached a copy of the S106 for reference. The sections relevant to transport matters are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seventh Schedule: Covenants with the County Council (pp.43-49) • Eighth Schedule: Highway Works (pp.50-52) • Ninth Schedule: A420 Junction Works (pp.53-55) <p>NB: page numbers given are those of the PDF rather than the page numbers shown on the scanned copy.</p> <p>Provision is made within the signed S106 for funds secured through other developments (Fernham Fields, ref: P13/V0139/O and The Steeds, ref: P15/V1934/O) to be transferred to the developer, who will directly deliver the</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>junction improvement. The design of the scheme will be subject to technical approval from OCC (including an independent multi-stage Road Safety Audit).</p> <p>Per the conclusion of the Inspector in their Appeal Decision (also attached for reference), the site is obligated to deliver the junction improvement <i>and</i> 35% affordable housing (plus many other contributions listed in the S106), so there would be no reason for the S106 funds referred to in the councillor's question to be lost. For further clarity, the sum of £854,000 referred to in the question relates to the initial amount of £854,653 secured per the S106 for 'phase one' of The Steeds (P15/V1934/O). This is already held by Vale of White Horse District Council, so the conclusion of the Appeal for the South of Steeds (P18/V0259/O) has no bearing on this sum.</p> <p>As such, a clear mechanism for the delivery of the improvement to the A420/Coxwell Road junction has now been established and secured via legal agreement.</p>
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>congratulations, excellent, good news, the traffic lights are about to happen. I think we have only waited ten years, that I can recall. Please can you tell us if there is a date to start construction?</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>I am delighted to be the one who is brought this ten year wait to an end and there are some other ten year waits that I am hoping to end as well. I will certainly get back to Councillor Constance with a written reply.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>3. COUNCILLOR YVONNE CONSTANCE</p> <p>The new National Bus Strategy is being implemented in Oxfordshire, and we know that OCC met the June deadline to submit proposals for an Extended Bus Partnership Strategy. We must now submit the bid for enhanced bus services, and we expect that to feature increased service to rural areas. Will the Cabinet Member inform Council residents and interested parties can submit their proposals in time to be included for the October deadline?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR TIM BEARDER, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT</p> <p>At this stage, the Council is still evaluating different approaches to the rural transport issue in Oxfordshire. The Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) will set out a broad ambition, with indicative financial implications, for the many aspects of bus travel in the County. The BSIP, to be submitted this October, will therefore not include details of specific bus routes and locations. However, the Council will be engaging with the public and Stakeholders about their ideas for specific proposals and other measures to boost bus use. These will be considered, and a final set of proposals included in the Enhanced Bus Partnership document to be approved by this Council in spring 2022.</p> <p>It is worth bringing in an unfortunate splash of reality here. Whilst the government is promising services that are so frequent, passengers will be able to "turn up and go" the money they are providing to achieve that is so derisory that their promises are pure hyperbole. In the face of a Climate Emergency the Conservatives have a £27bn roads investment plan and they offer councils a measly £3bn for buses! It's a shameful missed opportunity, but I can assure you we will do all we can, to be as ambitious as we can with the crumbs they've given us.</p>
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>The answer of course is much as expected, but I would say lack of money is of course a reason for not delivering many projects. Will you make the rural bus services the priority for allocation of this funding, information has come through to Councillors very late on this one. When will rural transport be the priority?</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER (response by Councillor Duncan Enright)</p> <p>Thank you very much Councillor Constance. You will know that the Alliance is determined to make walking and cycling much easier across the county followed by public transport and in particular the bus, the bus is the backbone of our transport service and we want to strengthen that though looking not only at this bus partnership, but at the expansion of community transport and other measures including rural mobility hubs, which I know she has done work on because I have inherited that work. I think it is important that we look</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>at every bus service on its merit and I would encourage all members to think how buses can be improved in their area. The idea of a rural mobility hubs it to allow people to be only a few minutes away from a place where they can get a bus in only a few minutes. That applies just as much to our rural areas as to our city and towns. So, thank you very much indeed for the question as it highlights the importance of the rural bus services which I am grateful to acknowledge.</p>
<p>4. COUNCILLOR EDDIE REEVES</p> <p>Has a Devolution Deal bid been submitted to HM Government by this Council, following the example set by Hampshire and other upper tier authorities, and if not, why not?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LIZ LEFFMAN, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>This Council has not submitted a “devolution deal” bid to HM Government. There are several reasons for this. First, it is not up to this Council unilaterally to pursue a deal or put in a bid – any such bid would have to be agreed with the Districts and the City. Secondly, we do not know at this stage what exactly HM Government means by a “Devolution Deal” or “County Deal” and we will only have a clear idea of this when the expected White Paper is published in the autumn. Finally, I would remind Cllr Reeves that in his Levelling Up speech of July 15th, the Prime Minister was clear about the continued importance of the Ox - Cam Arc, referring to it as ‘<i>the golden triangle of London, Oxford and Cambridge - the greatest scientific constellation in this hemisphere...</i>’ Oxfordshire is a key player in the Arc and it is in that context we and our District and City partners are framing our conversation with HM Government, focussing on our vision for a greener, fairer county and a vibrant green economy. It is clear that for those authorities within its geography, the Arc is expected to be the conduit for requests for funding, freedoms, and flexibilities.</p>
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Given that Hampshire and other comparable authorities have done what apparently, we have been unable to do. Why is this Council showing such lack of ambition?</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Well thank you for your question Councillor Reeves. I would like to answer by saying the information I had from the County Council Network is that although a number of Councils have expressed an interest in the possibility of a County-Deal, the conditions which the Government is putting down at the</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>moment have meant that they have withdrawn those expressions of interest because one of the key questions that the Government asks, the first question in fact is will you take a Mayor? For this Council, I think to be honest the answer is probably not at the moment, but in any case, as I have said in my previous answer, we don't know what the Government is going to be coming forward with because we are waiting for a White Paper and until that White Paper is published, I don't think it makes a great deal of sense for use to be speculating on what might work. So, our stance at this moment is that we are working with the Districts and the City in the context of the Arc to put forward what we believe is important for the County, because that is where the funding is probably going to come from. There will probably be no funding for Counties under these Council-Deals, and we have to do the best for our County, and we believe that the best is going to be through the co-operation that we have at the moment with the other councils across the Arc.</p>
<p>5. COUNCILLOR EDDIE REEVES</p> <p>Under the last administration, the Growth Deal attracted Government funding of some £30 million a year alongside £60 million for much needed affordable homes and a £5 million fund to help develop a strategic plan for Oxfordshire. Given that we are now in the penultimate year of the Growth Deal, what plans do the current administration have to attract similar levels of public funding to Oxfordshire from 2023 onwards or does the Leader think that we have received enough inward investment already?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LIZ LEFFMAN, LEADER OF THE COUNCIL</p> <p>Oxfordshire has been successful in attracting funding in recent years. There is however never sufficient funding, and we will continue to bid for available funding and state the case for further investment in Oxfordshire including exploring any opportunities being brought forward by Government including the UK Infrastructure Bank to support the climate agenda and economic recovery.</p> <p>The refresh of OXIS and LTCP that my administration is supporting will better enable us to align business cases to the priorities of the council as well as capitalising on funding opportunities such as those presented through Active Travel funding. Should new bid opportunities arise, the new refreshed OxIS will allow us to build business cases for infrastructure schemes that better align to the political priorities of Oxfordshire.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>I am grateful for the response. Yes or no will she commit to securing similar levels of inward investments as in the last administration.</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Yes, we will do our best to get as much funding as we possibly can from Government into this County.</p>
<p>6. COUNCILLOR ANDREW COLES</p> <p>Further to my emails, could I ask Councillor Bearder what steps he and his team intend to take to address the unsightly and dangerous condition of the pavements on Burwell Drive in my division. Full details of which I have forwarded to him over the course of the summer along with photographs. Could I also politely remind Councillor Bearder that the invitation for him to come and visit and see the situation for himself still stands and that he would be very welcome.</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR TIM BEARDER, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT</p> <p>As intimated, the Burwell Drive footways are in the footway slurry programme for this year, and the programme is likely to take place during October.</p> <p>As recognised, following a meeting with Cllr Walker, much of the condition is cosmetic and hence the slurry is the correct repair method, there will be the odd location that will need some prep work in advance, but this will be undertaken by the same sub- contractor nearer the time.</p>
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Thank you for the response which is very much appreciated. I know the residents I represent will be delighted that there is a timeframe now for these urgent works. Could I remind Councillor Bearder that the invitation for him to come a visit and speak with residents is still very open and would very much welcome his input and would love to see him.</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER (response by Councillor Duncan Enright)</p> <p>Thank you, I will be happy to pass that invitation on and I have already made the same invitation myself to Councillor Bearder who will be very pleased to do so. I just remind Members that “Fix my Street” is another project which is under review, in so far as reporting things like the Burwell Drive footways through this mechanism, which certainly brings them to priority. We hope that “Fix my Street” is going to be a much more transpiring and affective tool in the future. It has been constantly under review and as technology improves, we hope to use that too. And I urge all member to visit Witney it is a terrific town.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>7. COUNCILLOR TED FENTON</p> <p>Given that all the meetings for decisions by the Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Change Delivery have been cancelled to date can the Cabinet member please assure Council that climate change is being taken seriously and explain what action has been taken over the last four months which apparently needs no decisions to be made?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR PETE SUDBURY, CABINET MEMBER FOR CLIMATE CHANGE DELIVERY & ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate the irresistible rhetorical flourish, I cannot believe that an experienced member of a Party that until recently had been in power for over 100 years cannot distinguish between rare items requiring formal decisions and decision-making itself.</p> <p>The council is taking action to deliver our climate action commitments – both to reduce the council’s own emissions in line with our net zero commitment by 2030, and to deliver a zero carbon Oxfordshire. Decisions are being taken at the appropriate level in the organisation and within the relevant services in reflection of the cross organisational nature of the climate programme.</p> <p>Amongst the activity in the previous 4 months is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The completion and launch of the Pathways to Zero Carbon Oxfordshire as an evidence base for the infrastructure and approach to reach net zero across land, power, buildings and heat and transport. • Mobilisation and delivery of Green Home Grant Programme to retrofit 150 homes in fuel poverty. • Submission of a £3m bid to the Sustainable Warmth Fund • Work to embed zero carbon in the development of major policies – Local Transport Connectivity Plan, OP2050 and Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy • Supporting the establishment and launch of an Environmental Advisory Group of the Future Oxfordshire Board • Completion of Banbury Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan • Delivery of Community Cycling & Walking activation projects in Witney, Bicester, and Oxford. • Continued to deliver roll out of streetlighting LED conversion • Tendered delivery of £2.1m retrofit investment for several own estate and school buildings

Questions	Answers
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery of the LED retrofit of Thornhill and Water Eaton Park and Rides • Completion of the retrofit and installation of a heat pump at Benson Library • Secured InnovateUK funding to complete a study on the feasibility of hydrogen fuelled Fire Service vehicles • Trained our first trainers and delivered the first courses in peer-to-peer carbon literacy training • Launched a climate action training module mandatory for new starters, and available to all staff.
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Could he reassure me that when it does come to introducing new decisions and new aspects of policy, and I am delighted that things are moving along smoothly and satisfactorily from decisions that have already been made. But when new policies are introduced can he reassure me that rural areas that sometimes don't find it quite so easy to fit in with new regulations will be considered alongside the city and town ones.</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Thank you for that, as a representative of myself to a rural area I can absolutely assure you that I am banging the drum for rural areas as hard as I possibly can in every single policy area.</p>
<p>8. COUNCILLOR TED FENTON</p> <p>The news that a trial "gully" scheme to allow householders who haven't got access to off-street parking to charge electric vehicles is very welcome indeed. Can the cabinet member explain why the request for volunteers to trial the scheme has been limited to Oxford City and Cherwell District, can he give an indication as to</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR PETE SUDBURY, CABINET MEMBER FOR CLIMATE CHANGE DELIVERY & ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>Thank you for this very pertinent question.</p> <p>I queried the geographical limitations myself when I was first informed of it, and have received assurances that further trials of this or other innovations will be shared around all districts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The decision to limit geographical scope for the pilot project was made

Questions	Answers
<p>whether residents of other Districts might be invited to participate in the trial and, if the trial is successful, how soon the scheme might be available to residents across the County?</p>	<p>for practical reasons of the small scale and limited length of the project funding period of 8 months.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 30 gullies to be installed; limiting the geographical spread and concentrating installations in a smaller area is more efficient and cost effective, allowing installations to be completed by a smaller number of staff in a shorter time period. • Similarly – for follow up visits to carry out inspections, testing and interviews with users, limiting the geographical area covered helps us to manage the time and costs of this work. • We will need to take planning advice and possibly make planning applications with each of the district councils where gullies will be installed – each of these will take time and have associated expenses. Limiting the number of district councils will make this more manageable within a short project. • GIS analysis highlighted Oxford City and Cherwell Districts as having the largest hotspots for of EV uptake coinciding with lack of on-street parking. <p>2. The council is a partner in another small project aimed at piloting a different technology for EV charging without off-street parking which will launch in September. This project will recruit volunteers from different areas of Oxfordshire.</p> <p>3. The two pilots will gather evidence which we hope will;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ help the Council to make a decision on whether the technologies could become ‘business as usual’ – approved for use across the whole of Oxfordshire. ○ help the commercial partners to make business decisions about their products and their launch into the market. <p>Both decision making processes are necessary to determine how soon either</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>technology may be available to the wider public and are dependent upon the outcomes and learnings from the pilots.</p>
<p>9. COUNCILLOR TED FENTON</p> <p>What, if any, evidence is there that any reduction in car travel and pollution outweighs the increase in pollution caused by those who have to make longer car journeys to bypass them in regard to LTN's?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR TIM BEARDER, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Whilst evidence is increasing from the many London LTNs implemented in 2020, research evidence is so far mainly from the experience of Waltham Forest LTN, which was implemented in 2015. Traffic monitors found that traffic within the Waltham Forest LTN reduced by around 50%.</p> <p>Additionally, there was little or no impact on traffic along the main peripheral roads, where wider factors and longer-term trends in traffic had more impact than LTNs on levels of motor traffic on the boundary roads.</p> <p>In terms of air pollution and public health, King's College London modelled a range of interventions around air quality, exposure and attitudes, and its impact on the public in Waltham Forest. It found a 7% reduction in NOx, PM10 and PM2.5 emissions from cars between 8-9 am, relative to leaving the mode share at the same level as in 2013. Waltham Forest's interventions, such as the Mini-Holland LTN scheme and additional infrastructure, accounted for two thirds of the reduction, with the other third from the longer-term trends in traffic between 2013 and 2020. As a result, each person living in Waltham Forest will gain on average an increase in life expectancy of around 1.5 months, which for Waltham Forest as whole equals around 41,000 life years, compared with air pollution remaining at 2013 concentrations.</p> <p>The innovation team are currently undertaking extensive monitoring of the Oxford LTNs and peripheral main roads and junctions. Monitoring includes traffic flows, air quality, noise, cycle, and pedestrian flows. We are also conducting attitudinal and mode trip data by surveys. Because of the impacts of Covid 19 lockdowns, monitoring needs to distinguish between different</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>causes and control sites are therefore being used to identify local impacts. The results will not therefore be available for some time.</p> <p>Of course, whilst the emerging evidence is positive, LTNs are about so much more than purely air quality. Research has found that road injuries halved in low-traffic neighbourhoods installed during the coronavirus pandemic when compared against areas without the schemes. Will Norman, the walking and cycling commissioner for London, said: "This research categorically shows yet another benefit that well-planned LTNs bring, adding to the long list of advantages." Safer, less polluted, quieter streets are what residents in the proposed areas overwhelmingly want as is borne out by this consultation and the election results in May.</p>
<p>10. COUNCILLOR EDDIE REEVES</p> <p>Given the very considered deliberations of the One Headington group and others, will the Cabinet member undertake to genuinely listen to those views and commit to cancel any plans for new LTNs in a given area where a majority of respondents pursuant to any future consultations is found to be against Council plans?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR TIM BEARDER, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Dear Cllr Reeves, although the Conservatives don't seem to be doing much about it, you will surely be aware that human activity is changing the climate in unprecedented and sometimes irreversible ways.</p> <p>A landmark UN scientific report released in August warns of increasingly extreme heatwaves, droughts and flooding, and a key temperature limit being broken in just over a decade.</p> <p>The report "is a code red for humanity", said the UN Secretary General António Guterres.</p> <p>If you personally don't understand the implications of this, the majority of Oxford's residents do. Despite the Conservatives best efforts to oppose LTNs and turn it into an election issue in May, your party failed to win a single seat in the City, and you lost control of the council overall. I would have hoped this would have been a wakeup call but still you seem intent on stoking division where there ought to be unanimity.</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>This surprises me because having held my cabinet post before me, you above many others, must understand that this isn't just an environmental issue, this is a social justice issue. In heavily congested cities cars are very dangerous - they pollute our air, and they harm our residents in serious road traffic accidents. Oxford has some of the lowest rates of car ownership outside of London and we need to stand up for those people that don't have access and can't afford to ensconce themselves in a safe protective metal shell. Our roads need to be safer for everyone.</p> <p>But also, you should know that we can't afford to spend millions of pounds we don't have on miles and miles of tarmac that is used exclusively for a small number of people in cars. I know your administration chose to borrow £80m so we could but I believe that without adequate funding coming forward, we need to look to reprioritise road space for less damaging modes of transport. The most sensible place to do this is in cities where alternative modes of transport are readily available and distances to sites of employment or commerce are short.</p> <p>Even your own party leader agrees. In July Boris Johnson said: "I support councils, of all parties, which are trying to promote cycling and bus use. And if you are going to oppose these schemes, you must tell us what your alternative is, because trying to squeeze more cars and vans on the same roads...is not going to work."</p> <p>Do you have a plan?</p> <p>This administration is genuinely listening. We are listening to the parents who want their children to be able to get to school safely on their bikes, we are listening to doctors and nurses that say that active travel can promote healthy lives and improved mental wellbeing and we are listening to scientists and the experts that tell us that doing nothing is not an option if we want to tackle climate change. The consultation is about involving the community in our</p>

Questions	Answers
	plans and seeking their engagement in their design and implementation so that the community is part of the change. It is not about giving people a veto over the important vision to create a better Oxfordshire.
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Yes or no, if the majority of residents in a given area say no to a LTN, will the administration plough ahead regardless?</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER (response by Councillor Duncan Enright)</p> <p>Thank you for that question, and I think that the answer is that I shall pass it on to Councillor Bearder of course for him to say yes or no. I would also say that it isn't as simple as that and if the world was as simple as that it would be a sadder place actually because the complexities of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods are that you have support within a particular area for those measures, but neighbouring areas may be affected as well and they have a legitimate stake in decisions that are taken. For example, decisions that we make about Oxford City are incredibly important for the residents of Oxford City, but for those of you like me, who represent the market towns and the rural areas in the county will know that the Council itself depends on what happens in the City too, because we love this City, and we use it for a large number of important services. It is a major driver of employment in our areas so the County outside the City has an interest in what happens in the City just a Low Traffic Neighbourhoods, the areas of streets affected, there are others who also have an interest and they may be for example taxis, emergency services (that we have heard before), businesses but neighbouring areas as well, so there are complexities here which need to be considered.</p>
<p>11. COUNCILLOR NICK FIELD JOHNSON</p> <p>Four years ago, we agreed to invite the six Oxfordshire MPs to come forward and exchange views with the County Council. However, this never happened.</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR PETE SUDBURY, CABINET MEMBER FOR CLIMATE CHANGE DELIVERY & ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>In September 2018 in response to a motion you proposed, Council asked the Leader to write to the Minister for the Environment, the Chief Executive Officer of Thames Water, and the Head of the Environment Agency, supporting the long and short term aims to fight against sewage pollution in</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>I know that you have recently approached the six MPs but have had little response from several. As you know, I am keen to get all the six MPs to sign off on a clean river policy and stop raw sewage being dumped into our rivers.</p> <p>Can I push for a response from MPs and ask which MPs have not responded so that we can lobby them to respond and meet with you and members of the Council?</p>	<p>our rivers.</p> <p>This was followed on 8th September 2020 by a motion that asked the Leader to write to a number of parties including Oxfordshire MPs “to ask that HM Government takes urgent action to ban the dumping of raw and untreated sewage into our rivers and to support a clean river policy including the reintroduction of quality status in order to re-establish the high quality of water in our rivers.”</p> <p>The request in 2020, which included MPs, was for them to urge Government action as identified above rather than to engage specifically with us on this issue.</p> <p>My officers are not aware of further specific communication with any of our MPs about this issue since then.</p> <p>I have myself been seeking a meeting with the new Chief Exec of Thames Water, Sarah Bentley, to make clear the unacceptability of daily discharges of sewage, failure to deal with a poor record on leakage, poor customer service and to seek not only assurance but time-phased, specific commitments for improvements. I have been fobbed off by underlings but will continue to pursue this path of action.</p> <p>The management of water quality in our rivers is the statutory responsibility of the Environment Agency rather than the County Council. Nevertheless, the issue of river pollution is ongoing and remains a great concern in the county and, the County Council would welcome any opportunity to speak with MPs and others to press the case for improvements. The support of Members in this process would be welcome.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>I would like to thank Councillor Sudbury for his response which I have noted but the other part of the question he has not answered and really it is addressed to the Leader of the Council. I was asking about the status of the six Oxfordshire MPs; the Leader did propose a motion 3 years ago to invite them to the Council which I did support. We want to ask them about further funding for the County as well as national legislation for our rivers. So, my question is really to the Leader on the current status of discussions with the six MPs?</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>I will consult with the Leader and get back to you.</p>
<p>12. COUNCILLOR MARK CHERRY</p> <p>Can I be assured by the cabinet member for highways management that Edmonds road will be considered for full resurfacing? Highways officers are aware that this road is continually having to be patched up by Skanska contractors to my local knowledge has not had any major resurfacing since I went to Drayton school in the late 1980s to 1990s.</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR TIM BEARDER, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT</p> <p>Thank you for your enquiry, and I would like to offer my apology to your residents. As you have stated our Highway Officers are aware of the condition of Edmonds Rd and others in Banbury, unfortunately Oxfordshire is not alone in maintaining a highway network that is deteriorating, with recent surveys showing that over 17% of all local authority roads are considered to be in poor condition.</p> <p>It won't surprise you to learn that the Conservative Government is massively underfunding Oxfordshire's roads with an eye-watering 28.6% reduction in the Highway Maintenance Block grant this year alone! This comes after years of inadequate funding that the previous administration masked, to a certain extent, by borrowing around £80m to plug the gap.</p> <p>That has meant the position in Oxfordshire is slightly better than the national</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>average with only 13% of roads considered to be in poor condition, this still represents 362 miles of road that are in need of significant repair, which it is recognised is not good enough.</p> <p>The council therefore has to take a prudent view in the way it maintains its highway and to this end, the County Council has a Highway Asset Management Plan that seeks to balance the costly repair of roads that are already in the poorest condition with cheaper resurfacing schemes on roads that are about to fall into disrepair to prevent more costly repairs at a later date. This, however, still leaves many roads where potholes are occurring to which the council needs to react.</p> <p>It is very clear that without a radical change in the funding formula we will need to make some major changes and I know you will support the administration with the ideas and energy needed to offer alternatives to our residents. The perpetual state of managed decline we've seen under the Conservatives is simply not sustainable.</p> <p>All that said, I can confirm that Edmonds Road is on our provisional programme for 2022/23, however the repair type will very much depend on the further detailed inspection and available funding.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>13. COUNCILLOR MARK CHERRY</p> <p>The previous principal and current principal of north Oxfordshire academy school backed in writing, is for a lower speed limit of 20MPH from the current 30MPH on the A422 Stratford Road , Banbury. This includes local residents of trinity close. A lot of highways officer's time and another Active travel 3 bid pending. Can I be assured by the cabinet member for highways management that he supports the lower speed limit for A422 Stratford road that will make it safer for school children, cyclists and local residents alike?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR TIM BEARDER, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT</p> <p>I can confirm I support the wider implementation of 20mph speed restrictions across Oxfordshire and that I would be supportive of consulting on a lower speed limit on the A422 Stratford Road as it passes the North Oxfordshire Academy entrance.</p> <p>Given the long history behind this issue, officers have added this request to their programme and will work with Councillor Cherry to progress the matter as soon as possible.</p> <p>I can confirm, as I understand you are aware, officers are progressing with the installation of Flashing Amber Lights to help slow traffic as it passes the school.</p> <p>To clarify with regards the Active Travel Tranche 3 bid, this part of the network was not included in this round of bids. Some feasibility funding for a scheme in the Easington area was included. The completion of the Local Walking and Cycling Improvement Plan for Banbury will put the town in a much clearer and stronger position for any future bid opportunities.</p>
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Would Councillor Enright agree that when there is no contention of schemes like a 20mph in North Oxfordshire Academy (my old school, where I used to attend) it would be nice to source funding in places like Banbury.</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER (response from Councillor Duncan Enright)</p> <p>Yes, and thank you very much Councillor Cherry and it is really useful to get the input of local members. We are always seeking that, and we are looking for better ways to do that on the priority of schemes and on schemes themselves, and school streets and 20mph zones are very high priority.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>14. COUNCILLOR BRAD BAINES</p> <p>Figures published in August by the ONS showed drug-related deaths last year in Oxfordshire were the highest since 2002. Can the Cabinet Member confirm what is being done by this administration in response to ensure we do not see a year-on-year increase in deaths and explain whether cuts to public health under the previous administration have contributed to this unfortunate rise?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR MARK LYGO, CABINET MEMBER FOR PUBLIC HEALTH & EQUALITY</p> <p>Any premature death is very sad, and our sympathies are with the families of these individuals. In Oxfordshire we are committed to supporting people to recover from substance misuse and have maintained significant funding for these services over recent years. This funding is used to provide education and awareness, harm reduction services, and clinical services both in the community and in residential settings. Since 2020, a number of grants have boosted funding to support the homeless, those who have been in the criminal justice system, and to provide further residential detoxification capacity.</p> <p>The provider of Oxfordshire Community Alcohol and Drug Services, Turning Point has been recognised by CQC as Outstanding, and supports clients through all stages of their recovery from drugs and alcohol.</p> <p>The Oxfordshire system has a range of services which specifically help to prevent drug related deaths. Oxfordshire has a well-established “Early Warning System” that is used to inform front-line staff and people in services whenever we have concerns related to for example, contaminated drugs. These alerts are informed by national and local intelligence. The Public Health team also works closely with the Coroner to identify and investigate drug related deaths and to look for trends and identify ways to reduce deaths.</p> <p>There is a strong focus on Harm Reduction in our service. Turning Point provide Naloxone kits (which reverse the potentially fatal effects of an opiate overdose), with training, to all people who use the services, their family and carers and professionals who work with them, as appropriate. We also have a network of pharmacies and Turning Point hubs providing needle exchange kits, providing clean needles to reduce the risk of infection. Turning Point also provide outreach work with vulnerable groups including people who are homeless and/or rough sleeping across Oxfordshire, which includes harm</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>reduction support and advice.</p> <p>Further information: The 2020 ONS data released last month shows the drug misuse death rate is lower than the south east average, and national average, but is higher than it has been in the last 4 reporting periods.</p> <p>The definition of “drug related deaths” is set out by the Office for National Statistics as <i>Deaths where the underlying cause is poisoning, drug abuse, or drug dependence and where any of the substances are controlled under the Misuse of Drugs Act (1971)</i></p>
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>I welcome the detailed answer to my question but as he notes in his response, drugs deaths in Oxfordshire and across the country are still on the rise. Will the Cabinet Member commit to writing to the Secretary of State for Health to request public health grants are increased to front continuation of this trend and to support further early intervention and support to save lives?</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Thank you, Councillor Baines, your suggestion to seek more funding for this area of work is something we are looking at. This year a significant amount of grant funding has been provided to drug and alcohol services and we are anticipating this additional funding will continue for future years. Deaths that are expected to be drug related were reviewed by the coroner and information gathered from multiple sources. There is a significant time lag in the availability to complete this information, so the report is issued retrospectively. The latest ONS reports 19/20 which was due to be published has been delayed due to capacity in the team, but as I speak now, we are almost at full capacity and I would like to thank the Public Health Team who have gone above and beyond during this difficult time. We can apply for more funding, but we have had significant amount of funding, which I said earlier, and this had been provided to the Drug and Alcohol Services and this will continue, as I said and illustrated earlier that additional funding will continue in future years.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>15. COUNCILLOR BRAD BAINES</p> <p>The County Council has rightfully pursued an ambition of promoting a modal shift to active travel and improved road safety by supporting school streets at trial sites across the County, however many of these have or are under threat of falling through due to the pressures placed on a small number of committed volunteers. Can the Cabinet Member explain whether it is the intention of the new administration, subject to new powers being granted in December from Whitehall, to replace volunteer enforcement of school street schemes with ANPR cameras, and what is the likelihood of the necessary powers for such a move being granted?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR TIM BEARDER, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT</p> <p>This is an excellent question, and I would like to confirm that, subject to OCC being granted the power to use camera enforcement for the moving traffic offences in December, it is an ambition of the school streets team for the enforcement of them to move from them being volunteer lead to an ANPR system.</p> <p>The team are currently setting a paper to review the steps that would be needed to be carried out for this to happen. In the meantime, I would like to take the opportunity to thank all the volunteers that have given up their time to make children's school journeys safer and more enjoyable and the school streets team for constantly striving to do the same.</p>
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>I welcome the answer having seen the massive benefits to health and safety of children on their way to school, because of the implementation of school streets and with the enforcement potential of ANPR cameras on the horizon as he notes, what are the Administrations plans for further school streets in Oxford and across the County?</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER (response by Councillor Duncan Enright)</p> <p>Thank you very much, I will share that with Councillor Bearder as I think he can give a more detailed written response, but rest assured, we are looking to expand this scheme and we note the success and thank the volunteers involved.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>16. COUNCILLOR BRAD BAINES</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member confirm whether residents of St Ebbe's by the Water, whose only entry to their estate is via the Thames Road / Blackfriars Road junction, will be eligible for residents' discounts for the Zero Emission Zone once expanded to the proposed 'Green Zone'?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR DUNCAN ENRIGHT, CABINET MEMBER FOR TRAVEL AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</p> <p>We have not yet confirmed the nature or scope of discounts and exemptions for the wider ZEZ (covering the 'green zone') as we are currently focused on the ZEZ Pilot.</p> <p>The potential impact of the ZEZ on residents of St Ebbe's south of Thames Street has been raised previously, so we will consider this as we develop the scheme and will keep local councillors and residents informed as the proposals develop. There will be a public consultation on the wider ZEZ before any decisions are made.</p>
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>I thank the Cabinet Member for his answer. What role will the expanding green zone ZEZ have had in tackling the extreme levels of congestion caused by visitors wanting to park at the Westgate Shopping Centre.</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>And the answer is I don't know of course. I do think that this is something that we need to look at very clearly because the Westgate is a significant driver of traffic of within the City and from outside the City. It has been discussed with a wide group of stakeholders. We know that there is potential for development of Oxford West End as well, and the impact of that is going to need to be considered very carefully. I will get back to Councillor Baines and all members with a fuller response.</p>
<p>17. COUNCILLOR ROBIN BENNETT</p> <p>Even before the current crisis in Afghanistan, many unaccompanied children were arriving in Britain seeking asylum and needing urgent support. The most recent published figure for the number of such children supported by Oxfordshire County Council was 42.</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR LIZ BRIGHOUSE, DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL AND CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, EDUCATION & YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES</p> <p><u>Background</u></p> <p>Unaccompanied children in our care are comprised of those who arrive spontaneously in Oxon and those who transfer to us via the national transfer scheme, which aims to relieve pressure on port areas and disperse children more evenly across local authorities.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>By way of background, as I'm sure you are aware, the government ask that councils take unaccompanied asylum-seeking children up to 0.07% of their child population. There aren't many councils who meet this 0.07% - in the South East there are just three. That would produce a figure of 103 rather than the current 42 for Oxfordshire, suggesting that the previous administration did not see it as a priority to support these children.</p> <p>As well as being the right thing to do, we've seen from the amazing contributions and donations, as well as supportive demonstrations, that our Oxfordshire residents want to do all they can to support refugees from Afghanistan; Can the Cabinet Member explain what steps we are taking under the new administration to support more child refugees, as well as those over 18 who receive continued support from the Council, and to get up to or above that recommended figure.</p>	<p>Between Mar 2015 and Sept 2021, the annual number of unaccompanied children looked after in Oxfordshire has ranged between 64 and 41, we are currently at 47, with a government target of 103.</p> <p>We also support 80 care leavers aged 18+years, to whom we have statutory responsibilities.</p> <p>In 2019/20, the Council fulfilled an additional commitment to Portsmouth Council to take 10 young people transferred over a period of approx. 14 months. This was in addition to our regular quota on the national transfer scheme.</p> <p><u>Steps to support more child refugees</u></p> <p>The key driver to the Council's capacity to welcome unaccompanied children has been the availability of placements. There is a national crisis of placement sufficiency for all children in care including fostering and residential care – this affects citizen children and unaccompanied children and drives up the real costs for the council, which the government funding has not covered in the past. The discrepancy has been especially wide when the shortage of local placements has necessitated placing children out of county in independent fostering agencies and external residential homes. Across the country this problem has negatively impacted local authorities' capacity to support children.</p> <p>The recent rise in government funding for unaccompanied children and young people and the current concentration of 16 and 17yr olds arriving in Kent and Portsmouth (as opposed to younger children who require foster or residential care) have opened an opportunity for us to increase our commitment to child refugees. We are able to focus on local group-living arrangements with support from social workers and staff.</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>The Directorate is currently developing a rapidly expanding supported accommodation scheme for 16+yrs unaccompanied young people which aims to create more placements, within the government's newly improved financial envelope for LAs. We have opportunities to source suitable properties in Oxford, Banbury, and South Oxfordshire. We have identified a stretch target of 32 more young people over this year which will get us closer to the government target of 103 for OCC. We anticipate the first two properties will be ready for occupation in October 21.</p> <p>As part of this work, we are drawing in expertise from local housing providers; our own young people's supported housing and unaccompanied children's teams; experienced refugee education providers and community organisations which help direct the very generous contributions from Oxfordshire residents.</p>
<p>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION</p> <p>Thank you, Councillor Brighouse for the answer and it is great to see that we are expanding our capacity for unaccompanied asylum-seeking children. I just wondered if you are able to say at this point whether there is anything specific that we are doing for children coming to the UK after the Afghan withdrawal?</p>	<p>SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER</p> <p>Thank you. As everyone knows, we have been working with the Home Office in terms of families that are coming to Oxford, and it is mainly families at the moment that are coming from Afghanistan. I think none of us can watch the news and not feel that there is going to be many young people from Afghanistan who really do want to get away from what is happening in that country at the moment, and I am sure we are finding that more refugees are coming in through Dover and through Portsmouth. We will be ready to do what we can for those young people. I think we have a moral duty to make sure that we are supporting them and that we are providing properly for them. But at the moment in Kent, in Dover many of the children don't all come from Afghanistan, they come from places like Vietnam where they are being trafficked into this Country. We really do need to make sure that we are able to respond to these global crises and we are doing that, and we will continue to do that and will update Council whenever that happens.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>18. COUNCILLOR IAN MIDDLETON</p> <p>Bearing in mind the Adaptation Plan adopted for the Glasgow City Region is the only such plan in the UK at present, will the County Council develop and adopt an Adaptation Plan to address the Climate Emergency, for Oxfordshire as a whole?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR PETE SUDBURY, CABINET MEMBER FOR CLIMATE CHANGE DELIVERY & ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>Our first priority needs to be keeping our citizens safe.</p> <p>The severity and frequency of life-threatening and deadly adverse weather events has accelerated faster than predicted by climate scientists. The recent IPCC report predicts further very significant increases at 1.5C and 2C of warming, both of which are almost inevitable, at least for periods of years to decades on any conceivable emissions trajectory. Risks from climate change and destruction of ecosystems include:</p> <p>Excessive Heat, Cold Drought, Crop failure and Wildfires, Increased wind speeds, Extreme and or extended periods of rainfall, Migration or increased frequency of diseases or disease vectors (for example ticks carrying Lyme disease). Further pandemics.</p> <p>Even where these do not directly impact the UK, they may disrupt global and UK supply chains for food, goods, medicines, and services from other parts of the World, or disrupt our exports.</p> <p>The Recent report by the Committee on Climate Change was highly critical of the failure of strong words from the Government to be matched by effective action, especially around adaptation. They particularly highlighted failure the address the consequences and exacerbating factors for extreme heat (which kills more people than flooding in the UK) and take measures (through planning legislation and building regs) to reduce the dangers of overheating in homes.</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>As a result, the climate team at the County have agreed that we should as a top priority work with partner organisations and the plentiful supply of local experts to review our understanding of the risks posed to our citizens by extreme weather, the adequacy of mitigations planned or in place. We will also scrutinise and where necessary amend plans to prepare and warn citizens at risk and take prompt, effective emergency action where necessary.</p>
<p>19. COUNCILLOR IAN MIDDLETON</p> <p>The lack of enforcement on bus gates in Bartholomew Road and Cornwallis Road has led to widespread flouting of the restrictions and therefore the Florence Park and Church Cowley LTNs have not yet been fully implemented. When does the Council expect to install ANPR cameras to monitor the bus gates?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR TIM BEARDER, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT</p> <p>We are very much aware of the frustration associated with the delay in installing the ANPR cameras and can only apologise for the delay.</p> <p>We have experienced a number of unexpected issues associated with the implementation of the ANPR cameras, this includes ensuring our current contracts permit additional cameras to be installed, resourcing wind loading assessments and supply chain issues associated with procuring lamp columns.</p> <p>Unfortunately, we are seeing issues not only in Oxfordshire but across the Country with timescales for procurement of materials increasing and in some cases these delays are exceeding 12 weeks. It is difficult to pin this one specific example on Brexit, but we know that the Road Haulage Association (RHA) has said HGV driver shortages of more than 100,000 was "hitting crisis level" due to a combination of factors, which included increasing supply chain demands. We are seeing numerous problems across the sector and the Brexit 'dividend' certainly isn't helping. We are now just waiting on confirmation on when the cameras will be installed.</p> <p>It is important to note that provisions of ANPR cameras is not a requirement and as such does not invalidate the LTN trial.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p>20. COUNCILLOR IAN MIDDLETON</p> <p>The Council has paused implementation of the proposed East Oxford LTNs to allow for more consultation and a more comprehensive transport strategy. What measures are being taken to consult affected residents and which specific scheme is being consulted on?</p>	<p>COUNCILLOR TIM BEARDER, CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT</p> <p>A report went to CMD on 29 July 2021, where it was agreed that further targeted consultation on specific issues raised during the consultation and technical investigation would be undertaken.</p> <p>The following actions have subsequently been taken to address specific issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Officers have met with the Special Education Needs transport team and agreed an approach to trial the allocation of keys to OCC fleet vehicles. If successful, this could be rolled out to other providers. • Meetings are being arranged with mosques and taxi companies. • Meetings with St Frideswide and St Gregory schools are to be arranged as term starts • Proposals in Howard Street have been reviewed and we will inform residents and businesses once the design has been confirmed via letter drop, so views can be fed back. <p>The output of the targeted consultations will be reported back to CMD on 23 December 2022. Should approval to proceed be given we anticipate that the scheme will be implemented in March 2022.</p> <p>All consultees will be advised of the outcome of CMD, any minor changes that have been approved and next steps prior to implementation.</p>

Divisions-N/A

COUNTY COUNCIL – 2 NOVEMBER 2021

REPORT OF THE CABINET

Cabinet Member: Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Travel & Development Strategy

1. England's Economic Heartland

(Cabinet, 21 September 2021)

Following discussions with Government and its Members, and in context of the emerging Oxford to Cambridge Arc Governance, England's Economic Heartland (EEH), the sub-national transport body for the area which includes Oxfordshire, had produced a new governance framework, including changes to the political oversight process.

Cabinet confirmed England's Economic Heartland (EEH) as a 'strategic' outside body, endorsed the new governance framework and confirmed the appointment of the Leader of the Council to the new EEH Political Forum, proposed to be called the Strategic Transport Leadership Board.

Cabinet Member: Adult Social Care

2. Oxfordshire's Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy

(Cabinet, 19 October 2021)

Cabinet discussed the first county-wide Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy, marking our commitment to inter-agency and cross sector partnership working to prevent homelessness and end rough sleeping in the county.

Cabinet agreed the strategy which had been out for public consultation and amended as a result of the public's feedback.

Cabinet Member: Climate Change Delivery & Environment

3. Review of the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Part 1 - Core Strategy

(Cabinet, 19 October 2021)

The County Council is responsible for preparing the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. This will guide all future Minerals and Waste development across the County to 2031. Cabinet considered a report relating to Part 1 of 2: the Core Strategy.

Cabinet endorsed the proposed progression of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan and delegated to the Corporate Director, Environment and Place, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Climate Change Delivery and

Environment, the final production of consultation documents relating to the Core Strategy review.

4. Minerals and Waste Development Scheme

(Cabinet, 19 October 2021)

Cabinet was asked to approve the Minerals and Waste Development Scheme, which the County Council must prepare and maintain, setting out the Council's programme for preparing the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

Cabinet approved the Scheme to have effect from 1st November 2021 and delegated any final detailed amendment and editing to the Corporate Director Environment and Place, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Environment.

Cabinet Member: Community Services & Safety

5. Community Risk Management Plan 2022-2026 Public Consultation

(Cabinet, 21 September 2021)

The 2018 Fire and Rescue National Framework requires each Fire and Rescue Authority to produce a publicly available Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP). Within Oxfordshire Fire and Rescue Service (OFRS) we have called this our Community Risk Management Plan (CRMP) to make it more meaningful to the public.

Our current CRMP is due to End in March 2022 so the production of a new CRMP has taken place which will run from April 2022 to March 2026. The CRMP is subject to public consultation which will take place for 12 weeks from 22nd September 2021.

Cabinet accepted and adopted in the final version the Community Risk Management Plan 2022 - 2026, for public Consultation.

Cabinet Member: Corporate Services

6. Workforce Report and Staffing Data – Quarter 1 – April to June 2021

(Cabinet, 21 September 2021)

Cabinet considered the quarterly staffing report providing details of key people numbers and analysis of the main changes since the previous report. Among other things the report updated on progress with

- mentoring and the Reverse Mentoring Programme: Mentoring for Diversity
- the Lone Worker Mobile Technology
- decreased spending on agency staff

Cabinet noted the report.

Cabinet Member: Finance

7. Capital Programme Monitoring Report – August 2021

(Cabinet, 19 October 2021)

Cabinet had before it the second monitoring report and Capital Programme update for 2021/22 which set out the monitoring position based on activity to the end of August 2021. It also provides an update to the Capital Programme overview approved by Council in July 2021 taking into account additional funding and new schemes.

The Cabinet agreed the updated programme and added a provisional budget allocation of £1.2m towards a new Free School in Faringdon for pupils with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND).

8. Budget and Business Planning Report 2022/23 – October 2021

(Cabinet, 19 October 2021)

Cabinet considered the first in the series of reports on the budget and business planning process for the forthcoming year which provides context and background information ahead of Council setting a budget for 2022/23; a medium term financial strategy to 2025/26 and capital programme to 2031/32 in February 2022.

Cabinet endorsed the report, approved the process for 2022/23; and approved a four-year period for the medium-term financial strategy to 2025/26 and ten-year period for the capital programme to 2031/32.

Cabinet Members: Highway Management and Travel & Development Strategy

9. Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP)

(Cabinet, 19 October 2021)

Cabinet considered a report on the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (LTCP) on which it is proposed to undertake public consultation. The paperwork also included context about the supporting data, a draft Freight and Logistics Strategy, a draft Innovation Framework, a draft Active and Healthy Travel Strategy, a Bus Service Improvement Plan and the Integrated Sustainability Appraisal.

Cabinet endorsed the content of the LTCP document and the supporting strategies as the basis for public consultation, commencing in November 2021 for a period of 6 weeks, and delegated the decision on the final LTCP document to the Corporate Director for Environment and Place in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways Management and Cabinet Member for Travel and Development Strategy.

Cabinet Member: Highway Management

10. National Bus Strategy – Proposal for an Oxfordshire Bus Improvement Strategy

(Cabinet, 19 October 2021)

Cabinet received a report which supported the increased priority and investment to promote buses and the need for much closer joint working required in the forthcoming Enhanced Partnership, recognising the requirements for increased Council staffing and budget to support this area.

Cabinet approved the Bus Service Improvement Plan to be submitted to Government by the end of October 2021 and delegated authority to the Corporate Director Environment and Place to make any necessary changes to the Bus Service Improvement Plan in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways Management and the Cabinet Member for Travel and Development Strategy.

11. Countywide 20mph Policy and New Approach

(Cabinet, 19 October 2021)

Cabinet considered a new countywide 20mph speed restriction approach in areas that have traditionally mainly been 30mph limits. To accommodate this change there is a requirement for a new 20mph speed policy and the development of a new procedure to aid their implementation.

Cabinet approved the update of the County Council's Speed Limit Policy statement, the criteria for consideration of 20mph and the Funding Prioritisation Framework to manage funding requests and the overall programme.

Cabinet Member: Public Health & Equality

12. Voluntary Sector Infrastructure Contract

(Cabinet, 21 September 2021)

Cabinet endorsed the development of an organisational Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) Strategy and approved the recommendation of converting the current VCS infrastructure contract into a grant for the next year (2022/23) to enable the development of the VCS Strategy.

Cabinet Member: Travel and Development Strategy

13. Draft Oxfordshire Plan 2050 Reg 18 (Stage 2) Consultation Response

(Cabinet, 21 September 2021)

Cabinet was asked to consider a draft OCC response to the Oxfordshire Plan Regulation 18 (Stage 2) consultation. The draft response was agreed without amendment.

14. Oxfordshire Street Design Guide

(Cabinet, 21 September 2021)

Cabinet was asked to endorse the Guide which outlined how we can prioritise active and healthy travel through street design in new developments, meeting our carbon ambitions and that of established transport policy.

Cabinet agreed to adopt the recommendations on that understanding, and with a commitment, that the Place Overview and Scrutiny Committee will be involved in the next stage of development of the guide.

15. Watlington Relief Road – Preferred Options and In Principle Use of Statutory Powers

(Cabinet, 21 September 2021)

Following completion of Stage 0 Options Appraisal Report and consultation, Cabinet was asked to agree to continue with the design of the identified preferred option.

Cabinet approved the revised alignment route and progression into Design and Procurement Stage 2 of the project as well as approving in principle the use of a Compulsory Purchase Order in parallel with negotiations for private acquisition. A paper will be brought back to Cabinet, once the necessary approval has been sought, including public engagement on preferred options and submission of a planning application for the scheme.

Cabinet Member: All Cabinet Members

16. Business Management & Monitoring Report

(Cabinet, 21 September 2021 & 19 October 2021)

Cabinet considered reports setting out Oxfordshire County Council's progress towards Corporate Plan priorities for 2021/22 during July and August 2021.

Cabinet approved the reports as well as

- virements which include transferring £1m from the Covid-19 reserve to fund relevant expenditure;
- revised Music Service fees and charges; and
- the transfer of the Tax Income Guarantee Scheme grant to the Business Rates Reserve.

LIZ LEFFMAN

Leader of the Council

October 2021

This page is intentionally left blank

Divisions: N/A

COUNTY COUNCIL – 2 NOVEMBER 2021

SCHEME OF MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES 2022/23

Report by the Director of Law & Governance

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Council is **RECOMMENDED** to adopt a Scheme of Members' Allowances for the financial year 2022/23, and in so doing to consider the following options, either:

- 1) To adopt the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel made in November 2020 and as set out in Annex 1 to this report; OR
- 2) To adopt any particular recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel as the Council may determine; OR
- 3) To agree alternative values for any of the allowances, as the Council may determine; OR
- 4) If the Council does not wish to accept the Panel's recommendations at this time, in whole or in part, or to substitute alternative amounts, to agree a status quo Scheme of Allowances for 2022/23 for any unchanged aspect; AND
- 5) That in any event, the Council adopts an annual index for a four year period (whereby if no other changes occur to a Scheme, then the Members' Allowances may increase in relation to that index for a period of no more than four years), and that this should relate (as in previous years) to the annual pay award for local government staff.

Introduction

1. Each year, Full Council must adopt a Scheme of Members' Allowances to apply from 1 April of the following year. In particular it must set the amount of a Basic Allowance payable to all members, and may make payments for Special Responsibility and Co-opted Members' Allowances. Accordingly, this report asks members to adopt a Scheme of Allowances to apply from 1 April 2022.
2. Principally, Council's attention is drawn to the recommendations made by the Independent Remuneration Panel in November 2020. Consideration of these was deferred by Council in December 2020. In adopting a Scheme, the Council must have regard to the recommendations. However, it is the Council's choice whether to accept the Panel's recommendations in whole or in part, or not at all, or to determine other amounts. As such, options are set out in this report.
3. The Council may, for example, agree other amounts; or adopt a status quo Scheme which makes no substantive changes. In addition, Council may also choose to adopt an index, as in previous years, whereby the Basic, Special Responsibility Allowances and Co-opted Members' Allowances would rise each

year by reference to an index. Formerly the Council has adopted as an index the pay award for local government employees.

4. Council may also wish to note that whatever Scheme is adopted, each individual member may choose to forgo any allowance to which they are entitled, in whole or in part, on a voluntary basis.
5. The Council must make a Scheme by no later than 31 March 2022.

Making a Scheme of Members' Allowances

Option A) The Independent Remuneration Panel

Approach

6. In framing its recommendations, the Independent Remuneration Panel had regard to a range of evidence, comparative information, survey responses from councillors and interviews a cross-section of members of the council. The Panel was mindful of its role of assessing what allowances are appropriate to the roles of elected and co-opted members, having regard to their workload formally and within constituencies and with an understanding of additional responsibilities where these are performed within the Council's governance arrangements.
7. The Panel was also mindful of the political and budgetary implications surrounding the adoption of a Members' Allowances Scheme but recognised that such considerations are for the Council to determine.
8. The Panel also recognised that an individual member can choose whether or not to accept an allowance in full or in part. Rather, the Panel concentrated on providing the Council with an objective, benchmarked view on what allowances it thinks are appropriate to the roles of elected and co-opted members for Oxfordshire County Council.
9. It has also been mindful that a Members Allowances Scheme is intended to present allowances that minimise the potential for any person to be out of pocket as a result of serving their community; recognising of course that some aspect of councillor's service is necessarily voluntary. Therefore, while a Scheme cannot alone influence wider democratic representation, it should at least not be a barrier to it. The Panel has presented its recommendations with these principles in mind.

The Panel's recommendations

10. The Panel's full Report is included as Annex 1. It sets out their recommendations in full, with rationale given at each stage. The main changes are:
 1. that the Basic Allowance payable to all councillors increase from £11,014 to £12,000 per annum;

2. that, in addition to the Basic Allowance, a Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA) be paid as follows:-
 - i. Leader of the Council – raise to three times the Basic Allowance: £36,000
 - ii. Deputy Leader of the Council – keep at twice the Basic Allowance: £24,000
 - iii. Cabinet Members – keep at 1.6 times the Basic Allowance: £19,200
 - iv. Leader of the Opposition – increase to 1 times the Basic Allowance: £12,000
 - v. Shadow Cabinet – keep at 0.25 times the Basic Allowance: £3,000
 - vi. Chairs of Scrutiny Committees – keep at 0.6 times the Basic Allowance: £7,200 *[NB Since the Panel met, the Council has amended its scrutiny arrangements, creating three scrutiny committees in place of these: however, the SRA still applies to the three new committee chairs]*
 - vii. Chair of the Planning and Regulation Committee – keep at 0.6 times the Basic Allowance: £7,200
 - viii. Chair of the Audit & Governance Committee – keep at 0.6 times the Basic allowance: £7,200
 - ix. Chair of the Pension Fund Committee – keep at 0.6 times the Basic allowance: £7,200
 - x. Chair of the Remuneration Committee – no allowance
 - xi. Chair of the Council – keep at 0.85 times the Basic Allowance: £10,200
 - xii. Vice-Chair of the Council – keep at 0.25 times the Chair's Allowance: £2,550
 - xiii. Third Party Leader – no allowance but review in 2021/22
 - xiv. Locality Meeting Chair – increase from 0.05 to 0.10 times the Basic Allowance: £1,200
 - xv. Police and Crime Panel Member – no allowance
 - xvi. Police and Crime Panel Chair – keep at 0.6 times the Basic Allowance: £7,200 but invite the Council to review with the Police and Crime Panel members the principle as to whether all authorities should contribute to this cost
 - xvii. Police and Crime Panel Vice-Chair – no allowance
 - xviii. Chair of the Oxfordshire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee – keep at 0.6 times the Basic Allowance: £7,200
 - xix. Chair of the Horton Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee - keep at 0.45 times the Basic Allowance: £5,400
 - xx. Adoption & Fostering Panels – introduce an allowance for member attendance at each of £100 per Panel with a cap of £1,200 per year
3. a cap be introduced such that no individual member of the Council should be entitled to receive more than two Special Responsibility Allowances at any one time;
4. a Co-optees' Allowance continues to be payable to an independent co-opted member of the Audit & Governance Committee when the co-opted

member serves as Chair of the Audit Working Group, equivalent to Committee/Scrutiny Committee Chair: £7,200;

5. the Council's Basic and Special Responsibility Allowances and the Co-optees' Allowance to the Chair of the Audit Working Group be amended annually by reference to the annual Local Government Pay Award for staff and that this should take effect from the date on which the award for staff similarly takes effect; however, if the above increases are agreed, the pay award should not be applied to any increased allowances in 2021/22 but from 2022/23;
 6. that Child and Dependant Carer's Allowances be increased:-
 - a. Child Care: the hourly rate is equivalent to the Oxford Living Wage, capped at £1,200 per year, payable on production of receipts
 - b. Dependent Carer: the hourly rate is twice the Oxford Living Wage capped at £2,400 per year, payable on production of receipts;
 7. the Council retains, for members, the travel and subsistence scheme that is applicable to officers. Overnight accommodation to be booked by officers where possible; when alternative accommodation arrangements are to be used, this should be approved by the relevant officer.
 8. the amounts for Basic Allowance, Special Responsibility Allowances and Co-optees' Allowances be rounded to the nearest pound when first set.
11. Full Council may choose to accept these recommendations in whole or in part, or not at all.

Option B) Alternative amounts

12. The Council may choose alternative amounts for the Basic, Special Responsibility and Co-opted Member Allowances as it may determine, other than those recommended by the Panel. For information, the current values are shown in the middle column of Annex 2.

Option C) Status quo scheme

13. If the Council does not wish to make any substantive changes at this time, it may adopt a status quo Scheme based on the currently adopted Scheme. For information, the current values are shown in the middle column of Annex 2.

Option D) Indexation

14. The Council should also be aware that it has the opportunity, when adopting a Scheme of Allowances, to apply an index to Members' Allowances. In recent years, the Council has chosen to do this with regard to the pay award for local government staff. The effect of doing this is that, if in any given year there is no other change required to be made to a Scheme, the Scheme can remain unchanged except for an annual adjustment by virtue of the agreed index. While Council must still approve the Scheme each year, it need not undertake a fuller review each year in doing so while the index lasts.

15. It is recommended that Council may wish to do this whether the Panel's recommendations are accepted or not, applying such an index to any Scheme adopted.

Legal Implications

16. The Council is required to adopt a Scheme of Allowances ahead of 1 April 2022 to apply from that date. Under the Members' Allowances (Local Authorities)(England) Regulations 2003, the Council must have regard to the recommendations of its Independent Remuneration Panel when making or revising a scheme of allowances. Any decision not to follow the Panel's recommendations must be published. Consequently, Full Council should consider the Panel's recommendations, but it is for Council itself to agree its own scheme.
17. Therefore, Council can:
- (a) Follow the Panel's recommendations in whole or in part
 - (b) Agree a revised scheme of allowances, either in whole or in part, including a 'status quo' arrangement
 - (c) Adopt an index to apply for a maximum period of 4 years

Financial Implications

18. If the Panel's recommendations are accepted in full, there will be additional costs of £98k which will need to be considered in the Budget & Business Planning process for 2022/23. A summary of the financial implications is set out in **Annex 2** to this report. A point to note is that, since the Panel met, the Council has changed its scrutiny arrangements to create three scrutiny committees instead of two. As such, the overall net effect is that if the Council agrees the recommendations for increasing the SRA for scrutiny chairs, this will mean an additional cost of £7,200 (instead of, currently, an additional £6,608.88).

Equality & Inclusion Implications

19. Before making a decision, Section 149 Equality Act 2010 requires that each decision-maker considers the need to promote equality for persons with the following "protected characteristics": age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation. Each decision-maker must, therefore, have due regard to the need to:
- i) Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Equality Act 2010.
 - ii) Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it. This involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to --
 - remove or minimise disadvantage suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic;

- take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it (in relation to disabled people, this includes, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities);
 - encourage persons who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.
 - iii) Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it. This involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to –
 - tackle prejudice; and
 - promote understanding.
20. Public sector equalities duties have been considered by the IRP as part of their deliberations.
21. It is also important to note that the Panel's report was produced at time before the Council changed its own terminology to refer to the chairs of meetings as Chairs (rather than Chairmen). As such, while this covering report refers to the Council's recently adopted terminology, the Panel's report is appended in its original form, as it existed in November 2020.

ANITA BRADLEY

Director of Law & Governance and Monitoring Officer

Contact Officer:

Glenn Watson, Principal Governance Officer, glenn.watson@oxfordshire.gov.uk
07776 997946

November 2021.

MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES
Report of the Independent Remuneration Panel
to Oxfordshire County Council

November 2020

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

- A. The Independent Remuneration Panel has now carried out a full review of the County Council's scheme of members' allowances and this report sets out the Panel's recommendations.
- B. The Local Government Act 2000 provides that before any new scheme of allowances is agreed, the Council is required to take into account the advice of its duly appointed Independent Remuneration Panel on the levels and types of allowances to be paid under that scheme.
- C. In summary, it's our view that the current levels of allowances are, in the main, lower than for comparable authorities and do not sufficiently recognize the time and workload involved. It's important too that an allowances scheme acts as a means of encouraging a diverse range of people to consider becoming county councillors in Oxfordshire. Clearly, allowances cannot be the only means of overcoming obstacles to wider democratic representation; however, they are an element. We consider our recommendations to be appropriate to the roles performed by county councillors in the service of the people of Oxfordshire.

Principles Adopted

- D. This was the first full review since December 2014. As such we considered this to be an opportunity to consider the entire scheme of allowances by looking at each element afresh.
- E. We were also particularly mindful, and heard from many councillors, that part of the purpose of an allowances scheme is to encourage a diverse range of people to consider standing as councillors and undertaking responsible positions once elected. This is in the interests of a healthy democracy and perhaps particularly so ahead of the County Council elections due to take place in May 2021.
- F. We decided to look objectively at the appropriate level for allowances, noting the relative lowness of the Council's allowances compared to other authorities in the region. As an Independent Remuneration Panel, we must be mindful of affordability, but our main task has been to assess the councillor and co-opted roles objectively. We are however very conscious that we are undertaking this review during a year of a national pandemic, which itself continues to have considerable cost implications to local government, businesses and individuals. We are conscious too of press reports that the Chancellor may consider a public

sector pay freeze. It is for the Council, rather than the Panel, to have regard to the political and financial dimension in considering a review of allowances.

- G. A Council's Independent Panel should therefore give an honest, benchmarked view of the level of allowances appropriate to the various roles and commitments of Oxfordshire County Councillors and Co-opted Members.
- H. We also noted that the pandemic itself has impacted on the work of County Councillors, with virtual meetings rather than physical ones taking place and engagement with parish councils and community groups similarly recast, with consequent effect on the workload that arises. We heard for instance that while travel time has been saved, online meetings and email engagement have increased. Of course, such effects may be time-limited, however it is perhaps likely that some new ways of working may continue.
- I. The Panel's focus has been on reviewing the *roles* in question, within the Council's governance structure, and not on the persons occupying those roles. We have however taken the opportunity to consider the various approaches and levels of allowances set by comparable authorities across the South East and nationally.
- J. We noted that in recent years, the Council's Scheme did not feature a cap on the number of Special Responsibility Allowances that any individual could claim. We decided to review this principle and consider whether a cap was now appropriate and beneficial in encouraging wider representation. We also noted that most County authorities surveyed do have a cap of only one SRA.
- K. As a starting point, we decided to review the Basic Allowance and use this as a base, with Special Responsibility Allowances assessed in terms of multiples of the Basic Allowance. It was also important that we considered the fact that allowances are not a 'salary', are not payment for work done, but are intended to offset the cost of being a councillor so that no one is out of pocket as a result of representing their communities. That said, we were also mindful that becoming a councillor is a choice and has a voluntary element to it.
- L. We also wanted to hear directly from members of the Council themselves and so carried out a survey and a selection of interviews.

Recommendations

- (a) that the Basic Allowance payable to all councillors increase from £11,014 to £12,000 per annum;
- (b) that, in addition to the Basic Allowance, a Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA) be paid as follows:-
 - 1) Leader of the Council – raise to three times the Basic Allowance: £36,000
 - 2) Deputy Leader of the Council – keep at twice the Basic Allowance: £24,000
 - 3) Cabinet Members – keep at 1.6 times the Basic Allowance: £19,2000
 - 4) Leader of the Opposition – increase to 1 times the Basic Allowance: £12,000

- 5) Shadow Cabinet – keep at 0.25 times the Basic Allowance: £3,000
 - 6) Chairs of Scrutiny Committees (Performance, Education) – keep at 0.6 times the Basic Allowance: £7,200
 - 7) Chair of the Planning and Regulation Committee – keep at 0.6 times the Basic Allowance: £7,200
 - 8) Chair of the Audit & Governance Committee – keep at 0.6 times the Basic allowance: £7,200
 - 9) Chair of the Pension Fund Committee – keep at 0.6 times the Basic allowance: £7,200
 - 10) Chair of the Remuneration Committee – no allowance
 - 11) Chairman of the Council – keep at 0.85 times the Basic Allowance: £10,200
 - 12) Vice-Chairman of the Council – keep at 0.25 times the Chair's Allowance: £2,550
 - 13) Third Party Leader – no allowance but review in 2021/22
 - 14) Locality Meeting Chairman – increase from 0.05 to 0.10 times the Basic Allowance: £1,200
 - 15) Police and Crime Panel Member – no allowance
 - 16) Police and Crime Panel Chairman – keep at 0.6 times the Basic Allowance: £7,200 but invite the Council to review with the Police and Crime Panel members the principle as to whether all authorities should contribute to this cost
 - 17) Police and Crime Panel Vice-Chairman – no allowance
 - 18) Chair of the Oxfordshire Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee – keep at 0.6 times the Basic Allowance: £7,200
 - 19) Chair of the Horton Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee - keep at 0.45 times the Basic Allowance: £5,400
 - 20) Adoption & Fostering Panels – introduce an allowance for member attendance at each of £100 per Panel with a cap of £1,200 per year
- (c) a cap be introduced such that no individual member of the Council should be entitled to receive more than two Special Responsibility Allowances at any one time;
- (d) a Co-optees' Allowance continues to be payable to an independent co-opted member of the Audit & Governance Committee when the co-opted member serves as Chairman of the Audit Working Group, equivalent to Committee/Scrutiny Committee Chair: £7,200;
- (e) the Council's Basic and Special Responsibility Allowances and the Co-optees' Allowance to the Chairman of the Audit Working Group be amended annually by reference to the annual Local Government Pay Award for staff and that this should take effect from the date on which the award for staff similarly takes effect; however, if the above increases are agreed, the pay award should not be applied to any increased allowances in 2021/22 but from 2022/23;
- (f) that Child and Dependant Carer's Allowances be increased:-
- 1) Child Care: the hourly rate is equivalent to the Oxford Living Wage, capped at £1,200 per year, payable on production of receipts
 - 2) Dependent Carer: the hourly rate is twice the Oxford Living Wage capped at £2,400 per year, payable on production of receipts;
- (g) the Council retains, for members, the travel and subsistence scheme that is applicable to officers. Overnight accommodation to be booked by officers

- where possible; when alternative accommodation arrangements are to be used, this should be approved by the relevant officer;
- (h) claims made under the Council's travel and subsistence scheme be accompanied by receipts and/or any other relevant evidence of the costs incurred and that claims under the scheme be made, in writing, within two months of the relevant duty in respect of which the entitlement to the allowance arises;
- (i) the list of Approved Duties for the purpose of travel, subsistence and dependent care allowances continue and be agreed as set out in the attached Annex;
- (j) the amounts for Basic Allowance, Special Responsibility Allowances and Co-optees' Allowances be rounded to the nearest pound when first set.

THE PANEL'S REPORT

Introduction

1. The Local Government Act 2000 and the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances)(England) Regulations 2003 require local authorities to review their Allowances Schemes and to maintain an Independent Remuneration Panel to consider and make recommendations on new schemes. In brief, the Regulations say that the following issues are to be addressed by the Panel:
- Basic Allowance: each local authority must make provision for a basic, flat rate allowance payable to all members. The allowance must be the same for each councillor; it can be paid either in a lump sum or in instalments.
 - Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA): each local authority may make provision for the payment of SRAs for those councillors who have significant responsibilities. The Panel has to recommend the responsibilities that should be remunerated and the levels of the allowances.
 - Co-optees' allowance: each local authority may make provision for the payment of an allowance to co-optees' for attending meetings, conferences and seminars.
 - Childcare and dependant carers' allowance: local authorities may make provision for the payment of an allowance to those councillors who incur expenditure for the care of children or dependent relatives whilst undertaking particular duties.
 - Travel and subsistence: each local authority may determine the levels of travel and subsistence allowances and the duties to which they should apply.
 - Indexation: each local authority may determine that allowances should be increased in accordance with a specified index and can identify the index and set the number of years (not exceeding four) for which it should apply.

- Backdating: each local authority may determine that, where amendments are made to an allowances scheme, the allowances as amended may be backdated.

The Independent Remuneration Panel

2. The Independent Remuneration Panel for Oxfordshire County Council is:-
 - Bronwen Buckley
 - Martyn Hocking
 - Katherine Powley
 - David Shelmerdine
3. The Panel elected David Shelmerdine as its Chairman for this review.

Terms of Reference

4. To make recommendations to Oxfordshire County Council on the allowances that should be payable to County Councillors in Oxfordshire, in accordance with the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances)(England) Regulations 2003 and to do so in the following circumstances:
 - annual recommendations on the Council's yearly scheme of allowances where the Council is minded to amend the scheme of allowances otherwise than by reference to a duly adopted index
 - when the Council proposes to revise or modify any aspect of an existing scheme or the Council requests a review
 - where required to do so by virtue of Regulations.
5. The County Council wished the Panel to undertake a comprehensive review of the Council's Scheme of Members' Allowances. This last occurred in December 2014, with minor changes to some aspects of Schemes since that time.

The Panel's Work

6. We met three times as a Panel during October and November 2020. On
 - 8th October
 - 20th October
 - 19th November.
7. In conducting our review, we had regard to a significant amount of information, which included the following:
 - The Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 and of the Government's "Guidance on Consolidated Regulations on Members' Allowances for Local Authorities in England";
 - County Council allowances: details of the allowances of numerous County Councils, especially those comparative authorities adjacent to Oxfordshire and in the South East generally

- Responses to a questionnaire to Oxfordshire County Councillors seeking comments on the Council's allowances scheme
 - The County Council's political management structure.
8. We also interviewed 14 members of the Council, seeking in our selection of interviewees to obtain a sample which was representative of the various roles performed by members. This included all three political group leaders, chairs of committees and backbenchers. The following members were interviewed over five different days:
- 6th November**
- Cllr Keiron Mallon – chairman of the Police & Crime Panel; Locality Chairman; Conservative Independent Alliance Group (CIA Group)
 - Cllr Kevin Bulmer – chairman of the Pension Fund Committee; Locality Chairman; CIA Group
 - Cllr Richard Webber – Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group
- 9th November**
- Cllr John Howson – Liberal Democrat Group Councillor
 - Cllr Tim Bearder – Liberal Democrat Group Councillor
 - Cllr Mrs Judith Heathcoat – Deputy Leader of the Council; CIA Group
 - Cllr Ian Hudspeth – Leader of the Council; CIA Group
 - Cllr Pete Sudbury – Green Councillor
 - Cllr Emily Smith – Liberal Democrat Group Councillor
 - Cllr Liz Brighouse – Leader of the Opposition, Labour Group
 - Cllr Pete Handley – Locality Chairman; CIA Group
- 13th November**
- Cllr Nick Carter – chairman of Audit & Governance Committee; CIA Group; Locality Chairman
- 16th November**
- Cllr Mark Cherry – Shadow Cabinet; Labour Group
- 23rd November**
- Cllr Arash Fatemian – chairman of the Joint Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee and of the Horton Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee; CIA Group.
9. An online survey was sent to the 63 councillors and received 39 responses (62%). In addition, we viewed recordings of council meetings, for example Full Council and the Audit & Governance Committee.

Political Structure

10. We noted that the Council had operated a 'Leader and Executive Model' since 5 November 2001 and that the Council reinforced this commitment by adopting a Strong Leader model in August 2009. A Conservative Independent Alliance administration is in place, operating a Cabinet system of decision-making, with a series of scrutiny committees providing challenge and policy focus. Since 2013, the Council had introduced informal locality meetings, all the County Councillors of that particular area meeting together. A number of more regulatory committees are also in operation to carry out statutory non-executive functions. All 63 members meet together as the Full Council to agree the

budget and policy framework. All members were also involved in the important task of community representation within their own electoral divisions.

11. We were therefore concerned in the current review to see if roles and responsibilities had changed over time, to gauge the time-commitment involved and to assess the level of remuneration appropriate to the responsibilities and work done by members.

REVIEW OF ALLOWANCES

Basic Allowance

12. It is required under the relevant legislation that a Basic Allowance be provided to all members of the Council and that it must be of the same value for each. This allowance is intended to remunerate councillors for their time spent as a councillor, covering incidental costs incurred by them as ordinary members of the Council, including the use of their homes.
13. In determining an appropriate level of Basic Allowance, we had regard to:
 - Oxfordshire County Councillors' own views as to the appropriate level of Basic Allowance (as expressed both in written submissions and in answer to interview questions)
 - The current level of Basic Allowance paid by the County Council and the value of the Council's Basic Allowance relative to that paid by other County Councils, principally those immediately adjacent to Oxfordshire and in the South East
 - The need to consider the voluntary service principle as required by the statutory guidance.

What the Basic Allowance should cover

14. The Basic Allowance, in our view, is intended to recognise the many calls on a councillor's time including the costs associated with general constituency work. This includes the use of a councillor's home, home phone and utilities. In our view, it also covers time commitment integral to serving as an ordinary member (or substitute) of a formal meeting of the Council. We also noted that it is the Council's practice to deploy ICT devices to enable seamless working with the Council's systems. In our view, while we can see the business reason for this, we felt that the Basic Allowance should be deemed to cover incidental user-consumables such as printer cartridges for council supplied printers.

Voluntary element

15. We still hold the view that a proportion of a councillor's time should continue to be voluntary and should not be remunerated. It is our view that while the role of county councillor contains an element of voluntary activity – such as the aspiration to serve and represent constituents in the community – it is no longer appropriate or feasible to try to quantify this. The pace of change and the immediacy of contemporary communication means that the demands of the

role are ever more present. Consequently, no specific formula has been used to assess this in the calculation of the allowances arrived at in this report. Rather, we consider that this is bound up in the principle that an allowance is not a payment for work done but a recognition of the time and level of responsibility that such public duty requires.

Determination of the level of Basic Allowance

16. Our starting point was to consider the evidence received from councillors in relation to the Basic Allowance. We heard from councillors that the Basic Allowance was too low, principally in that it did not encourage people of working age to come forward as councillors and did not sufficiently recognize the potential implication that some people may need to reduce working hours in order to undertake the role of councillor. While the allowances scheme alone cannot facilitate a wider demography – the candidate selection of political parties, the governance structure of authorities play a significant part - realistic and benchmarked allowances are one way of contributing to a more level playing field.
17. We considered the various calls on County Councillors' time both in their constituency and formal roles (e.g. attending meetings, engaging with parish councils and community groups). We also looked at the levels of Basic Allowance paid by comparator County Councils, primarily in the South East but also other comparable County Councils across England. We found that Oxfordshire County Council had fallen behind, particularly among South East counties, if not some others nationally, and that an increase was appropriate to rebalance the Basic Allowance better to support a more diverse range of people, reflective of Oxfordshire. We deemed that a Basic Allowance of £12,000 was a modest but important increase sending a clear message about the importance of councillor work in the community and helping facilitate a wider range of representation.
18. In achieving this, we wanted to use the Basic Allowance as a base for assessing the various Special Responsibilities required within the Council.

We RECOMMEND that the Basic Allowance payable to all councillors increase to £12,000.

Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA)

19. We then considered which posts should qualify for an SRA and the appropriate level at which each allowance should be set.
20. We had regard to:
 - The political management arrangements set out in the Council's Constitution, the responsibilities performed within that framework and the functions of the various roles.
 - The range and levels of SRA proposed in other County Councils and in the South East.

- Evidence from Oxfordshire County Councillors (in person and through responses to the questionnaire) as to whether current SRAs are appropriate and as to suggestions for additional SRAs.
21. We have considered whether an SRA is appropriate to the following responsibilities within the Council's structure:
- i. Leader of the Council
 - ii. Deputy Leader of the Council
 - iii. Cabinet Members
 - iv. Chairmen of Scrutiny Committees (Performance; Education)
 - v. Chairman of the Planning & Regulation Committee
 - vii. Chairman of the Audit & Governance Committee
 - x. Chairman of the Pension Fund Committee
 - xii. Chairman of Remuneration Committee
 - xiv. Chairman of the Council
 - xv. Vice-Chairman of the Council
 - xvi. Leader of the Opposition
 - xvii. Other Shadow Cabinet Members
 - xviii. Third Party Leader
 - xix. Locality Meeting Chairman
 - xx. Police and Crime Panel member
 - xxi. Police and Crime Panel chairman
 - xxii. Police and Crime Panel vice-chairman
 - xxiii. Chairman of the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee
 - xiv. Chairman of the Horton Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council

22. We considered changes to the roles and responsibilities of the Leader and Deputy Leader since the last full review. We were mindful of their roles in leading the political direction of the Council as the senior members of the Cabinet. We were also mindful of their considerable responsibility for delivering the Council's budget and policy framework. Their responsibility for steering the partnership dimension of the Council's working e.g. through the Growth Board and as demonstrated in the engagement with key stakeholders through the pandemic, is more important than ever. This increases the level of complexity involved and the roles of Leader and Deputy Leader are similar in terms of workload to those of senior management. We recognise that the complexity and workload mean that these roles are, in practice, only capable of being carried out effectively on a full-time basis. Whilst clear that the allowance is not a wage, we are concerned that the allowance paid should not be a barrier to attracting people to these pivotal roles.
23. We considered the differential allowances paid to the Leader and the Deputy Leader and we continue to be of the view that the Leader's role carries more responsibility than that of the Deputy Leader and this is reflected in our recommendations.
24. We then looked at the levels of SRA paid to the Leader and Deputy Leader by comparator County Councils primarily in the South East but also other

comparable County Councils across England. We found that Oxfordshire County Council was below the average for the region if not with some other authorities nationally. With the aim of resetting these allowances to reflect current workload and responsibilities, and with the objective of providing an allowance that encouraged progression to senior roles, we deemed that this average allowance was an appropriate guide for the level of remuneration.

We RECOMMEND that the Special Responsibility Allowance to the Leader of the Council be set at 3 times the Basic Allowance i.e. increased to £36,000;

We RECOMMEND that the Special Responsibility Allowance to the Deputy Leader of the Council be set at 2 times the Basic Allowance i.e. increased to £24,000.

Other Cabinet Members

25. The consideration given to the Leader and Deputy Leader applied similarly to the role of Cabinet Members. We noted the difficulties inherent in performing a Cabinet role while also maintaining full employment. We heard that a younger member of the Cabinet had previously resigned the role as it would otherwise have detracted from full-time employment. Equally, others had managed to do so. Again, although we consider that these posts should not be treated as a source of paid employment (a view supported by councillors) there is none the less a need to rebalance the amount paid better to reflect the time commitment, workload and level of responsibility.
26. As with other posts we found that the SRA for Cabinet Members lagged below the county council comparator average and, as a starting point, considered an increase to the level. We also considered the level of the SRA against that of the Leader and Deputy Leader.

We RECOMMEND that the Special Responsibility Allowance to Cabinet members be set at 1.6 times the Basic Allowance i.e. increased to £19,200.

Chairs of Performance and Education Scrutiny Committee

27. We noted that the new arrangements had been in place since May 2013 with two Scrutiny Committees. We interviewed the chair of the Performance Scrutiny Committee and a former Scrutiny Chairman. Having considered the demands of the roles, we reached the view that the chair of a scrutiny committee performed a pivotal role in managing the business of that committee in holding the executive to account; and that the burden of the role fell more significantly to the chair rather than the vice-chair. We considered that the chair's responsibilities should receive an allowance in line with comparator averages.

28. In doing so, we recognized that while by convention, the Leader of the Opposition also serves in the role of chair of the Performance Scrutiny Committee, there was no constitutional requirement to this effect. As such, we assessed the roles entirely separately.
29. We received no representations that an additional allowance be paid to the Deputy Chairs of Scrutiny Committees. We consider that the responsibilities of the Deputy Chairmen of the Committee are not onerous and that no SRA is needed.

We RECOMMEND that the Special Responsibility Allowance for the Chairs of the Education and Performance Scrutiny Committees be set at 0.6 times the Basic Allowance i.e. increased to £7,200.

Chair of the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Horton Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee

30. We heard that both of these Committees still play a significant function in the scrutiny of health services across Oxfordshire. The Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee continues to be a busy Committee. The Horton Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee, while originally created as a time-limited, task-and-finish body, scrutinizing proposals for maternity services, has been refocused by the constituent Councils and still plays a key role in scrutinizing the development of a Horton General Hospital masterplan.
31. We met with the Chairman of both Committees. We remain of the view that an allowance for chairing these meetings is appropriate.

We RECOMMEND that the Special Responsibility Allowance for the Chairs of the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Horton Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee should be set at:

- a) Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee: 0.6 times the Basic Allowance i.e. £7,200
- b) Horton Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee: 0.45 times the Basic Allowance i.e. £5,400

Planning and Regulation Committee

32. This significant committee deals with a range of quasi-judicial non-Executive regulatory functions. It meets every six weeks and in addition there are site visits, and it carries a considerable workload. We note that the post of the Chair of the Planning & Regulation Committee needs to be knowledgeable on technical issues, and able to deal with contentious issues, in order to guide the discussion and enable the Committee to focus on the key regulatory issues before it. We heard that there was very little additional preparation needed by the Deputy Chair over and above that as a Committee member and considered that there was no need to introduce an allowance for that role.

33. We considered whether the responsibilities and workload of the post of Chair required a different allowance to that of a Scrutiny Chair and we consider the two posts to be comparable and therefore recommend that the same allowance be paid.

We RECOMMEND that the Special Responsibility Allowance for the Chairman of the Planning & Regulation Committee be set at 0.6 times the Basic Allowance i.e. increased to £7,200.

Chair of the Audit & Governance Committee

34. This Committee (including a co-opted representative who also chairs this Committee's Audit Working Group) is responsible for seeing that good governance is maintained, with a strong system of internal control and risk management through the audit function. It meets approximately 6 times a year and the Committee maintains a strong focus on internal and external audit, ethical governance for elected members and gives pre-consideration to key changes to the Council's Constitution. For instance, the Committee had a pivotal role in reviewing the draft governance arrangements for the partnership between Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council. In addition to the Committee meetings there are monthly Audit Working Group meetings.
35. We interviewed the Chairman of this Committee.
36. We heard no representations to introduce an allowance for the Deputy Chair of the Committee and heard that the role was not significantly onerous to require an allowance.

We RECOMMEND that the Special Responsibility Allowance for the Chairman of the Audit & Governance Committee be set at 0.6 times the Basic Allowance i.e. increased to £7,200.

Chair of the Pension Fund Committee

37. This Committee manages the significant local government pension fund. It meets 4 times per year and there is required training for members throughout the year.
38. We are of the view that this is a considerable responsibility and requires specialist and technical knowledge with a constant requirement to keep up to date. Leading this Committee's work is a significant role at least equivalent to a scrutiny chairmanship. We interviewed the current chairman of the Committee.
39. We did not hear any calls for the introduction of a Deputy Chair's allowance and understood that the work of a Deputy Chairman was not so significantly more than a member of the Committee to require an allowance.

We RECOMMEND that the Special Responsibility Allowance for the Chairman of the Pension Fund Committee be set at 0.6 of the Basic Allowance i.e. increased to £7,200;

Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Council

40. We continue to regard the civic, ceremonial and constitutional role of the Chairman of the Council to be significant within the Council. While COVID-19 may have impacted on the range of public engagements and events the Chairman or Vice-Chairman needed to attend was lessened, the requirement to adapt to manage Full Council meetings on line has been a responsibility. As civic head of the authority, the Chairman will continue to have a key role within the community, perhaps even more so once COVID-19 lessens and community engagement can once again take place in full. As such, we continue to regard the roles as important, albeit that each incoming Chairperson can make of certain aspects of the role what they choose, in terms of outreach and involvement.
41. We received no representations about the level of the allowance and recognize that the Vice-Chair does not frequently need to cover formal meetings, and has more of a role in the community, assisting with such events and engagements. Our view is that the responsibilities will remain significant in 2021 and perhaps even more so post-COVID.

We RECOMMEND that the Special Responsibility Allowance for the Chairman of the Council be set at 0.85 times the Basic Allowance i.e. increased to £10,200;

We RECOMMEND that the Special Responsibility Allowance for the Deputy Chairman of the Council be set at 0.25 times the Chairman of the Council's Allowance i.e. increased to £2,550.

Chairman of the Remuneration Committee

42. We heard that the Remuneration Committee does not meet often and that its membership and chairmanship relate largely to the holders of existing Special Responsibility Allowances, and as part of those responsibilities. It does not appear to us that there is the need for any specific SRA for this Committee.

Leader of the Opposition

43. We consider that an effective Leader of the Opposition is essential to the democratic accountability of the Council. As such, the Leader of the Opposition needs to invest significant time and effort in keeping abreast of the work of Cabinet, Scrutiny and the Council as a whole, which has a public benefit. The role is significant, constitutional and integral to the democratic checks and balances within the Council.

44. We interviewed the Leader of the Opposition.
45. Having regard to the demands of the role, we consider that it does not carry the equivalent responsibility of a Cabinet Member and that there should rightly be a differential between the allowances relevant to those positions. In addition, we have considered the involvement and support provided by Shadow Cabinet Members and have taken this into account when setting an appropriate level. We also believe it is significant that the Council has given a Constitutional role to the Leader of the Opposition and not to the leaders of other opposition groups on the Council. This also, in our view, supports the attraction of an allowance for the responsibilities involved.

We RECOMMEND that the Special Responsibility Allowance for the Leader of the Opposition be set at the same level as the Basic Allowance i.e. increased to £12,000.

Other Members of the Shadow Cabinet

46. We note that the Council's Constitution recognizes that the second largest political group on the Council will be regarded as the official Opposition and as such will be entitled to receive briefings from officers in order to carry out this form of democratic challenge. We think this Constitutional recognition is important and we acknowledge that the formation of a Shadow Cabinet to deliver on the holding of the executive to account, is a key means of sustaining the work.

We RECOMMEND that a Special Responsibility allowance be set at 0.25 times the Basic Allowance i.e. increased to £3,000.

Locality Meeting Chairman

47. We noted that when the Locality Meetings were introduced after 2013 and allowances set for the chairing of them, the concept of Locality Meetings was a new one. The meetings then and now do not have formal decision-making powers delegated to them. However, we heard that these meetings – 9 of them area-based around the county, of all the councillors elected for that geographical area – had increasingly become very useful. This is indicated by the officer resource deployed to them, to report on local issues and answer questions. They are a key means of communication about the effectiveness of council activity and policy on the ground, and a means of reflecting back to the Council the particular needs and interests of those areas. The members also often discuss together the scope for using each individual councillor's allocated Cllr Priority Fund.
48. We interviewed several chairs of locality meetings.
49. It is our view that although these meetings are still informal, the co-ordination of the issues discussed and the management of the discussions remains a

pivotal and embedded part of harnessing the Councillor perspective for the benefit of the Council and communities. As such, we think the time has come to give further recognition to the responsibility of chairing them. Clearly as the meetings are not decision-making in the formal sense, the responsibility is not akin to any decision-making role. As such, we considered that an allowance of 10% of the Basic Allowance was appropriate.

We RECOMMEND that the Special Responsibility Allowance for the Chairs of Locality Meetings be set at 0.10 times the Basic Allowance i.e. increased to £1,200.

Police and Crime Panel

50. We noted that the Special Responsibility Allowance for the chairmanship of this Panel, should Oxfordshire County Council be elected to that position (as now), had been refreshed by a Panel previously, with Full Council agreeing to an uplift. We see no diminution in that role and are agreed that it remains a responsible one, with a regular set of meetings for the chairman to attend, plus a range of preparatory and sub-committee responsibilities attendant on the position. The responsibility is equivalent to that of a Scrutiny chair. Our concern is different.
51. We note that, according to the Police and Crime Panel terms of reference, endorsed by the constituent authorities, it is the authority which chairs the Panel which will pay the allowance for its Chairman. We question the equity of this for Oxfordshire's taxpayers. While we need to make recommendations within the current framework, we would ask the Council to revisit this point with its colleague members of the authority: we would question why the County Council's allowances scheme should bear the sole cost of this role when the effectiveness of meetings is the business of all constituent members. We are mindful too that there is perhaps an unexplored source of resource from the Home Office for the funding of some allowances. We would strongly encourage that the Council revisits this point with the PCP on a value for money basis for constituent authorities' residents and businesses.
52. However, we do not consider that there needs to be a current allowance for being a member of the Panel, nor its Vice-Chairman, a responsibility which we heard was not in any case onerous. So we are recommending that those allowances cease from April 2021.

We RECOMMEND that the Special Responsibility Allowance for the Chairman of the Police & Crime Panel be set at 0.6 times the Basic Allowance i.e. £7,200;

We RECOMMEND that no allowance be payable to the role of member of the Police & Crime Panel;

We RECOMMEND that no allowance be payable to the Vice-Chairman of the Police & Crime Panel;

We RECOMMEND that the Council revisits with the Police and Crime Panel and its constituent members, the potential for sharing the costs of the responsibilities required in chairing the Panel, and otherwise explore sources of contributory Government funding.

Third Party Leader and group leaders of other minority groups

53. Currently no allowance is paid for the role of leader of the third party group. We considered whether this should change. We noted that the role, unlike that of Leader of the Opposition, does not have a formal basis in the Council's Constitution; we consider that to be significant. We interviewed the current holder of this role. We also heard that the Third Party Group Leader is regularly and integrally involved in monthly meetings of Political Group Leaders with senior officers, to discuss various plans and proposals. However, we would welcome some further delineation of this role by the Council within the Constitution or otherwise, before we recommend any change to create an allowance for this responsibility. We certainly remain open to that possibility.
54. As such, we are not currently convinced that the role of a Third Party Leader is sufficiently constitutionally embedded to warrant a formal SRA and that the day to day management of a political group is not itself a matter requiring remuneration.
55. For now, we recommend that an SRA is not appropriate for the Third Party Group Leader.
56. We recognize that there are not, currently, any other party groups on the Council. Were this to be the case, and the Council were to consider some degree of involvement for their leaders in the Council's formal and informal governance arrangements, we would be open to revisiting the question of allowances for minority group leaders.

We RECOMMEND that no Special Responsibility Allowances be paid for the role of the Third Party Group Leader but that this be reviewed in 2021/22.

Adoption and Fostering Panels

57. We heard that members of the Council may, but are not required to, serve on Adoption and Fostering Panels. The current member serving on the Adoption Panel commits to at least 6 such panel hearings per year. There is no current member representative on the Fostering Panel. We are of the view that the exceptional level of responsibility in taking part in such a panel, given the life-changing outcomes involved, merits consideration under the Council's Scheme of Allowances. We are mindful of the work in preparing for such hearings and the responsibility of taking part in the decision making.
58. We suggest that the Council should introduce an allowance for a councillor who takes part in such meetings and that this should be reviewed after a year's operation. Rather than a flat fee, we recommend that this begins with a

payment per meeting of £100 capped at £1,200 based on the current trajectory that the Councillor serving on the Adoption Panel attends one such hearing per month.

We RECOMMEND that a Special Responsibility Allowance is introduced for member representatives on Adoption and Fostering Panels, to be set at £100 per Panel hearing capped at £1,200 per year.

Capping of Special Responsibility Allowances

59. We considered that it would best serve the wider representation of the Council if it adopted a cap on the number of Special Responsibility Allowances which any individual councillor could receive at any one time. While it is true that any responsibility does take time and commitment to fulfil, we think it is important to strike the right balance between fair remuneration for a role performed, an encouragement of wider representation and a safeguard from the accrual of remuneration. In practice, it would be rare indeed for any individual to hold more than two SRAs at any given time.
60. We do believe this cap would signify a step-change and a marker towards potentially reducing the cap to one SRA per councillor in a future year, which is the practice of many other authorities. We have not recommended this further step this year so as to allow the Council best to consider its governance arrangements going forward, with this in mind.

We RECOMMEND that the Council's Scheme adopts a cap whereby a councillor may only hold no more than two SRAs at any one time.

Child and Dependant Carers' Allowances

61. We noted that there have been no claims made for these allowances since the last review but agreed that the continuation of these allowances as part of a package of measures (including the increase in the basic allowance), was of significant importance, to encourage those with young families or care responsibilities to stand for Council in the coming years.
62. We considered the rates for hourly allowances for comparator County Councils in the South East and noted that the existing Oxfordshire rates are comparatively low. We also considered the average figures for carer costs across Oxfordshire and were attracted to the approach of achieving a realistic hourly rate with an annual cap. As such, we benchmarked that against other councils' experience.
63. We believe a more realistic rate in this particular area is essential in demonstrating a commitment to enabling those with caring responsibilities to consider performing the role of a councillor. The Approved Duties in the Council's Scheme of Allowances provides a tangible set of circumstances for which such an allowance can be claimed, suitably evidenced.

64. We do not consider a councillor should be able to claim such expenses for care provided by family members. We feel the Scheme should recognize caring responsibilities in respect of dependent children under 16 or dependent adults certified by a doctor or social worker as needing attendance.
65. We considered it appropriate that the hourly rate should also take into account the Oxford Living Wage as a base for the Child Care allowance; and as a multiple of that (twice) for the Dependant Carer allowance. This is reflected in our recommendation.

We RECOMMEND that Child and Dependant Carer's Allowances continue to be paid on the basis that:-

- a) **Childcare: up to a maximum of £10.21 per hour for a child (i.e. Oxford living wage pertaining from time to time), to a maximum level of £1,200 per annum, on the production of receipts;**
- b) **Adult Care: up to £20.42 per hour for an adult (i.e. twice the Oxford living wage pertaining from time to time), to a maximum level of £2,400 per annum, on the production of receipts.**

Co-optees' Allowance

66. We continue in the view that there should not be a general co-optees' allowance payable to all co-opted members on Council Committees and so are not making a recommendation for such an allowance. We also continue to endorse the principle that co-opted members should be able to claim travel and subsistence allowances, provided that these cannot be claimed legitimately from another body.
67. We remain of the view that the independent member of the Audit & Governance Committee should receive the allowance for carrying out the specific role of Chairman of the Council's Audit Working Group, which reports to the Audit & Governance Committee. We concluded that the Chairman of the Audit Working Group is a key role in the financial/business workings of the Council which should be remunerated.

We RECOMMEND that the co-optees' allowance to the independent co-opted member of the Audit Committee when the co-opted member serves as Chairman of the Audit Working Group be set at 0.6 times the Basic Allowance i.e. increased to £7,200.

Indexation

68. A council can apply an index to their allowances and in such a circumstance, if the only change each year is the application of the index, then the Council does not formally need to adopt a scheme of allowances each year. We have for some years recommended linking members' allowances to the local government pay award for Oxfordshire County Council staff. We believe this is

still appropriate particularly in the current economic climate. However, we are mindful that we are recommending increases to allowances in this report and we believe that the index should not be applied (for the year 2021/22) on any increased Basic or Special Responsibility Allowances.

We RECOMMEND that the Council's Basic and Special Responsibility Allowances and the Co-optees' Allowance to the Chairman of the Audit Working Group be amended annually by reference to the annual Local Government Pay Award for staff and that this should take effect from the date on which the award for staff similarly takes effect, with the proviso that no such index should be applied during 2021/22 to any allowances that are increased either as recommended in this report or otherwise.

Travelling and Subsistence Allowances

69. The Panel did not receive any strong views that the current basis of travel and subsistence allowances should change. We noted that claims for travel were low even before COVID-19 prevented actual travel and formal meetings became virtual. We would invite the Council to consider why this was the case and whether the allowances claim systems are themselves a help or a hindrance to members. We noted the existing list of 'Approved Duties' (duties for which claims can be made) and suggest that the Council periodically reminds members of their right to make claims and how to do so.

We RECOMMEND that claims made under the Council's travel and subsistence scheme be accompanied by receipts and/or any other relevant evidence of the costs incurred and that claims under the scheme be made, in writing, within two months of the relevant duty in respect of which the entitlement to the allowance arises;

We RECOMMEND the Council retains, for members, the travel and subsistence scheme that is applicable to officers.

Amounts

70. We recommend that the Basic Allowance, Special Responsibility Allowances and Co-optees' Allowance amounts be rounded to the nearest pound at the time they are set each year, to make it easier and clearer to identify the allowances for each role.

We RECOMMEND that the amounts for Basic Allowance, Special Responsibility Allowances and Co-optees' Allowances be rounded to the nearest pound at the time of their setting and after any indexation is applied.

Conclusion

71. In conclusion, the Panel considers the current levels of allowances to be, in the main, too low having regard both to the time and workload involved and,

crucially, as a means of encouraging a diverse range of people to consider becoming county councillors in Oxfordshire. Clearly, allowances cannot be the only means of overcoming obstacles to wider democratic representation however they are an element. We did hear from some members that they thought it would be beneficial if allowances were once again pensionable: it is not however open to us to suggest something not currently permissible in law. We do though consider our recommendations to be appropriate to the roles actually performed by county councillors in the service of the people of Oxfordshire. We understand it is for the Council whether to accept these recommendations having regard to the budgetary and political implications of so doing. Our role has been to present a Scheme we feel is reflective of the responsibilities of elected and co-opted members of Oxfordshire County Council.

72. We would be willing of course to give any recommendations to the newly elected Council following the May 2021 election if any aspects of an adopted Scheme are then considered in need of amendment. In any event, the Panel has expressed its wish to meet again in autumn 2021

David Shelmerdine

**Chairman
Independent Remuneration Panel
November 2020**

Financial Implications of the Independent Remuneration Panel's recommendations

Allowance that the Panel is recommending for change	Current position	Yearly estimated additional costs if the Panel's recommendations are implemented
Basic Allowance	£11,013.77 x 63 = £693,867.51	£986.23 x 63 = £62,132.49
SRA: Leader	£31,940.87	£4,059.13
SRA: Deputy Leader	£22,027.55	£1,972.45
SRA: Cabinet Member	£17,622.65 x 8 = £140,981.20	£1,577.35 x 8 = £12,618.80
SRA: Chair of the Council	£9,361.55	£838.45
SRA: Opposition Leader	£8,810.81	£3,189.19
SRA: Scrutiny Chairs*, Planning & Regulation Chair, Audit & Governance Chair and Pension Fund Committee	£6,608.88 x 7* = £46,262.16	£591.12 x 7* = £4,137.84 *NB since the Panel's recommendations were made, there are now seven not six committees attracting this allowance.
SRA: Co-optees allowance – Audit & Governance Committee	£6,608.88	£591.12
SRA: Chair of Horton HOSC	£4,957.00	£443.00
SRA: Shadow Cabinet Member	£2,753.70 x 9 = £24,783.30	£246.30 x 9 = £2,216.70
SRA: Vice Chair of the Council	£2,340.65	£209.35
SRA: Locality Chair	£550.74 x 9 = £4,956.66	£649.26 x 9 = £5,843.34
SRA: Chair Police & Crime Commission Panel	£6,608.88	£591.12
SRA: Adoption OR Fostering Panel Members	NIL	£100 per session, to be capped per at £1,200 per annum, per Member, per Panel £2,400.00
Estimated total additional cost for the year		£98,842.98
Total cost of the allowances scheme	£1,003,507.02	<u>£1,102,350</u>

Oxfordshire County Council Calendar of Meetings 2022/23¹

Council	Cabinet	Cabinet Member Decisions for Leader; Deputy Leader and Children, Education & Young People's Services; Community Services & Safety; Corporate Services; and Finance	Cabinet Member Decisions for Climate Change Delivery & Environment	Cabinet Member Decisions for Adult Social Care; Cabinet Member Decisions for Public Health & Equality	Cabinet Member Decisions for Highway Management	Cabinet Member Decisions for Travel & Development Strategy
Tues 10.00am	Tues 2.00pm	Tues at 3.00 pm or on the rising of Cabinet	Thurs at 2.00 pm	Tues at 9.00am	Thurs at 10.00am	Wed at 10.00am
2022 17 May – Annual Council – 12 Jul 13 Sept 1 Nov 13 Dec 2022 14 Feb 28 Mar ² - 2022/23 16 May 2023 – Annual Council	2022 24 May 21 Jun 19 Jul 20 Sept 18 Oct 15 Nov 20 Dec 2023 24 Jan 21 Feb 21 Mar 18 Apr	2022 24 May 21 Jun 19 Jul 20 Sept 18 Oct 15 Nov 20 Dec 2023 24 Jan 21 Feb 21 Mar 18 Apr	2022 26 May 23 Jun 21 Jul 8 Sept 13 Oct 17 Nov 8 Dec 2023 26 Jan 23 Feb 23 Mar 27 Apr	2022 7 Jun 5 Jul 6 Sept 4 Oct 8 Nov 6 Dec 2023 17 Jan 21 Feb 21 Mar 25 Apr	2022 26 May 23 Jun 21 Jul 8 Sept 13 Oct 17 Nov 8 Dec 2023 26 Jan 23 Feb 23 Mar 27 Apr	2022 8 Jun 6 Jul 7 Sept 5 Oct 9 Nov 7 Dec 2023 11Jan 22 Feb 22 Mar 26 Apr

Oxfordshire County Council Calendar of Meetings 2022/23¹

Performance & Corporate Services Overview & Scrutiny Committee	Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee	Joint Oxfordshire Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee	People Overview & Scrutiny Committee	Audit & Governance Committee	Planning & Regulation Committee	Pension Fund Committee	Health & Wellbeing Board	Remuneration Committee
Fri 10.00am	Weds 1.00pm	Thurs 10.00am	Thurs 10.00 am	Weds 2.00pm	Mon 2.00pm	Friday 10.00am	Thurs 2.00pm	Fri 4.00pm
2022 17 Jun 9 Dec 2023 27 Jan 28 Apr	2022 15 Jun 16 Nov 2023 25 Jan 26 April	2022 9 Jun 22 Sept 24 Nov 2023 8 Feb 20 Apr	2022 16 Jun 10 Nov 2023 12 Jan 30 Mar	2022 20 Jul 21Sept 23 Nov 2023 18 Jan 15 Mar 10 May	2022 6 Jun 18 Jul 5 Sept 17 Oct 28 Nov 2023 16 Jan 27 Feb 17 Apr	2022 10 Jun 9 Sept 2 Dec 2023 3 Mar	2022 30 Jun 6 Oct 1 Dec 2023 16 Mar	2022 13 Jan

Oxfordshire County Council Calendar of Meetings 2022/23¹

Teachers Joint Consultative	Employees Joint Consultative	Fire Service Joint Consultative	Thames Valley Police & Crime Panel	Local Pension Board
Thurs 2.00pm	Thurs 2.00pm	Friday 10.00am	Fri, 10.00am	Fri, 10.30am
<p>2022</p> <p>7 Jul</p> <p>3 Nov</p> <p>2023</p> <p>2 Mar</p>	<p>2022</p> <p>9 Jun</p> <p>29 Sep</p> <p>25 Nov</p> <p>2023</p> <p>2 Feb</p>	<p>2022</p> <p>24 Jun</p> <p>23 Sept</p> <p>9 Dec</p> <p>2023</p> <p>10 Mar</p>	<p>2022</p> <p>24 Jun</p> <p>16 Sept</p> <p>18 Nov</p> <p>2023</p> <p>27 Jan</p> <p>24 Mar</p>	<p>2022</p> <p>8 Jul</p> <p>21 Oct</p> <p>2023</p> <p>20 Jan</p> <p>5 May</p>

Notes

¹ Dates are subject to change. The website will be updated and Members notified accordingly.

² April Council meeting brought forward to avoid Easter

³ February Council meeting brought forward to aid District Council budget setting

This page is intentionally left blank