

Briefing Note

www.oxford.gov.uk



Council

Date: **Monday 18 April 2016**

Time: **5.00 pm**

Place: **Council Chamber, Town Hall**

For any further information please contact:

**Jennifer Thompson, Committee and Members Services
Officer**

Telephone: 01865 252275

Email: democraticservices@oxford.gov.uk

This briefing note forms part of the Council agenda papers and should be read alongside these.

The Council meeting is available via a webcast. This means that people may choose to watch all or part of the meeting over the internet rather than attend in person. The webcast will be available to view on the City Council's website after the meeting.

PART 1 - PUBLIC BUSINESS

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2 MINUTES

Minutes of the ordinary meeting of Council held on 8 February 2016.
Minutes of the budget meeting of Council held on 17 February 2016.

Council is asked to approve the minutes as a correct record.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

4 APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEES

There are no proposed changes.

5 ANNOUNCEMENTS

Announcements by:

- (1) The Lord Mayor (see attached)
- (2) The Sheriff
- (3) The Leader of the Council
- (4) The Chief Executive, Chief Finance Officer, Monitoring Officer

6 PUBLIC ADDRESSES AND QUESTIONS THAT RELATE TO MATTERS FOR DECISION AT THIS MEETING

There are no public addresses and questions in this section.

CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

7 DEVOLUTION UPDATE AND BUDGET ALLOCATION

The Board Member will move the recommendations.

Recommendations

The City Executive Board recommends Council to allocate the budget of £50k to support the initial study on viability and sustainability and governance; specialist work on collaboration around Children and Adult services; public consultation and involvement; and preparation of a revised

Main agenda
17 - 38

Briefing
note p9

Main agenda
39 - 42

Devolution Deal. This will be funded from reserves and balances.

8 **A HOUSING COMPANY FOR OXFORD**

Main agenda
43 - 60

The Board Member will move the recommendations.

Recommendations

The City Executive Board recommends Council to:

1. amend the Treasury Management Strategy to enable the making of loans to the wholly owned Housing Company on State Aid compliant terms of up to £12,250,000 to fund its purchase of the Phase 1 affordable housing at Barton Park and to delegate to the Chief Finance Officer approval of the terms of the loan and the terms of the facility agreement(s) and any associated documentation;
2. agree the inclusion of an amount of £12,250,000 in its General Fund Capital Programme in 2017/18 funded by Prudential Borrowing;
3. agree the provision of a loan facility to the Company of up to £250,000 to fund the set up costs and provide initial working capital and delegate to the Chief Finance Officer approval of terms of the loan and the terms of the facility agreement;
4. agree the adoption of the Local Authorities (Indemnities for Members and Officers) Order 2004 in respect of officers of the Council appointed to the Housing Board in accordance with paragraph 40;
5. agree a General Fund revenue budget of £40,000 in 2016/17 for the setting up of the Company funded from reserves.

9 **ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN 2016-2020**

Mani agenda
61 - 118

The Board Member will move the recommendations.

Recommendations

The City Executive Board recommends Council to approve the Asset Management Plan 2016-2020 attached at Appendix 1 for adoption by the Council.

10 **INTEGRATED PERFORMANCE REPORT QUARTER 3 2015/16 - CAPITAL BUDGET CHANGE**

Main agenda
119 - 124

The Board Member will move the recommendations.

Recommendations

The City Executive Board recommends Council to approve an additional capital budget of £0.150 million for electrical works at Cowley Marsh Depot to be funded from the service's projected underspend.

11 OXPENS: SALE OF OXPENS LAND AND LOAN TO OXFORD WEST END DEVELOPMENT LTD

Main agenda
125 - 134

The Board Member will move the recommendations.

The City Executive Board agreed the recommendations below at their meeting.

City Executive Board resolves to recommend full Council to approve:

1. a loan of £4.16 million to Oxford West End Development Ltd to provide funds to the company to purchase land owned by Oxford City Council on terms set out in this report;
2. a capital budget of £4.16 million in the Council's General Fund Capital Programme in 2017/18 funded from the Capital Receipt received from the sale of the land.

OFFICER REPORTS

12 AWARD OF FREEDOM OF THE CITY TO MS LESLEY DEWHURST

It is proposed that the Honorary Freedom of the City of Oxford is awarded to Ms Lesley Dewhurst in recognition of her work with single homeless people in Oxford over the past 20 years.

The Lord Mayor will ask Councillor Price to move:

In accordance with Section 249 of the Local Government Act 1972 that the Honorary Freedom of the City be conferred on Ms Lesley Dewhurst and that this is conferred at a formal ceremony to be held at a later date.

Councillor Fooks will second the motion and Councillor Simmons will support the motion.

Council is asked to support this motion.

13 PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2016

Main agenda
135 - 146

Officer Recommendation: Council is recommended to approve the Annual Pay Policy Statement 2016 for publication.

14 REGULATION OF INVESTIGATORY POWERS ACT 2000

Main agenda
147 - 148

Officer recommendation: That Council note the Council's use of its powers under the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (RIPA) for the period 1 April 2015 to 31 March 2016.

QUESTIONS

15 CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD MINUTES

This item has a time limit of 15 minutes.

Councillors may ask the Board Members questions about matters in these minutes.

a **Minutes of meeting Thursday 11 February 2016 of City Executive Board**

Main agenda
149 - 160

a **Minutes of meeting Thursday 17 March 2016 of City Executive Board**

Main agenda
161 - 170

a **Minutes of meeting Thursday 24 March 2016 of City Executive Board**

Main agenda
171 - 174

16 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

**Briefing
note p13**

Questions on notice from councillors received in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.10(b)

The briefing note contains all 37 questions submitted by the deadline, and written responses where available.

PART 2 - PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND SCRUTINY

17 PUBLIC ADDRESSES AND QUESTIONS THAT DO NOT RELATE TO MATTERS FOR DECISION AT THIS COUNCIL MEETING

**Briefing
note p31**

A total of 45 minutes is available for this item. Responses of up to three minutes are included in this time.

Public addresses and questions to the Leader or other Board member received in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.11 and 11.12 and not related to matters for decision on this agenda are attached.

Where available, written responses to questions are included below each question.

Up to five minutes is available for each public address and three minutes for each question.

18 OUTSIDE ORGANISATION/COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORTS AND QUESTIONS

Main agenda
175 - 178

1. On behalf of Councillor Price the Head of Policy, Communications and Culture has submitted a report providing an update on the work of the Oxfordshire Growth Board.

Council is invited to comment on and note the submitted report.

2. No member gave notice to the Head of Law and Governance that they wish present a written or oral report on any other organisation.

19 SCRUTINY COMMITTEE UPDATE REPORT

Main agenda
179 - 208

The Chair of the Scrutiny Committee has submitted a report.

Council is invited to comment on and note the report.

PART 3 - MOTIONS REPRESENTING THE CITY

20 MOTIONS ON NOTICE

**Briefing
note p47**

This item has a time limit of 60 minutes.

Motions will be taken in turn from the, Green, and Labour, Liberal Democrat groups in that order.

Eight motions were received by the Head of Law and Governance by the deadline. No substantive amendments were submitted before publication of this briefing note.

Council is asked to consider the eight motions set out in the attached report.

21 MATTERS EXEMPT FROM PUBLICATION AND EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

If Council wishes to exclude the press and the public from the meeting during consideration of any aspects of the preceding agenda items it will be necessary for Council to pass a resolution in accordance with the provisions of Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 specifying the grounds on which their presence could involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as described in specific paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act if and so long as, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

(The Access to Information Procedure Rules – Section 15 of the Council's Constitution – sets out the conditions under which the public can be excluded

from meetings of the Council)

|

To: Council

Date: 24 April 2016

Title of Report: Lord Mayor's engagements - February 2016 to April 2016

Introduction

The Lord Mayor wishes to draw Councillors' attention to the list of engagements and events attended since the last Council meeting (below). He will mention highlights in his announcements.

Engagements in February 2016

Date	Event	Attendance
1	OU Newcomers Club proposed visit	Lord Mayor
3	Official Opening of Oxford Abingdon road Travel Lodge	Lord Mayor
4	Oxford World Cancer Day	Lord Mayor
4	Civic Dinner - The Mayor of High Wycombe	Lord Mayor & Mayoress
7	2016 Chinese New Year Celebration	Lord Mayor & Mayoress
8	Cheque Presentation - North Parade Market	Lord Mayor
9	Oxford Women's Luncheon Club	Mayoress
10	Woman in Adversity: Contemporary and traditional crafts as a source of hope and income, as part of the 14th Human Rights Festival	Lord Mayor
12	Charity Big Band Concert - Mayor of Bicester	Lord Mayor & Mayoress
14	Oxford Music Festival Concert	Lord Mayor
20	Oxford University Officers' Training Corps (OUOTC) Annual Dinner	Lord Mayor
20	A Reunion and Revue of the 30 years - Oxford Leon Link	Deputy Lord Mayor
21	Inter National Mother Language Day Celebration	Lord Mayor
24	Blackbird Leys Walking Football	Lord Mayor
26	OxClean Launch of the Annual Spring Clean	Lord Mayor
26	Didcot Mayor - charity dinner and dance	Lord Mayor
27	Brahms Requiem	Lord Mayor & Mayoress
29	Fair Trade Fortnight - Breakfast / Photo	Lord Mayor

Engagements in March 2016

Date	Event	Attendance
1	Veterans Medal of Honour Presentation	Lord Mayor
4	Oxford Chair Oxford Chair - Charity Dinner -	Lord Mayor & Mayoress
10	British Dyslexia Association 10th International Conference	Deputy Lord Mayor
10	Freemen Admission Ceremony	Deputy Lord Mayor & Sheriff
11	Pets at Home re-opening	Deputy Lord Mayor
12	Magistrates Mock Trial Competition, Oxfordshire Heat	Lord Mayor
12	Korean Prayer Meeting - Dinner	Lord Mayor & Mayoress
14	Fly a flag for the Commonwealth	Lord Mayor
14	WW1 Commemorative Act	Lord Mayor
17	Consumer Challenge Quiz Mabel Prichard Special Needs School	Lord Mayor
17	Civic Reception And Citizen of the Year Awards Witney	Lord Mayor & Mayoress
18	South Oxfordshire charity dinner	Lord Mayor & Mayoress
19	Concert - Dvorak: The Spectre's Bride and Slavonic Dances: and Smetana: Vitava	Lord Mayor & Mayoress
20	Morning Worship Service St Mary's Haddenham	Lord Mayor
23	Coffee Morning/ Talk, to Friendly's Elderly People's group	Lord Mayor
24	New Marston 50+ Club	Lord Mayor

Engagements in April 2016 including those planned

Date	Event	Attendance
1	Annual General Meeting -Oxford Leiden Link	Lord Mayor
2	Oxford Literary Festival, Opening Dinner	Lord Mayor & Mayoress
6	World table tennis day - ping pong takes centre stage	Lord Mayor
6	A Night at the Museum - Helen & Douglas House	Lord Mayor & Mayoress
7	Jonathan Aitken Lecture	Lord Mayor
	Charity Cheque Presentation	Lord Mayor
9	Mayor of Thame - Dinner Dance	Lord Mayor

		& Mayoress
9	Nepalese New Year 2073 Celebration Party	Deputy Lord Mayor
11	Route 57 Road Trip	Lord Mayor
12	Abingdon Operatic Society	Lord Mayor & Mayoress
13	Wesley Memorial Church Open Door Project	Deputy Lord Mayor
13	SE Asian Festival Reception	Lord Mayor
15	LORD MAYOR Charity Dinner	Lord Mayor
16	Freedom of the Town Ceremony	Lord Mayor
19	'Loop Hole'	Lord Mayor
19	Photo Call for Fashion Revolution	Lord Mayor
20	Awarding of the 2016 Christopher Tower Poetry Prizes on the theme of Wonder	Lord Mayor
20	United for peace - 3 counties against extremism	Lord Mayor
21	Department of Statistics New Building	Lord Mayor
21	Queen's 90th Birthday	
22	OX50+ Public Meeting	Lord Mayor
22	Henley Mayor Fundraising Drinks Reception	Lord Mayor
23	Shakespeare Birthday Celebration	Lord Mayor
23	Mayor of Abingdon on Thames - Civic Dinner Dance	Lord Mayor & Mayoress
24	St George's Day Civic Service	All civic office holders
28	Royal British Legion Charity Dinner - Royal Air Force Benson	Lord Mayor & Mayoress
29	Marston Court Care Home	Lord Mayor
30	Air Cadet 75th Anniversary Reunion	Lord Mayor & Mayoress
30	Charity Concert - Rifles	

Report author	Jennifer Thompson
Job title	Committee and Member Services Officer
Service area or department	Law and Governance
Telephone	01865 252275
e-mail	jthompson@oxford.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

To: Council
Date: 18 April 2016
Title of Report: Questions on Notice from members of Council and responses from the Board Members and Leader

Introduction

1. Questions submitted by members of Council to the Board members, Leader of the Council, by the deadline in the Constitution are listed below in the order they will be taken at the meeting.
2. Responses are included where available.
3. Questioners can ask one supplementary question of the councillor answering the original question.
4. This report will be republished after the Council meeting to include supplementary questions and responses as part of the minutes pack.

Questions and responses

Board member for Climate Change and Cleaner, Greener Oxford

1. From Councillor Wolff to Councillor Tanner

The portfolio holder will no doubt have noticed the appalling state of our streets with many major and minor roads peppered with potholes large enough to put cyclists in danger.

1. What is the portfolio holder doing to improve the performance of the County Council in repairing the major roads for which it is responsible?
2. How quickly are the City Council responding to reports of potholes?
3. What is the portfolio holder doing to improve the performance of the City Council in repairing the minor roads for which it is responsible?

Written response

(1) The revenue budget allocated for pothole repairs by the County Council on major roads has been substantially reduced, therefore the County Council Highway Inspectors are rigorously adhering to the inspection policy. Repairs will only be instigated if they meet the relevant investigatory levels. These levels can be found in the highway inspection policy:-

<https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/sites/default/files/folders/documents/roadsandtransport/transportpoliciesandplans/highwaymanagementpolicy/highwaysafetyinspectionpolicy10feb2011.pdf>

The City Council is continually pressing the County Council to increase the money available for keeping Oxford's main roads in a good state of repair.

(2) The City Council inspects reported potholes and if they meet the appropriate investigatory levels we aim to repair them within either 2 hours, 24 hours (or next working day) or 28 days depending on the severity of the defect and level of risk.

(3) The City Council undertakes the maintenance of minor roads under the Section 42 agreement and the County Council provides the budget for this agreement. This has been significantly reduced as part of their budget reductions. The Direct Services team perform very well within the stringent financial constraints and are regularly exploring alternative repair methods to improve quality and reduce costs.

2. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Tanner

No one doubts the value of increased food waste recycling but did the Council do a proper evaluation of bin colours before deciding on the visually intrusive bright red bins that are appearing on our streets?

Written response

The 'Food Waste Recycling for Flats' project was initially devised in 2014. The rationale underlying the distinct bin colour choice was to:-

- Provide service uniformity/consistency at sites across the city;
- Ensure that residents could easily differentiate food waste bins from those for other waste streams (blue for recycling, green for residual waste, brown for organics).

Bin colour choice is limited and whilst black or grey bins may have been an option, these are universally associated with residual waste and were therefore deemed likely to generate confusion and consequent contamination; the latter at significant financial and environmental cost to the council.

It is estimated that 5-10% of food waste bin sites are visible from the highway, with the majority concealed within bin stores.

Board member for Crime, Community Safety and Licensing

3. From Councillor Wade to Councillor Sinclair

When is it anticipated that the draft Waterways PSPO will be revised and ready for consultation? When will the public consultation take place? And will the consultation period be extended if it takes place over the holiday period?

Written response

The draft Waterways PSPO amended by the CEB on the 17 March is the version that will be used in the consultation. The consultation will begin when the Council's Public Involvement Board have agreed the approach to consultation. Therefore there is no end date to the consultation at present. It is likely to continue throughout the summer period.

4. From Councillor Thomas to Councillor Sinclair

Do you agree that instead of officer time being spent drawing up a poorly worded, half-baked, and impractical Waterways PSPO their time would be better spent working on a 'living waterways' plan prioritising the provision of additional residential moorings to aid the housing crisis in Oxford?

Written response

The draft Order was developed to stimulate a discussion with members and the public on the best way to deal with the issues that have been arising for some time on the waterways and riverbanks.

5. From Councillor Thomas to Councillor Sinclair

Will you be cross referencing the Waterways PSPO proposals with existing human rights legislation to ensure there are no breaches?

Written response

Yes. If a PSPO is eventually presented for the consideration of the CEB, the Human Rights Act 1998 and the equalities impact will be taken fully into consideration.

6. From Councillor Thomas to Councillor Sinclair

Will you make the minutes of past meetings of UMBEG publicly available, obviously with the exclusion of any references to named individuals?

Written response

Yes, subject to data protection considerations.

7. From Councillor Thomas to Councillor Sinclair

Will you make Action Plans from UMBEG publicly available, obviously with the exclusion of any references to named individuals?

Written response

Yes, subject to data protection considerations.

8. From Councillor Thomas to Councillor Sinclair

Will the Council make publicly available all correspondence regarding the 2015 consultation on the PSPO with private land owners?

Written response

The discussion with private land owners in 2014-15 sought their views on whether they would support a PSPO to include a schedule of mooring locations and other provisions. This was not the draft PSPO presented to CEB on the 17 March.

9. From Councillor Benjamin to Councillor Sinclair

Do you find emerging stories of Council representatives telling boaters and waterside rough sleepers 'we will get you when the PSPO comes in' worrying?

Written response

I am not aware of any such comments. There is a procedure for dealing with these matters through our website.

10. From Councillor Benjamin to Councillor Sinclair

What are your plans for practically enforcing the Waterways PSPO on private land?

Written response

The PSPO is unenforceable on private land, unless there is an implied right of access. The majority of the waterways of Oxford are publicly accessible, therefore there is an implied right of access. The public also has an implied right of access to the tow path, foot paths and some of the riverbank.

11. From Councillor Thomas to Councillor Sinclair

In a recent Oxford Mail article entitled "Softer approach to tackle anti-social behaviour working in the Leys", which opens with "Methods used to deal with anti-social behaviour in Windrush and Evenlode Towers have been successful and should be deployed elsewhere, councillors say." Cllr Linda Smith is quoted as saying "One of the first responses of council officers was to explore the possibility of putting in a PSPO, like the one at Foresters Tower. Councillors in Blackbird Leys and Northfield Brook felt that using the criminal process to deal with young teenagers wasn't the way we wanted to go."

Does the Board Member agree that the City Executive should be following the lead of Cllr Smith and her Blackbird Leys and Northfield Brook colleagues to work pro-actively with people rather than implementing yet another unpopular PSPO which will only alienate and criminalise?

Written response

As the Councillor knows, the Board has approved an extensive consultation process for the draft Waterways PSPO that will involve working closely with the groups and individuals who are most involved in the identified anti- social behaviours that are affecting the city's waterways. That consultation process will allow the officers to consider the merits of all the available approaches to controlling these behaviours.

12. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Sinclair

Why has the dog waste bin on the canal towpath by the Frenchay Road bridge been consistently left unemptied? If Council is proposing to give officers greater powers to make boaters and others look after the waterways, would it not be a good start for council to make sure its officers keep their part of the deal by keeping the living and recreational environment of boaters and other users in an acceptable condition?

Written response

The canal towpath is a popular location for dog walkers. Officers will monitor the situation and take any necessary action.

13. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Sinclair

The city centre PSPO has been in force for some months now.

Could the councillor tell us how many notices have been issued under its provisions?
Of those:

- how many were for each of the behaviours listed in the order;
- how many were issued north of St Giles' church;
- how many were issued inside property owned and managed by the University of Oxford;
- how many were issued inside property owned and managed by Colleges of the University of Oxford?

Written response

for each of the behaviours listed in the order;

- o Aggressive begging – 10 occurrences
- o Alcohol – 3 occurrences
- o Busking – 5 occurrences
- o Cycling in Queen St or Cornmarket – 132 occurrences
- o Dog control – 3 occurrences

issued north of St Giles' church - None

issued inside property owned and managed by the University of Oxford - None

issued inside property owned and managed by Colleges of the University of Oxford – None.

The city centre PSPO has been in place since February 1 2016. Officers have been addressing anti social behaviours covered by the Order by giving advice and handing out a Frequently Asked Questions leaflet.

14. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Sinclair

The Microchipping of Dogs (England) 2015 Act comes into legal force on April 6. This requires dog owners to have their pets microchipped and gives responsibility for enforcement to local councils, but, rather unhelpfully, does not specify whether this means county or districts (see provision 2 (Interpretation) sub-section (b), part (i), at <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2015/108/regulation/2/made>). Does the City Council exercise this responsibility, and if so how will it go about it and what are the implications for resources?

Written response

The dog warden service within Direct Services will be taking on the responsibility for enforcing the Microchipping of Dogs (England) Regulation 2015.

To date a template legal notice has been drafted with Legal Services and a formal procedure is being written. Authorisation of relevant officers under the regulations has been requested from Community Services who manage this function following the restructure of regulatory services within the Council.

The Dog Warden service has limited resources (0.5 FTE Dog Warden) and therefore in practical terms the new regulations will be enforced only when stray dogs are collected without microchips.

Owners looking to claim their dogs will be advised it is a legal requirement to chip their dog and we will offer to do so before returning the dog. The cost of chipping is already included in the repatriation fee for the dogs. If the owner refuses this offer then a legal notice will be served requiring chipping to take place within 21 days. The dog warden will follow up on the notice and if it has not been chipped we will take the dog and chip it in default of the notice. The costs of doing so will be recovered from the owner. The owner can then be prosecuted for failing to comply with the notice.

If the stray dogs are not claimed and are rehomed then the dogs will be chipped by the rehoming centre before going to a new owner.

There are no additional resources required by enforcing the new regulations in this way and it will become an extension of the existing stray dog procedures.

It is not anticipated that there will be a high level of enforcement action required.

Board member for Culture and Communities

15. From Councillor Fooks to Councillor Simm

I see that the West Oxford Community Centre has been offered very generous terms for a new lease. Will you assure Council that similarly generous terms, exempting the Association from performance measurement and providing rent-free occupation, will be on offer to other Community Associations in the city?

Written response

We are very supportive of the excellent work undertaken by WOCA and the quality of their operational performance over many years. This is reflected in the terms of the lease and we are currently discussing with them the performance measures that will be used outside the lease itself. We will be agreeing the terms for the remaining four associations with protected leases on an individual basis and in these cases too, the measures will be kept outside the lease itself and negotiated individually to reflect the work of each specific organisation.

16. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Simm

Can the Councillor give us figures for room hire, gym membership and uptake of medical services at the Rose Hill Community Centre, what percentage of capacity has been achieved, and what proportion of bookings have come from local residents?

Written response

Attendance is building well, the below is the record of visits.

- Jan (18-31) – 1,333
- Feb – 3,950
- March – 5,994
- Total – 11,277

This does not include tenant's numbers

Gym

- Currently has 368 users that have either taken out a membership or been inducted and using on a casual basis
- The vast majority of these are from Rose Hill - 313 (87%)

Capacity

- The capacity has built steadily and we are now at 33%
- Regarding booking split currently nearly all bookings are at the community rate as they are activities run by community residents/ groups or activities run by the community.

Board Member for Customer Services and Corporate Services

17. From Councillor Fooks to Councillor Brown

The problems with lack of email and telephone connection over the weeks surrounding the changeover of the ICT provider have been considerable for staff, councillors and the public. The total loss of some emails can only be described as extremely worrying. What confidence can the public have that the Council has adequate business continuity plans in place in the event of a systems failure in future?

Written response

After 12 months of planning and a very intensive three months of work by staff in ICT they have successfully moved 57 software applications and more than 20 million files across from the County Council's systems to our new ICT platform Sentinel, managed by SCC. With this level of work, it was never likely that it would be completed without some unexpected outages and problems developing. I apologise to members and to staff for the inconvenience, but would also remind Cllr Fooks that we had two occasions of periods of several days last municipal year when the county was managing the service that we had a total IT outage. The problems we have been experiencing are transitional ones as we move to new servers, and use new hardware and software.

The reason for the change was to ensure consistent and improved levels of ICT availability for all customers in the long term. For example, the two major system outages that we experienced in the last six months with the County ICT platform, should not happen with our new provider, as the new backup arrangements mean systems can be switched to maintain service availability. In addition, these new arrangements have saved the Council £150,000 per annum.

Separately, the loss of telephony that the City Council experienced on 23 March was caused by a fault on the BT line that receives data to our systems in the Town Hall where the City Council's telephony server is also housed. This meant that we:

- Lost access to the general ICT networks in the Town Hall;
- Were not able to receive calls into the Council's contact centre;
- Were not able to make or receive calls via our desk phones on the network.

However, I'm glad to say that the business continuity plan for the Contact Centre meant that we were able to deploy some staff to Horspath depot to our emergency contact centre and arrange for the incoming calls to our switchboard number to be diverted by British Telecom. We arranged messaging on our website whilst also keeping our own staff abreast of the situation using email and the intranet. The fault was corrected and we were fully operational again the same day by 4:30pm. I have asked that for the future we look at how our emergency planning can support better communications to members.

I understand that we are currently waiting for an additional two lines to be installed to both the Town Hall and St Aldates Chambers from Vodafone and Virgin Media which will provide additional resilience should this happen in future, as we will be able to switch data to an alternate line.

As part of the migration of Member email accounts to our new ICT infrastructure, ICT moved email accounts from Exchange 2003 to Exchange 2010. This was co-ordinated with also moving Members from their old Blackberry devices to their new LG phones. This meant that some Members were offline for a period of time. This process was communicated in advance to all members, to try and reduce disruption.

Post migration to our new ICT environment, there have been particular issues with iPads and Citrix that have affected some members. All high priority group email accounts and public folders that members access are now fully operational. ICT have been contacting all members to verify the access that they have via their phones, iPads and laptops to email and mod.gov in particular and are pulling together an action plan to bring full access back to members and sort out any residual problems. I would encourage any councillor who is still experiencing problems to make sure that they are talking to ICT and continuing to report problems.

18. From Councillor Thomas to Councillor Brown

In the last Scrutiny Committee, it was reported that the Council will once again be handing back unspent Discretionary Housing Payment to the Government – at the same time it has spent none of the DHP top-up allocated in the last budget. The same Committee also heard that about one-third of DHP applicants are being refused support. Does the portfolio holder think that this is acceptable?

Written response

Once again the Council has had to plan for a delivery of benefit changes that the government has failed to deliver to the timetable they have suggested. In spite of the fact that we have not seen the number of people affected that we thought we might, we have nearly spent all the DHP this year. This raises concerns about the level of DHP that government are offering as well as their ability to plan. There are no guarantees on the level of DHP offered in future.

In 2013 the Council changed its approach to awarding Discretionary Housing Payments in response to the significant increase in demand caused by the introduction of the Bedroom Tax and Benefit Cap. In line with government policy and advice on the purpose of DHP, and in the light of the frequent reminders that DHP is supposed to be a temporary payment, instead of making awards based solely on an assessment of affordability, awards were made to support the recipient in taking positive steps to improve their financial position.

Alongside the conditionality, the Council invested in more support to those receiving DHPs, assisting them in finding work, alternative accommodation, help with debts and help with a range of other issues including mental health, confidence and self-esteem, skills etc.

The success of the approach is illustrated by the fact that of the 239 households that have been affected by the Benefit Cap to date, only 66 are currently receiving a DHP. We estimate this is due to the support that has been put in to help people gain exemptions from the cap. The exemptions include 76 people having been helped to find work, 35 having been helped to apply for an exempting benefit, and 19 having been helped to find more affordable accommodation.

Those supported in this way have often had several of the following characteristics: they have tended to be single women with four or more children, with few or no qualifications and no work experience. Supporting people to move off DHPs allows a smaller budget to go much further and support more people. The previous approach of granting money without conditions would have quickly exhausted the DHP budget.

People who have their DHP application turned down are still offered support by the City Council. Although not many take this up, some do. People who are initially turned down, often reapply with a more positive approach to changing their situation, and as a result are successful. The unaffordability of the private rented sector means that it is not practical to use DHPs to top-up rents without doing something to improve the customer's situation. This would just create an ongoing and increasing DHP liability for the Council.

19. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Brown

In July 2015, the Council commissioned a report on the City's credit unions which resulted in a series of recommendations for both the credit unions and the City Council. When this report came to light during a recent item on credit unions introduced on the Finance Panel agenda at my request as Chair (following an approach from the Oxfordshire Credit Union), officers could find no formal response from the Council to the report's recommendations. These recommendations seem, on the face of it, to be reasonable and would help the credit unions to address the serious problem of 'loan sharks' or 'pay day loans' – which are estimated to affect around 2,000 households in the City.

Will the portfolio holder agree to fully consider the report, and any subsequent advice from Scrutiny before withdrawing support from the City's credit unions?

Written response

A Credit Union is an organisation where members pool their money in order to be able to loan money to each other and provide some other financial services, as agreed by the Membership. They are intended to be a self-sustaining organisation, without reliance on external funding. The Council has provided significant financial support to both Oxfordshire Credit Union (OCU) and Blackbird Leys Credit Union (BBLCU), including providing funding to support a merger which did not then take place. From 2011/12 to 2015/16, £100,000 has been provided to OCU, and £32,000 to BBLCU.

Following the failure of the merger, a year of dialogue followed between the Council and Credit Unions to understand why the merger failed and to consider a way forward.

This was largely unproductive and so it was agreed to jointly commission an independent report into the future of Credit Unions in Oxford.

The resulting report made a number of recommendations to both Credit Unions and the Council. These were discussed at a meeting including the Credit Unions, officers and me as the portfolio holder for financial inclusion. We made it clear to both credit unions that in order for the Council to actively promote them to our staff, regular dividends needed to be paid to savers and reasonable loan rates needed to be available for borrowers and that we needed to be satisfied about their future viability.

I would welcome an opportunity to discuss the report at the Finance Panel. The Council recognise OCU have acted on all the recommendations made specifically for them. A further £12,500 grant was awarded to them last financial year although this should not be seen as a predictor of future grant.

OCU have requested that the Council promote their organisation to Council staff. However, on the basis that a dividend hasn't been provided to investors for some years, concerns over the competitiveness of the loan rates and the fact that the Council has the facility to provide financial support to staff who are experiencing difficulties with money, we have no current plans to promote OCU to staff.

Board member for Leisure, Sports and Events

20. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Lygo

I know members of the executive board will want to join me in congratulating Oxford United on a magnificent performance in the Johnstone's Paint Trophy, despite the disappointing result at Wembley on April 3.

Will the councillor also join me in noting the part played in Michael Appleton's strategy by local players like Callum O'Dowda (Kidlington) and Josh Ashby (Summertown)?

Will he therefore commit the council to continuing its support for local clubs, and in particular:

- Will he confirm where the £1.3 million cost of the new pavilion at Headington Quarry has fallen;
- will he acknowledge that of the £.75 million cost of the bottom pavilion at Cutteslowe, only £150 K has fallen on the council, the rest being raised through match funding due to the hard work of officers and the considerable efforts of the Summertown Stars football club in achieving the FA's top Charter status;
- Will he acknowledge that Summertown Stars have offered to talk to the council about ways of sharing costs of a new facility at Five Mile Drive;
- Will he commit the council to having these talks now with a view to installing a fit for purpose facility at Five Mile Drive as soon as possible?

Written response

The budget for Quarry includes demolishing the old pavilion, professional fees and contingency and pitch improvements and enhancing the park.

Yes our hard work over the past few years with our partners the Football Foundation and Sport England enabled over £480,000 of external funding to be brought into the

city. The council has also invested in the upper pavilion, two play areas and range of landscaping improvements at Cutteslowe Park and we have brought in investment for a new café and crazy golf.

We have committed to supporting the Summertown Stars to obtain external funding to purchase a small pavilion for Five Mile Drive.

Board member for Housing

21. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Rowley

On 22 March I wrote to the Chief Executive passing on an offer from the well-known eco-architect Bill Dunster OBE to build – at no cost to the Council – 24 demonstration affordable housing units above a Council owned car park of the Council's choosing in exchange for a 25-year air lease. This is being offered to other Council's on a first come – first served basis. Can the portfolio holder tell me whether he will be taking up this offer?

Written response

The Council has responded earlier to Councillor Simmons. Two of the three car parks discussed (Seacourt and Peartree park and ride) are already subject to plans to deck the car parking and so are not available. The third car park (Redbridge) has significant adverse ground conditions, being a former landfill site. Members also expressed significant concerns at the interim nature of the housing units and that these were not suitable for households most in need.

Board member for Planning, Transport and Regulatory Service

22. From Councillor Wolff to Councillor Hollingsworth

Can the portfolio holder provide an update to Council on the proposed expenditure on cycle provision – what schemes and projects are planned and by when?

Written response

A total of £70k capital is available for cycle improvements in 2016/17. The projects planned are:

- New Cowley cycle signage scheme due for completion at the end of May 2016.
- Delivery of cycle parking on privately owned land to be delivered by April 2017
- Removal of abandoned bikes across the City throughout the year.
- Dependant on the outcome of a funding application made by the Canal and Rivers Trust; upgrade of Frenchay Road canal towpath in partnership with the Canal and River Trust and Oxfordshire County Council, to be delivered by April 2017.

23. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Hollingsworth

In the light of his earlier promise to keep councillors fully involved and informed about the ongoing review of the local plan, could the councillor give us an update on progress and timescales?

Written response

The Local Development Scheme, adopted at CEB in January, sets out the work programme for production of the Local Plan 2036. Work on the Local Plan is progressing as anticipated. At present, work is taking place on collecting information to inform the first stage of consultation. The first stage of consultation will be designed to check our vision and that we have identified the right issues and some possible ways to approach them. The first stage of consultation will take place for 6 weeks beginning on the 13th June. All members will be informed at the beginning of the consultation, and help spreading the word will be very welcome. A cross-party meeting has been set up with group leaders on 18 April. This initial meeting will discuss the proposed local plan timetable, member governance and engagement, key stages and issues in delivering a new local plan. Each party was asked to nominate a representative for on-going engagement with the local plan process. Through feedback from this group, members will be kept aware of progress on the Local Plan.

Consultation will be wide-ranging and we will try to reach people at existing events, as well as running workshops and providing simpler ways to contribute. We will aim to publish a summary of the consultation within 2 months of the end of the consultation, although this will be dependent on the amount of responses received.

24. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Hollingsworth

Will the emerging local plan contain a policy on basements in residential properties?

Written response

A Technical Advice Note, which pulls together the relevant issues and matters that will be taken into account when decisions are being made on any application that includes basement development will be published very soon. This is likely to provide all the advice needed for development of basements.

Preferred policy options for the Local Plan will be consulted on in June/July next year. This current early stage of developing the Local Plan is about identifying key issues and setting a vision. If basements are considered to be a key issue needing policy guidance then policies for that can be developed later.

25. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Hollingsworth

Will the councillor repeat his assurances to trustees and users of the North Oxford Association Community centre that, if the current building is to be replaced, the Association will be provided with a suitable, fully accessible replacement facility both during any building works and afterwards, and that trustees and users will be fully involved in discussions about this?

Written response

Yes. I reiterate what is laid out in the Supplementary Planning Document for Diamond Place, adopted as part of the Local Plan by this Council only last year. "New leisure

and community facilities should be multi-functional, with small and large rooms capable of accommodating a large range of uses. Facilities should appeal to all groups in the community and they should be accessible to all. The existing community centre is popular and well used. New community facilities must be available for the existing community association to run. They should be at least equivalent to the size of the existing community centre. There should be a main hall able to accommodate a range of uses and which is suitable for hiring out for functions. It is vital that the existing community association is supported and maintained during construction and that alternative facilities are available in the area.”

While there are no immediate plans for any landowners in the area covered by the Diamond Place SPD to bring forward a planning application, if and when such plans are brought forward it will be a requirement on all involved – including the City Council as landowner – to ensure that the policy and spirit of the clearly stated and unambiguous objectives of the SPD with regard to both the community centre and the North Oxford Association are met. That means the full involvement of the NOA from the earliest possible stage in discussions about both temporary and permanent facilities and their management and operation.

Board member for Young People, Schools and Skills

26. From Councillor Fooks to Councillor Kennedy

The recent financial report to the Executive Board stated that the considerable sum of £195k from the Education attainment budget for 2015/16 had not been spent. Could you explain to Council how this situation has arisen and why you did not think of inviting schools, particularly those with a number of disadvantaged children, to suggest how the funds could be used to raise the attainment of these children?

Written response

The £195K was allocated for the City Council Education Programme and was carried over from an underspend in 2014-15. The intention was to ensure that we coordinated future work on educational attainment with the County Council and to do this we commissioned an independent review of how best to take this work forward. Unfortunately this work has been delayed due to a significant number of changes taking place in the delivery of education services and changes at the County Council. The study is due to go to Scrutiny Committee in June 2016.

There is also £43K allocated to education attainment in the base budget. The City Council has worked closely with schools to identify how best they can be supported and the City Council has used this base budget to:

- Participate in the Oxfordshire Strategic Schools Partnership to coordinate school support and promote educational attainment.
- Provide support through Business in the Community to provide support to schools and to develop links between schools and local businesses.
- Provide support to the University of Oxford, Internet Institute and the Home internet Access Scheme.
- Provide support to Premium School Pupils in Secondary Schools to enable access educational and cultural visits and events.

27. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Turner

Will recent changes to employers National Insurance (introduced as part of the pensions reforms) impact on the Council wages bill? If so, how is this being managed?

Written response

The introduction of the Single Tier State Pension from April 2016 is accompanied by the ending of contracting out from defined benefit pension schemes.

As a result:

- affected employees will lose their 1.4 per cent rebate and pay NI contributions of 12 per cent from April 2016 instead of the current 10.6 per cent
- affected employers will lose their 3.4 per cent rebate and pay NI contributions of 13.8 per cent from April 2016 instead of the current 10.4 per cent

It is expected that the cost to the council will be in the region of £600k per annum which the Council has provided for within its Medium Term Financial Plan.

28. From Councillor Thomas to Councillor Turner

Can the portfolio holder confirm whether the Council are planning to sell off Lucy Faithful House – until recently a homeless hostel?

Written response

This property is owned by the City Council but subject to a long lease to Riverside Housing Association as a hostel, and therefore the Council is not in a position to take any decisions about the future of this building at the moment. If Riverside decide to surrender their lease then Lucy Faithful House will form part of an options assessment to be presented to councillors, which will require the evaluation of the need for different forms of hostel accommodation and different funding streams to provide this.

29. From Councillor Wade to Councillor Turner

The Civic War Memorial in St Giles commemorates the fallen of the First and Second World Wars. Some of the lettering on the Memorial is so worn as to be almost illegible. On 1 July 2016, we will be commemorating the centenary of the Somme offensive, in which our Ox and Bucks Light Infantry fought gallantly and suffered terrible losses. Can you ensure that this lettering will be recut before 1 July?

Written response

I thank Cllr Wade for drawing this to my attention. I have asked that the extent of the restoration works be identified and for us to do all that we practically can to carry out the works within the timescale. The Council's Direct Services carried out a major cleaning and restoration works to the war memorial steps and adjacent paths prior to the WW1 centenary Remembrance Day parade

30. From Councillor Thomas to Councillor Price

Is the portfolio holder aware that at least one landlord registered under the City Council's Landlord Accreditation Scheme (Chancellors) is offering a 'tenant monitoring service' that offers landlords 'up-to-date [information on a] tenant's financial situation' with the aim of putting landlords in a 'better position to decide whether [to go ahead with a] tenancy renewal' and 'pre-empt payment problems'? Does the portfolio holder think, like me, that this is unacceptable?

Written response

Landlords and letting agents can only run financial background checks on tenants with their permission, so provided that the information provided is reliable and accurate, this seems to be a reasonable precaution.

31. From Councillor Fooks to Councillor Price

There are an increasing number of ex-Council houses being turned into HMOs. While of course these houses will be providing some accommodation, the big need in Council estates is for family housing to support the local community.

Are you aware that there is a covenant on any houses being sold under the Right to Buy legislation that stipulates that they should only be used for one-family occupation? Would you agree that this was a good idea and that it should be enforced to counter the current trend of the conversion of such houses to HMO use?

Written response

The Council does not at present impose such a restriction/covenant on any houses sold under the Right to Buy legislation. There is a restriction/stipulation in all transfers of ex-Council houses in the following terms: 'no trade or business shall be carried on upon the property or any part of the property nor shall it be used except as a private dwellinghouse'.

Paragraph 5 of Schedule 6 to the Housing Act 1985 (which contains the Right to Buy legislation) provides that the conveyance/transfer "may include such [covenants] and conditions as are reasonable in the circumstances". Given that such a restriction as proposed could potentially depreciate the value and adversely affect the future marketability of any property sold under the Right to Buy it is probably unreasonable for the Council to impose a stipulation that the property should only be used for one-family occupation, as desirable as this may be.

If a purchaser challenged the imposition of such a covenant under powers contained in section 84(1) of the Law of Property Act 1925 it is likely that a Lands Tribunal would find that the covenant impeded the reasonable use of the land and did not entitle the local authority (as the legal person entitled to the benefit of the covenant) to any practical benefit of substantial value and would order that the covenant be discharged.

Furthermore, even if the Council decided it would seek to impose this obligation, it would only apply to future disposals and could not be imposed retrospectively; i.e. it would not apply to the thousands of ex-council houses already sold under the Right to Buy legislation.

32. From Councillor Thomas to Councillor Price

At a recent meeting (Feb 2016), Full Council agreed to an amended version of a Green Party motion on rent control ('Tackling Oxford's Unaffordable Private Rented Sector'). The amendment had the effect of delaying any action on the motion including wording to the effect that it would consider the ideas proposed in the motion 'in the longer term'. Can the portfolio holder set out his timetable for action?

Written response

Not at the moment.

33. From Councillor Benjamin to Councillor Price

The list of confirmed occupiers of the new Westgate shopping centre once it is completed, as reported in the local press, includes 6 large clothing stores currently located in other parts of the City Centre. Is the Board Member worried that the relocation of these shops to the Westgate could well blight other parts of the City Centre?

Written response

The new Westgate development can be expected to lead to a period of change in the city centre. Since every retail survey that has been undertaken since the early 1990's has shown that Oxford has been substantially underprovisioned, it seems probable that new retailers and other occupiers (cafes, restaurants in particular) will move into the units that are vacated. In the 40 years that I have lived in the city, the character of all the main shopping streets (Cornmarket, Queen St, George St, High St etc) has been constantly changing and I expect them to continue to do so.

34. From Councillor Benjamin to Councillor Price

Given what we currently know about the large chain clothing stores that are relocating to the Westgate once it is completed, the plans for 100 stores as described on the Westgate Oxford website, and the number of chain stores in other parts of the city centre currently limited on what stock they can sell due to lack of retail space, is the Executive Member concerned that the completion of the Westgate could lead to further empty buildings in other parts of the city centre?

Written response

No; it is in the interest of the rentier class to find new occupants.

35. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Price

The current devolution proposals provide a once-in-a-generation opportunity to improve the accountability and representativeness of local government. The Government has expressed a preference for an elected mayor – which this Council has, in the Green Group's view, rightly resisted. Will the Leader consider supporting or promoting any other ideas for local electoral reform such as PR as used in local elections in Scotland?

Written response

At present, there are no proposals for changes in local electoral arrangements other than for elected mayors. It is unlikely that Government will be willing to entertain piecemeal voting reform in the context of individual devolution deals. However, if any such proposals do come forward, the City Council would, I feel sure want to consider them seriously.

36. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Price

In their plans for devolved local government, the current leaders of Oxfordshire's district councils have described a strategic authority including the leaders of the new Unitaries to oversee matters of common interest. Presumably this includes housing. Oxford City Council is currently spending up to £400K on legal and other costs challenging South Oxfordshire's approach to housing need. Should the people of Oxford be encouraged by this example of cooperation so far?

Written response

The Coalition Government of 2010- 15 ,which was propped up enthusiastically by the Liberal Democrat Party, introduced the National Planning Policy Framework. This designates each District Council as sovereign in its area on planning policy, subject to its Local Plan being approved, and to the fulfilment of the Duty to Cooperate. The City Council is working collaboratively with all of the Oxfordshire Districts through the Oxfordshire Growth Board to resolve housing issues and deliver the housing numbers identified in the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment. This includes working together to review the spatial allocation for housing to meet Oxford's unmet need. SODC is currently developing its new Local Plan and the City Council is seeking to make the case for an urban extension south of Grenoble Rd to feature in that Plan. This requires detailed planning support in order to make the case for the housing, and for the use of part of the Oxford Green Belt to meet the city's pressing housing needs. Relations with SODC are cordial and the people of Oxford should certainly be encouraged by the close collaboration that is taking place between all the District Councils in progressing the proposal for a four unitary devolution agreement with the government.

37. From Councillor Gant to Councillor Price

The leader of the Council has said that the proposed new Strategic Authority will be democratically accountable because the elected leaders of the proposed Unitary authorities will be members. However, it will also include unelected representatives. It will not be answerable to a single elected chamber or subject to a single scrutiny function, and the leaders of the unitaries will, as now, be elected by five different electorates on different, local, and presumably potentially opposing prospectuses, rather than by a single "demos" with the power to dismiss the authority if it wishes to do so. How is this democratic?

Written response

The proposed combined authority's voting members will all be elected councillors, whose actions can be scrutinised by their own Councils as well as by any combined scrutiny arrangement that is put in place. They can be recalled/ replaced by their own Council processes, and are subject (of course) to regular elections.

This page is intentionally left blank

To: Council

Date: 18 April 2016

Title of Report: Public addresses and questions that do not relate to matters for decision – as submitted by the speakers and with written responses

Introduction

1. Addresses made by members of the public to the Council, and questions put to the Board members or Leader, registered by the deadline in the Constitution, are below. Any written responses available are also below.
2. This report will be republished after the Council meeting as part of the minutes pack. This will list the full text of speeches delivered as submitted, summaries of speeches delivered which differ significantly from those submitted, and any further responses.

Addresses and questions to be taken in Part 2 of the agenda.

Addresses in part 2

1. Address by Nigel Gibson, Save Temple Cowley Pools (attached separately)
2. Address by Dr. Stefan Piechnik - Economic rationale of Tower Block Refurbishments.
3. Address by Artwell - Barton refurbishment

Questions in part 2

4. Question from Nigel Gibson – demolition of Temple Cowley Pools
5. Question from Cassi Perry – PSPO protection from complaints – and response
6. Question from Sam Dent – PSPO - Draft Guidance to local housing authorities on the periodic review of housing needs – and response
7. Question from Alex Wood - PSPO definitions – and response
8. Question from Jon Ody – PSPO supporting evidence – and response
9. Question from Jo Hamilton - PSPO alternative options – and response
10. Question from Helen Marshall, Need not Greed – OxLEP’s Strategic Economic Plan – and response
11. Question from Penny Schenk – PSPO – and response
12. Question from Ruth Anderson - British Waterways Act 1995 and legislation – and response

Addresses in part 2

1. Address by Nigel Gibson, Save Temple Cowley Pools

My name is Nigel Gibson, and I have been observing the way Oxford City Council operates since 2009, when I became involved in the Campaign to Save Temple Cowley Pools, the health and fitness centre that you eventually closed in 2014. Since then you have failed to track what the previous users have been doing to maintain their health and fitness – claiming instead that most have transferred to the Blackbird Leys pool when the reality was that you moved the database of users to the Blackbird Leys system. And this claim is a prime example of the topic of this address – what passes for openness and transparency in Oxford City Council, or in my experience the lack of openness and transparency.

We forecast what the closure of Temple Cowley Pools would mean for the thousands of users – exercising less frequently or not at all, increased costs and time to go to another facility, a loss of fitness and health compromised; as well as an increase in crime rate in the area. All of these predictions have come true, and you have failed in your promise to monitor these people, instead preferring a ‘good news’ approach and ignoring the consequences that your actions have had on real people.

And the legacy of this Labour administration, as we come up to another set of elections, is simply that you have actively and knowingly removed health and fitness facilities from 40,000 people, a quarter of Oxford’s population.

And there has been a lack of transparency and openness over the whole Temple Cowley Pools affair since 2009; some would say it has been cloaked in secrecy. Some examples include:

Consultations – yes, you did ‘consult’, but not in any meaningful way. The public engage in consultations believing they can make a difference – you have refused a Freedom of Information request to identify when any consultation on any topic over the last three years has made a real difference to your plans. And it’s not surprising that you refuse – public consultation is something you have to do, not something you enter into willingly.

Outsourcing Leisure Services to Fusion – you’ve engaged in a buddy relationship with Fusion that conveniently avoids tax through its charitable status, keeps the very same people employed that delivered your failed service in the first place. And now, under yet more secrecy, and zero scrutiny, you nod through their requests to increase admission prices for the public. No oversight, no accountability. I spent over a year attempting to have the contract released to public scrutiny, but you refused the FOI request.

And the demolition of Temple Cowley Pools - as the intent to demolish the site became clear, you have consistently and forcibly maintained that it has nothing to do with you. Yet more lack of transparency – the veil has been pulled back, but only using Freedom of Information. And there we see that it was indeed Oxford City Council, not Catalyst, that decided that demolition should happen before any planning application for redevelopment was approved.

Now the Freedom of Information process is something that you have spoken about in the media, where you very openly supported a reduction in power of the FOI Act; not surprising when you consider how much you do not reveal openly and transparently, forcing the public

to do the only thing they can to get information, which is to try and use FOI. If you were more open, transparent, and even accountable, then we the public would not need to use the FOI process and you could put your resources to better use.

My personal experience of your FOI process is that you take as long as possible to respond, delaying unreasonably beyond the required 20 day response time. Clearly from the result of recent FOI requests I can see why – in one example officers discussed the impact of releasing information as the public may take it to the media, and this would not fit your ‘only good news at any cost’ agenda. The answer is simple – don’t do the wrong thing in the first place. Act openly, act transparently – take responsibility and be accountable.

Put as simply as I can:

You are here as a district council, with one sole objective – to provide services to the public, that we want and need, where we want and need them.

You have failed in this time and time again over the last 7 years; and you have shown no sign of changing this attitude. Consultation? Mere lip service to your policy – decide what you want to do, show the public what’s going to happen, and employ ‘experts’ who will give you the answer you want to justify to yourselves that it is the right thing to do.

Temple Cowley Pools; Barns Road Community Centre; Barton ‘Park’ link road through Northway; East Oxford Community Centre; Northern Gateway; the threat to the unique ecology of the Lye Valley Site of Special Scientific Interest – even Rose Hill Community Centre, and now Barton Community Centre. They’ve all followed a similar process – let the public have their say, making as little information about your real intent available to them as possible, then ignore them.

When you stand in front of the Oxford public on their doorstep in the coming weeks, remember the lack of transparency and openness you have shown over all these issues and many more – even the housing register, where you conveniently inflated the figures to justify your strategy. Remember all the people that you are ignoring, safe in the knowledge that so few people vote nowadays that it doesn’t actually matter any more. Democracy, like openness and transparency, is truly dead in Oxford, and will remain so while Oxford City Council continues to ignore the real needs of the public.

2. Address by Dr. Stefan Piechnik - Economic rationale of Tower Block Refurbishments.

I am Dr. Stefan Piechnik, a Leaseholder in Plowman Tower where I have moved in 4 years ago, in the clear knowledge of pending major works quoted then as £9,500 per flat until 2020.

Since then, Oxford City has increased the budget to £20M and widely advertised improvements and regeneration aspects under slogans such as “Building a world-class city for everyone”. Given that neither improvements or building Cities are chargeable leaseholder obligations there was little reason to question any of the measures.

However, recently Oxford City Council handed £50,000 invoices to Leaseholders, five-fold increase over prior expectations and typical caps for such works. It also appears that until £20 million contract was signed, council officers made all effort to avoid any cost scrutiny from the prudent home-owner leaseholders. Only at this stage it is possible to reveal several worrying economic aspects:

Relative Value: £60,000 makes for over a half of the typical market value of affected properties (in my case 65% of the actual purchase price). This is really a lot to spend on one’s home, unless a complete ruin.

Increase in property valuation: Unofficial estimates obtained by leaseholders indicate that maybe £10,000 may be gained. This is 80% loss on investment from the day one.

Investment returns: Improvements to energy efficiency of windows and external cladding total an estimated £30,000 per flat. The official EPC- energy performance certificate I have for my flat indicates that such measures are expected to generate annual savings in order of only £100. This yields the time to return to profit on the proposed energy saving measures to be 300 years –THREE full centuries to see first penny of profit.

Rationale: All windows are to be replaced at the cost of approximately £18,000 per flat. For certain I have no single problem with my windows. In Plowman Tower I see not a single window frame or glass pane broken anywhere. Few tilt-and-turn windows in the staircase do not close properly, which is a problem I had with my kitchen window. All needed was a replacement gear mechanism costing £20. Instead of few minor repairs, the windows will cost on average £3,000 - each and every one to replace whole. Over 100-fold waste of money and natural resources too, as new aluminium and glass has to be melted, and working-condition plastic and glass disposed as waste.

These just few observations from the leaseholders on the major works. Council officers failed to provide any evidence on the economy of the project.

I urge the Council to request their staff to account fully for the rationale and economy of the proposed measures and answer all detailed observations by Oxford Towerblock Leaseholder Association dated February 7th, and subsequent complaint letter dated March 14th this year.

3. Address by Artwell - Barton refurbishment

It has been publicly announced that 4 million pounds will be spent in Barton on the Neighbourhood Centre and the Underhill Shops, at a time when Barton is in great need of accessible Public Space where the residents of Barton can celebrate the milestones of life like, Weddings, Birthdays and Funerals.

Barton has over 800 people under the age of eighteen, with no Public Space available for them to Dance and hold celebrations. At the Barton Community Association's AGM in 2015, in response to my question, I was informed that the last party held at Barton's Neighbourhood Centre was held two years previously. Clearly the Barton's Neighbourhood Centre does not welcome Party Celebrations from Barton's teenagers.

Barton's Royal British Legion has been closed for over two years now, and St. Mary's Community Hall has also closed, whilst the Church tries to gather the money needed to modernise the Community Hall. Barton Sports Pavilion will shortly close for eighteen months to allow site access for the new Barton Park construction vehicles.

I have used our democratic process of government and written to the two Labour Councillors for Barton, our Labour MP, and the Labour Leader and CEO of Oxford City Council, expressing the concerns of many people on Barton, at the acute lack of Public Space especially for the Youth of Barton to hire. Very sadly, I have not received a reply of any kind.

Barton is the home of two very successful Dance Troupes, which attract boy, and girls of all ages and colours. Messy Jam continues to be very popular for the Youth of Oxford, and Messy Jam continues to win national awards. Messy Jam started on Barton, and the founder would love to be able to base Massy Jam on Barton. If St., Mary's Church and Community Hall could also benefit from this 4 million pound grant, then St., Mary's could be in a position to offer a home or a space for Barton's Messy Jam Dance Troupe.

St., Mary's Community Hall has been available for the people of Barton for over forty years and with a much-needed refurbishment St., Mary's Community Hall could once again be a Public Space for the people of Barton.

Elected Councillors, the people of Barton need Community Space where the Youth and people of Barton can Dance, Sing and Celebrate life's achievements. I am requesting that some of this 4 million pound be spent on refurbishing St. Mary's Community Hall, for the benefit of the people of Barton, who currently have nowhere on Barton to Dance and Celebrate.

Questions in part 2

4. Question from Nigel Gibson – demolition of Temple Cowley Pools

Question to the Leader of Oxford City Council, Cllr Bob Price

In autumn last year, Catalyst Housing announced their intention to demolish the Temple Cowley Pools building. Supporters of the Campaign to Save Temple Cowley Pools asked Oxford City Council to intervene and ensure that demolition did not take place until after Catalyst had submitted and had approved planning permission for their development of the site. This was because it makes no sense to demolish this structurally sound building when a community group is ready, willing and able to take ownership and operate it as a going concern at no cost to the Council if planning permission was not granted for its replacement.

The Council made it clear in responding to these concerned citizens that any demolition would be Catalyst's decision alone, and had nothing to do with the Council itself. This message was relayed to Andrew Smith, our local MP, who passed on the same message to the public. This position has been maintained by the Council numerous times.

However, in an email from a Council officer to Catalyst, dated 3rd July 2015, timed at 7:49 am, it says, "The Council have decided that they want to demolish the Pool..." – this information only became public in a response to a Freedom of Information request.

Why have you and Oxford City Council in your emails responding to concerns over demolition misinformed both the public and our local MP, and what are you going to do, in the interests of open and transparent government, to correct this position?

Councillor Price will give a verbal response at the meeting.

5. Question from Cassi Perry – PSPO protection from complaints – and response

My name is Cassi Perry. I am residential boater who has been based in and around Oxford for the last two years, and a resident in the city for more than a decade. I am here as part of the official PSPnO campaign. I am a keyworker and, Child and Adolescent Psychotherapist, working with young survivors of sexual abuse and sexual exploitation here in Oxford. I am also currently a part time Masters Student at Oxford University.

I am here because I am very concerned about the potential impact of the proposed Waterways PSPO.

Over the last few years, life as a residential boater has become increasingly difficult in Oxford.

Constant reductions in services have made life physically demanding, particularly in the winter months.

Increasingly discriminatory language being used in the press by local elected councillors has fuelled harassment on the towpath. During a recent 5 day stay within the city, I was verbally abused by 3 separate local residents, each one of them mentioning the proposed PSPO as justification for their aggression. I was dismayed to see these repeat complainers made up the bulk of the evidence (and I use the term evidence lightly here), that was used to justify the suggestion of a PSPO in the first place.

For me the PSPO was the proverbial straw that broke the camel's back, and has driven me out of Oxford, a city I deeply love and where my friends and support are. Seeing local councillors proposing to legitimize the harassment we receive into law was horrifying, and for me as a single woman living alone, deeply frightening.

I have decided not to renew my mooring here, and have purchased a mooring in Banbury. This is depriving Oxford of yet another needed keyworker.

My Question for the council is this.

In considering a Waterways PSPO, how do Oxford City Council intend to protect boaters from individual homeowners making multiple malicious complaints, when it's clear they are giving these homeowners a stronger voice in this debate?

Written Response from Councillor Sinclair

The council are seeking the views of all members of the public interested in the Waterways. All comments will be given equal regard. Responses found to be malicious are unwelcome and will be disregarded.

6. Question from Sam Dent – PSPO - Draft Guidance to local housing authorities on the periodic review of housing needs – and response

My name is Sam Dent; I am a lifelong boater and an Associate of the Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales. I have been living on boats since 1990 across the waterways of the country, both with and without permanent moorings. Currently I am fortunate enough to have one of the very few residential moorings in Oxford, in Hinksey Park Ward.

What I have found almost unique to Oxford since I moved here in 2012 is the extreme tension between boaters and other communities in the city. Given the inflammatory and prejudicial language used about boaters by both elected council members and council staff, some of which has been referred to during Councillors' questions, this is unsurprising but deeply saddening. I have suffered, and seen my friends and neighbours suffer, direct and indirect discrimination. One of the multiple contributors to the so-called evidence backing up this proposal recently referred to boaters in my hearing as living on the fringes of society. Another individual named in the scrutiny committee documentation has boasted of making more than 60 complaints about boaters in a single season.

I am part of the PSPnO campaign as I believe both that PSPOs are poor legislation and specifically that this proposed PSPO breaches Oxford City Council's Statutory Duty of Care, the Equalities Act of 2010 and articles 8 and 14 of the European Convention of Human Rights. Given my privileged mooring position the proposed PSPO is less likely to impact on me than many of my friends, however I live on a boat because I enjoy boating, so I do regularly moor and run my stove as required within the boundaries of the proposed PSPO.

I feel that the proposed PSPO is believed by some sections of the Council to be required due to a fundamental misunderstanding of both the needs and the makeup of the boating community. Councils and their elected officials have a duty to protect the interest of all groups within the community – whether they be settled, unsettled, or travellers. In passing a PSPO, Oxford City Council would be acting in direct opposition to a minority group's interests and well-being.

In this context, I would like to ask if the Council is aware that the Department of Communities and Local Government ruled in April 2009 that "bargee travellers" are covered by the Housing Act 2004, s 225, if the council has received a copy of the March 2016 Draft Guidance to local housing authorities on the periodic review of housing needs from that department which makes specific reference to those with a preference to house boat dwelling, and what is the Council doing to assess, look after and protect the interest of us as a minority group?

Written Response from Councillor Sinclair

The Council is aware of its statutory housing duties and supports a number of people currently living on boats. A PSPO is used to prevent persistent and detrimental activities in a specified area, without a reasonable excuse.

7. Question from Alex Wood - PSPO definitions – and response

The 'Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act (2014)' gives councils the statutory power to make a PSPO if the activities being banned are persistent and will have a detrimental effect on quality of life. Moreover, according to the 'Crime and Disorder Act (1998)' anti-social behaviour is defined as acts causing 'harassment, alarm or distress.' Having read the PSPO waterways supporting evidence document, I was left wondering on what grounds Cllr Dee Sinclair was able to conclude that many of the activities documented genuinely constitute 'harassment, alarm or distress.' In particular, I am referring to activities such as mooring without consent and smoke and noise from engines, generators or stoves. I also wonder how Cllr Dee Sinclair was able to conclude that these activities are having a significant and persistent detrimental effect on quality of life. I would, therefore, like to ask Cllr Dee Sinclair to clarify under what circumstances mooring without consent or heating one's home with a stove causes harassment, alarm or distress and has a persistent substantive detrimental effect on the quality of life of others?

Written Response from Councillor Sinclair

The purpose of the consultation is to seek views on activities in the draft PSPO. No conclusions have been made; they are dependent upon the outcome of the consultation.

8. Question from Jon Ody – PSPO supporting evidence – and response

My name is Jon Ody. I am a marine engineer working on boats in Oxford, founding partner of Green Boat Services. Since 2009 I have worked on a self-employed basis repairing boats on and around the waterways of Oxford, as well as the wider UK canal network and the River Thames. As part of my work on the waterways I participated in the 2012 Thames Jubilee Pageant where over 1,000 boats paraded through London in front of the Queen.

I was born in Oxford, I attended school here, and I have called Oxford my home for over 35 years. I trained as a marine engineer in the Royal Navy, specialising as a Submarine Nuclear Reactor Panel Operator. I am also a graduate of Plymouth University where I studied and further specialised in underwater robotics and automated systems. I've spent time serving on ships in the North Sea, Irish Sea, English Channel, Bay of Biscay and the Mediterranean, as well as crossing each of the Atlantic, Pacific and Southern Oceans by ship.

I am incredibly fond of the boating lifestyle, through my work on the waterways I meet many people who live on boats, as well as other waterways and towpath users, who on the whole are supportive of my role in the community. I now live on a narrowboat on a residential mooring the Oxford Canal at Wolvercote. I am appalled by the proposed PSPO being suggested by Oxford City Council, and I have campaigned against its development since I first learned of its existence as late as February this year, helping to form the PSPnO campaign group. I spoke at the Scrutiny Committee, and I asked questions of the City Executive Board, although I did not receive a satisfactory response.

I would like to further press my concerns regarding the supporting evidence document, since I have recently been subjected to alienation and verbal abuse from members of the waterways community, my neighbours, which I believe is due to inclusion of so-called evidence which I have not been asked for my permission to use, which clearly identifies myself as the contributor. One example of this is a tweet from 2012 by Green Boat Services, which contains a photograph taken by me, with a link to a response from the City Council explaining that the issue should be dealt with by the Environment Agency and the Canal and River Trust.

There are at least two other photographs taken by myself in the PSPO Supporting Evidence document, and due to the recent lack of cooperation from councillors and council officers I have had to resort to submitting a Data Protection Request to establish what data the council holds from my social media accounts which are being claimed as evidence for the PSPO. I firmly believe that the supporting evidence does not demonstrate by any clear means any behaviour which is conclusively detrimental, unreasonable, and persistent, which I note are the tests required to be satisfied by the council by the 2014 Crime and Policing Act.

And so onto my question:

Will councillors work with me to establish by what methods the PSPO supporting evidence document has been produced, from what sources the alleged evidence has been gathered, and by what means the council believes that it has permission to reuse data that it has collated; and will the council remove from this document all the evidence that is not relevant or that they do not have permission to use?

Written Response from Councillor Sinclair

The Council is sorry to hear that you have been subject to verbal abuse from members of the waterways community. The information attached to the CEB report of the 17th

March Council was received from members of the public, partner agencies, or it was gathered from publicly accessible web sources. This information was de-personalised but anything that can be directly attributable to you as the source of the information will be removed from future documentation.

Question from Jo Hamilton - PSPO alternative options – and response

My name is Jo Hamilton, and I have lived on a boat in and around Oxford (on the River Thames and the Oxford Canal) for over seven years. In that time I have worked with a variety of community groups to improve the quality of their environment, and to minimise their carbon footprint. I am deeply concerned about the implications of the proposed Oxford Waterways Public Spaces Protection Order as it narrows down the options for collaborative solutions which could utilise the experience and expertise of many waterways residents, which could provide genuinely workable solutions to some of the problems expressed.

Prior to the scrutiny committee hearing on the 8th March 2016, two Oxford Mail articles (on 29th February and 1st March 2016) described using byelaws to prevent illegal mooring as “unworkable”, and that “The new PSPO has been drawn up with support from the Environment Agency (EA) and the Canal & Rivers Trust (CRT)”, yet we have seen no evidence of input from the EA or CRT.

We note that the council must consult with any representatives of the local community that they feel appropriate prior to introducing a PSPO, and that the council claims to have already done so during the 18 months that it has taken to develop the draft PSPO. As waterways residents, and some of the most interested of parties, we have seen no evidence of this, as we have never heard of the Waterways PSPO until the Oxford Mail articles appeared in March. We also note that the council must consult with the chief of police and the crime commissioner prior to introducing a PSPO, yet we have seen no evidence that this has occurred either. Additionally, we note that some Police Supervising Officers, who has worked closely with boaters in recent months, has not been included in the development of the Waterways PSPO.

We note that the council has indicated in some instances in response to questions submitted to the City Executive Board that “equal weight will be applied to all responses” and in other cases it states that in some cases “responses will be given no weight”, this seems contradictory. We believe that existing residents of the oxford waterways should be given priority weighting over, for example, a dog-walker who visits once a week, or a person who responds from America or Australia. We would like to draw to the council’s attention the 2008 HM Government Code of Practice on Consultation.

We note that no other Local Authority in the entire UK has used a PSPO for enforcement on the waterways, Oxford is conspicuous in being the only authority pursuing this, which is surprising given its strong record in Council- community collaboration in other areas. There are many examples of how multiple interest groups have worked together to produce positive solutions to issues around waterways issues, for example: the Mooring Strategy Steering Group that was established on the Western Kennet and Avon Canal; the Blue Ribbon Network that advises the Greater London Authority on waterways issues; working with CRT/EA to improve the condition of existing temporary visitor moorings in order to relieve pressure at popular sites.

From first-hand experience of supporting and helping to develop low carbon community groups across Oxford, I know the power of collaborative community action, working in partnership with other bodies such as the City and County Council. Such collaborations open up rather than close down the range of possible solutions and constructive dialogue.

Instead of bringing in a PSPO, this is an opportunity for creative thinking that capitalises on the rich expertise and experience of waterways users and residents, both those living on the Waterways and those in houses. The council could for example, establish a sub-committee or working group along the lines of its already established area forums, with full participation of all waterways users and residents.

My question is: does the City Council agree that the proposed consultation regarding the waterways PSPO should be expanded to include a range of alternative options for the waterways of Oxford, rather than just a yes or no outcome regarding only the PSPO?

Written Response from Councillor Sinclair

The consultation process is certain to raise many views, opinions and proposed solutions to some of the broader issues on the waterways. The Council welcomes the opportunity to work with interested parties in trying to resolve these issues.

9. Question from Helen Marshall, Need not Greed – OxLEP’s Strategic Economic Plan – and response

Question to the Leader of the Council

As the Council’s representative on the Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership (OxLEP), can the Council leader confirm:

-Whether he is happy that the City’s future economic strategy is being decided by an unaccountable and unelected limited company?

-What steps he has taken to ensure that the public will be consulted on the overall growth figures in OxLEP’s forthcoming ‘refresh’ of its Strategic Economic Plan?

-That all councillors will have an opportunity to debate the appropriateness of this Plan at a full Council meeting?’

Written Response from Councillor Price

1. LEP Accountability

The LEP Board includes all the elected Leaders from the Oxfordshire local authorities who are individually accountable to their own Councils. There is therefore democratic accountability and an electoral mandate.

2. Growth Figures

CPRE has misunderstood the basis for the SEP refresh. The overall growth figures have already been set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, an independent expert assessment jointly commissioned by the Oxfordshire Local Authorities and approved by them for planning and economic development policy. The Local Authorities confirmed their approval of the growth figures in the Oxford and Oxfordshire City Deal, and again most recently in the recent Devolution bid.

The SHMA figures have been accepted in a series of Local Plan public examinations by Planning Inspectors, where the CPRE has lost the argument on every occasion. It is the Local Plans which provide the statutory basis for planning-not the SEP.

The LEP has asked independent consultants to review the economic forecasts as part of the SEP refresh. It is already apparent that the current economic growth in the county is exceeding the earlier forecasts, which is not surprising as it is known that the SHMA assessment for housing need is conservative.

3. SEP Approval

The original SEP was debated by full Council and there is also an annual report to Council on the programme of the LEP. The revised SEP will come to full Council, as before.

10. Question from Penny Schenk – PSPO – and response

My name is Penny Schenk. My partner and I have lived in Oxford since 2002, and on a narrowboat since 2011. Despite sounding American, I am a UK citizen, and have worked at the University's Bodleian Law Library since 2005.

The fact that we were fortunate enough to secure a residential mooring on private property in Oxford, and would not be immediately affected by the proposed PSPO at home (and we know that the intent is to pass the PSPO, let's not be coy about all the options being open) has done nothing to allay my extreme disquiet at the possibility of so-called Waterways PSPO's going into effect here and in other cities across the UK.

The track record of PSPO's in their short and chequered history is not good. Because (and I wonder why?) the Home Office does not collect data on PSPO's, it is only through the efforts of the Manifesto Club and their FOI requests that we can get the full picture, and it is not pretty.

PSPO's put the power to *criminalise* behaviours in the hands of a single council officer. I think you would be hard pressed to find one constituent who thinks that the ability to make an activity a crime, without any statutory necessity for public consultation, is something they want a single council officer to have. And this is not a hypothetical: the Manifesto Club report found that HALF of councils passed a PSPO through a single council officer. To quote the report: "Never has the creation of crimes been attended to with so few procedural requirements..."

So my question to the Council is, are you pleased to be one of the Councils at the forefront of wielding these heavy-handed, ill-conceived instruments against your own citizens, a year after celebrating the 800th anniversary of Magna Carta?

Thank you for your attention.

Written Response from Councillor Sinclair

The Council was thorough and considered when deciding whether to introduce the two PSPOs currently in place in Oxford. They are succeeding in tackling the behaviours they were designed to through education and information about what is acceptable behaviour

Question from Ruth Anderson - British Waterways Act 1995 and legislation – and response

My name is Ruth Anderson. I am a residential boater on a Local Agenda 21 mooring in Oxford. I work for Oxfordshire County Council as a Senior Traffic Management and Control Engineer. My work involves the management of the highway network during incidents, roadworks, events such as the Oxford Half Marathon and adverse weather. During adverse weather events, such as those that closed the Abingdon and Botley Roads in Oxford, I am often required to come into the office outside of normal office hours to ensure there are appropriate skills available. I am representing the PSPnO campaign.

Members of the boating community have been struck by a recent undertaking by the Canal and River Trust to spray messages on the towpath at Isis Lock referring to a polite zone. Given the draft of the proposed PSPO specifically states “No person shall tamper with waterways habitats, signage, lifebelts, fencing or other waterways infrastructure” this seems to be a particularly ironic campaign by CRT and I can’t help but wonder what Oxford City Council’s input on this has been.

I remember a couple of years ago when the TV show Great Canal Journeys visited the Oxford Canal, and the presenters Timothy West and Prunella Scales were scathing about the graffiti around the canal in Jericho.

Given that a council officer acknowledged shortly before the recent Scrutiny Committee meeting, where this PSPO was on the agenda, that he was not aware of the British Waterways Act 1995, which is the basis on which the Canal and River Trust manage their Waterways, would the Council agree that there is a fundamental lack of joined up thinking between the two authorities, and what plans are there to ensure that no local legislation attempts to override full Acts of Parliament?

Written Response from Councillor Sinclair

The Canal and Rivers Trust are fully aware of the draft PSPO. The Anti Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 is a piece of primary legislation that allows for the implementation of a PSPO to tackle behaviours that are nuisance and detrimental to the public.

To: Council

Date: 18 April 2016

Title of Report: Motions received in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.17, as amended

Introduction

This document sets out motions received by the Head of Law and Governance in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.17 by the deadline, as amended by the proposers.

All substantive amendments sent by councillors to the Head of Law and Governance by publication of the briefing note are included below.

Motions will be taken in turn from the Green, Labour, Liberal Democrat groups in that order.

Council is asked to consider the following motions:

1. Oxford City Council supports EU membership (proposed by Councillor Craig Simmons, seconded by Councillor Elise Benjamin)

Green member motion

Oxford is an international City, with three EU twin towns, and a proud City of Sanctuary. The last census in 2011 showed that 1 in 10 of its resident population were born in EU countries other than UK.

The City Council has benefited directly from more than £1m of EU funding and, in May 2015, the City's Finance Panel took evidence from three of the South East regions MEPs identifying more than seven other potential EU funding streams that the City Council could apply for.

Oxford's economy also benefits enormously from EU tourism (9 out of the top 10 countries of origin are other EU states), from EU funding to its Universities, and other institutions, and from European businesses, such as BMW, that have chosen to operate within the City and County.

Workers in Oxford are better off as a result of EU employment directives on equal rights, holidays, pensions, working hours, health and safety and so on.

Oxford residents have more opportunities and lower costs when travelling as a result of the EU, free movement, lower mobile phone charges, European health card, educational possibilities and so on.

Oxford's environment has also benefited from EU legislation and guidance on, for example, air quality, recycling and biodiversity.

This Council therefore believes that the case for staying within the EU is overwhelming beneficial for the City and urges those electors eligible to vote to back an 'IN' vote at the forthcoming EU Referendum and asks the Leader to write to Oxford's MPs setting out the Council's views.

Of course, the EU is not perfect. But neither is Westminster. It needs to be more democratically accountable, transparent and efficient. This Council, however, believes that reform will be easier if the UK remains within the EU.

2. Unitary Council proposal (proposed by Councillor Price)

Labour member motion

The City Council notes that the response from government to the devolution proposals for Oxfordshire that were presented to the Department of Communities and Local Government and Cabinet Office in December 2015 indicated that a different and stronger form of governance was required if the proposals were to make progress.

Council therefore welcomes the initiative from the five District Councils in partnership with South Northants and Cotswold District Councils for a revised proposal based on four unitary authorities. This proposal would restore city government to Oxford and create an effective partnership with the neighbouring unitary authorities.

The Council notes that a feasibility study covering the full range of possible unitary options is being commissioned, and urges the County Council to participate in the commissioning and management of this study rather than duplicating the work with a separate study that will cover the same ground.

3. Adopt an eco-village approach (proposed by Councillor Gotch)

Liberal Democrat member motion

Bicester eco-village is an exemplar of how energy efficient and low-carbon-footprint housing is being built now - helping to slow climate change for the sake of our children and grandchildren.

We call on the City to instruct its architects to design buildings of all types, on City owned sites, to adopt the eco-village approach and, by example, persuade / push / cajole private developers in Oxford to make their contribution to saving planet earth.

4. Climate Change and Government Policy (proposed by Councillor Simmons, seconded by Councillor Thomas)

Green member motion

In the light of the Paris Agreement drafted last December (open for signature from 'Earth Day' 22nd April 2016) which included, for the first time, a global agreement on stabilising and reducing damaging greenhouse gas emissions, this Council calls upon

the government to reconsider policy changes which have made it more difficult for the Council and other local authorities to take action to help tackle climate change.

For example:

- Reductions in government subsidies for solar panels and other green energy sources;
- The discontinuation of Green Deal funding for loans to homeowners and private landlords to install insulation and other energy efficiency measures;
- Recent changes to planning policy, which make it more difficult for Councils to require developers to build new homes to high environmental standards.

This Council is committed to playing its part in global efforts to limit the extent of future climate change, and local efforts to respond to the impacts of climate change on residents, businesses and the local environment. It recognises that, in cities like Oxford which it is predicted will suffer from increased flooding due to climate change, inaction carries a real human and economic cost.

This Council therefore calls upon the Council Leader, in collaboration with other Group Leaders, to write to Oxford's MPs asking them to lobby the Government to live up to the commitments it made at COP 21 and invest more in tackling climate change.

5. Oxford City Council support EU membership (proposed by Councillor Tanner)

Labour member motion

This Council strongly supports remaining in the European Union in the referendum and urges all Oxford's voters to use their vote to Remain.

Remaining in Europe will continue Oxford's free access to the world's largest single market, will allow Oxford citizens to live, work and holiday freely within the 27 other nations, and will demonstrate our solidarity with over 500 million Europeans.

Leaving Europe will be bad for jobs. It will threaten the BMW car plant, the universities and the science jobs at Culham. Remaining in Europe will guarantee rights at work, high environmental standards and a more democratic Europe.

The referendum is an unnecessary measure to please sections of the Conservative Party and threatens Oxford's future.

6. Independent review of unitary options (proposed by Councillor Fooks seconded by Councillor Gant)

Liberal Democrat member motion

Council notes that the devolution debate appears to have stalled due to the Government's insisting on specific forms of governance for any new authority. However,

Council further notes that

- the current financial position of the County Council is causing unacceptable budget cuts, especially to the most vulnerable

- there is a growing belief that unitary governance would provide the best way forward
- it is not clear what the optimum size of any unitary would be.

Council believes that the best way to inform a decision on what is best for the people of Oxford and Oxfordshire is a genuinely independent review of all possible options, not seen to be favouring any particular model.

Council therefore asks the Executive Board to work with all other interested parties to commission such a review, assessing all possible models including the status quo, to enable an evidenced-based discussion to guide the selection of the best model.

Any model must be able to command public support, and be shown to be able to

- fund the services needed by the people of Oxfordshire, especially the most vulnerable
- provide strategic direction in a form which is properly accountable and fully consistent with local decision-making
- support economic growth and sustainability alongside strong and balanced communities

Council recognises that any changes to the current two-tier structure will involve the dissolution of all existing authorities and a review of all current ward boundaries, but believes that a unitary structure of some kind will offer the best chance of better strategic leadership and the efficient delivery of public services to the people of Oxford.

7. Community Involvement in Community Centres (proposed by Councillor Wolff, seconded by Councillor Benjamin)

Green member motion

1. This Council believes that the essence of community work is not so much the delivery of services but the building of stronger, more cohesive and more resilient neighbourhood communities.
2. Recognising that the Council's proposed Tier 1 'community hubs' may also be places where a wide range of services are delivered, Council recognises the danger that the community work objectives may be sidelined or even undermined.
3. Council therefore welcomes the statement in the Community Centres Strategy (currently out for public consultation) "The Council's preferred position is that robust, sustainable community organisations manage the centres".
4. Council believes that independent and locally accountable Community Associations should have a key role in ensuring that all the Council centres deliver on the key community work objective described in para 1.

8. Scrapping of student grants and curbing of access to higher education for disadvantaged young people (proposed by Councillor Hayes, seconded by Councillor Hollingsworth)

Labour member motion

This Council supports fair access and widening participation in higher education, and believes that these are important for making society more equal, in Oxford and across the country.

Accordingly, this Council notes with concern the Government's plan to scrap maintenance grants for up to 500,000 of the poorest university students, including those attending our city's universities.

This Council further notes that the poorest 40% of university students in England will graduate with an extra £12,500 of debt for a three-year course, according to research by the Institute of Fiscal Studies.

This Council is concerned that scrapping grants risks putting many young people off applying to university, including many from disadvantaged backgrounds. A 2014 study by the Institute of Education has shown that a £1,000 rise in grants created a nearly 4% increase in participation.

This Council asks the Council Leader to write to Oxford's Members of Parliament to express our dissatisfaction with the abolition of grants and make representations to the Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Education about the impact of the loss of grants on students at our city's universities, particularly those from poorer backgrounds.

This page is intentionally left blank