

# Agenda

www.oxford.gov.uk



## Council Briefing Note

Date: **Monday 29 September 2014**

---

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: [fullcouncil@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:fullcouncil@oxford.gov.uk)

---

As a matter of courtesy, if you intend to record the meeting please let the Contact Officer know how you wish to do this before the start of the meeting.

# Council Briefing Note

## Membership

Councillor Mohammed Abbasi	
Councillor Mohammed Altaf-Khan	
Councillor Elise Benjamin	
Councillor Susan Brown	
Councillor Bev Clack	
Councillor Mary Clarkson	
Councillor Colin Cook	City Development
Councillor Van Coulter	Leisure Services
Councillor Steven Curran	
Councillor Roy Darke	
Councillor Jean Fooks	
Councillor James Fry	
Councillor Michael Gotch	
Councillor Mick Haines	
Councillor David Henwood	
Councillor Sam Hollick	
Councillor Alex Hollingsworth	
Councillor Rae Humberstone	
Councillor Pat Kennedy	
Councillor Ben Lloyd-Shogbesan	
Councillor Mark Lygo	Parks and Sports
Councillor Sajjad Malik	
Councillor Chewe Munkonge	
Councillor Michele Paule	
Councillor Susanna Pressel	
Councillor Bob Price	Corporate Governance and Strategic Partnerships
Councillor Mike Rowley	
Councillor Gwynneth Royce	
Councillor Gill Sanders	
Councillor Scott Seamons	
Councillor Craig Simmons	
Councillor Dee Sinclair	
Councillor John Tanner	Cleaner, Greener Oxford
Councillor Ed Turner	Finance and Efficiency
Councillor Oscar Van Nooijen	
Councillor Ruth Wilkinson	
Councillor Dick Wolff	

# AGENDA

## Pages

### 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

### 2 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Guidance on this is contained within the main agenda. Members' attention is drawn to Section 23 of the Constitution.

If Members have queries about possible interests, would they please discuss them with the Monitoring Officer, before the meeting commences.

### 3 MINUTES

***To be signed as a correct record by the Lord Mayor. The Constitution does not permit any "matters arising"***

See pages 1 to 48 of the main agenda

### 4 APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEES

Following three recent by-elections there is no change to the political balance of the Council.

Councillor Gill Sanders is standing down from the Scrutiny Committee, leaving a vacancy.

Council is asked to make appointments from the Labour Group to the vacant seats as shown:

West Area Planning Committee – Councillor Alex Hollingsworth.

Scrutiny Committee – Councillor David Henwood.

Licensing and Gambling Acts Committee - Councillor Chewie Munkonge.

### 5 ANNOUNCEMENTS

Announcements may be made by the Lord Mayor, The Sheriff, The Leader of the Council, Chief Executive, Chief Finance Officer and Monitoring Officer

### PART 1 - ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

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

1 - 2

***NOTE: for items 6 and 14 combined, the Constitution sets a time limit of 45 minutes. If there is insufficient time to take all of the questions, the Constitution says that a written response will be given.***

Question to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Bob Price) from Sarah Lasenby on Item 15 on the agenda – petition to Council

## CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS - ITEMS 7 TO 9

### 7 DRAFT COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT POLICY STATEMENT 2014-17

See pages 49 to 136 of the agenda.

### 8 INTEGRATED PERFORMANCE REPORT QUARTER 1 2014/15

See pages 137 to 178 of the agenda

### 9 ROSE HILL COMMUNITY CENTRE DEVELOPMENT

3 - 8

Report to the City Executive Board meeting on 24<sup>th</sup> September attached.  
Extract from the Minutes attached.

The City Executive Board agreed to grant project approval for the construction of the Rose Hill Community Centre within a revised capital budget of £4,764,000.

Council is **recommended** by the City Executive Board to allocate a revised capital budget of £4,764,000.

## OFFICER REPORTS ITEMS 10 AND 11

### 10 HONORARY RECORDER - APPOINTMENT

See pages 179 to 182 of the agenda.

### 11 COVENANT OF MAYORS

See pages 183 to 188 of the agenda.

### 12 CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD MINUTES

***NOTE: This item has a time limit of 15 minutes.***

Pages 189 to 194 of the main agenda - Minutes of the meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> September 2014.

Pages 9 to 10 of the briefing note - Minutes of the special meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> September 2014. These have been substantially dealt with under the debate on item 9.

### 13 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

9 - 24

Questions on notice under Council Procedure Rule 11.9(b).

27 questions and responses are attached to this Briefing Note.

## **PART 2 - PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND SCRUTINY**

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

25 - 26

***NOTE: For items 6 and 14 combined, the Constitution sets a time limit of 45 minutes. If there is insufficient time to take all of the addresses and questions, the Constitution says that a written response will be given.***

1. Question to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Bob Price) from Andrew McKay: Carfax by-election
2. Question to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Bob Price) from Sietske Boeles: Oxford Core Strategy

There are no requests to address the Council.

### **15 PETITIONS -TEMPLE COWLEY POOLS - OXFORD CITY COUNCIL MUST DELIVER VALUE FOR THE COMMUNITY**

See pages 195 to 196 of the agenda.

Mr Gibson, who submitted the petition, will address Council. There is a time limit of five minutes for this address.

### **16 OUTSIDE ORGANISATION/COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORTS AND QUESTIONS**

See pages 197 to 204 of the agenda.

### **17 SCRUTINY COMMITTEE BRIEFING**

See pages 205 to 222 of the agenda.

## **PART 3 - MOTIONS REPRESENTING THE CITY**

### **18 MOTIONS ON NOTICE**

27 - 32

***The Constitution provides for a total time of 60 minutes for this agenda item. Members' speeches are subject to a maximum of 3 minutes.***

***All Motions and amendments received prior to the start of the meeting are attached to this Briefing Note.***

### **19 MATTERS EXEMPT FROM PUBLICATION**

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)**

## **DECLARING INTERESTS**

### **General duty**

You must declare any disclosable pecuniary interests when the meeting reaches the item on the agenda headed "Declarations of Interest" or as soon as it becomes apparent to you.

### **What is a disclosable pecuniary interest?**

Disclosable pecuniary interests relate to your\* employment; sponsorship (ie payment for expenses incurred by you in carrying out your duties as a councillor or towards your election expenses); contracts; land in the Council's area; licences for land in the Council's area; corporate tenancies; and securities. These declarations must be recorded in each councillor's Register of Interests which is publicly available on the Council's website.

### **Declaring an interest**

Where any matter disclosed in your Register of Interests is being considered at a meeting, you must declare that you have an interest. You should also disclose the nature as well as the existence of the interest.

If you have a disclosable pecuniary interest, after having declared it at the meeting you must not participate in discussion or voting on the item and must withdraw from the meeting whilst the matter is discussed.

### **Members' Code of Conduct and public perception**

Even if you do not have a disclosable pecuniary interest in a matter, the Members' Code of Conduct says that a member "must serve only the public interest and must never improperly confer an advantage or disadvantage on any person including yourself" and that "you must not place yourself in situations where your honesty and integrity may be questioned". What this means is that the matter of interests must be viewed within the context of the Code as a whole and regard should continue to be paid to the perception of the public.

\*Disclosable pecuniary interests that must be declared are not only those of the member her or himself but also those of the member's spouse, civil partner or person they are living with as husband or wife or as if they were civil partners.

This page is intentionally left blank

## QUESTIONS TO COUNCIL FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 11.11

**Question to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Bob Price) from Sarah Lasenby (to be taken under the first part of the agenda item 6).**

### Item 15 – petition to Council

Will Bob Price the Leader of the Council ask the Lord Mayor to intervene if any of the Councillors who speak in favour of the motion for debate [Save Temple Cowley Pools] then vote against that motion?

This has happened in the past and seems most undemocratic. It also appears as if Councillors are not interested in the views of these very large numbers of the public who want to keep the leisure centre. These specially include those from Rose Hill, Wood Farm and Cowley who will lose out if the leisure complex is not saved.

The voters are relying on fair and transparent processes and expect them to be used. What we have seen is voting by Councillors from the Groups in line with pre-agreed decisions rather than considering the facts and the issues that the public want debated and then voting in the way indicated by those facts.

### **Response**

The Lord Mayor has no constitutional power to direct the way that members vote on these issues. Such a restriction would be ultra vires.

This page is intentionally left blank

**To:** City Executive Board

**Dates:** 24<sup>th</sup> September 2014

**Report of:** Head of Leisure, Parks & Communities and Service Manager, Regeneration and Major Projects

**Title of Report:** Rose Hill Community Centre Development

## **Summary and Recommendations**

**Purpose of report:** To grant project approval for the construction of Rose Hill Community Centre at a total cost of £4,764,000

**Key decision:** No

**Executive lead member:** Councillor Christine Simm and Councillor Ed Turner

**Policy Framework:** Strong, Active Communities

**Recommendation(s):**

**That the City Executive Board:**

Grant project approval for the construction of the Rose Hill Community Centre within a revised capital budget of £4,764,000;

and recommend to full Council the allocation of a revised capital budget of £4,764,000.

## **Introduction**

1. The report provides an update on the progress of the Rose Hill Community Centre development and requests approval for the project and an increase in the budget in response to the market tender received from the preferred contractor.

## **Project Update**

2. The initial tenders were received in March 2014 and were over the current estimate included in the capital budget. Subsequently to try to bring the cost down we gave the tenderers a period of time to undertake a thorough value engineering process. While the work we

have undertaken over this time has resulted in savings of c£300,000, there have also been new costs to absorb which, in the main, result from the confirmation from Scottish and Southern Electric that a substation is required. This means the project remains above budget which is a reflection of the rapid rate of growth in the construction market.

3. While there is scope to undertake additional value engineering, it is clear that further budget is now required if we are to progress the current scheme. The pace with which costs are increasing in the construction market mean that if we were to redesign the scheme any potential savings may be eliminated by construction price increases over the period.
4. A detailed communications strategy is in place which sets out the continued work with all stakeholders. This includes the participation of community groups and a monthly newsletter.

### **Contract Award**

5. The tender documents were re-issued in July 2014, with a closing date for responses of the 8<sup>th</sup> September 2014. The new schedule seeks to complete the contract in early October.
6. The tendering process is being carried out in line with Oxford City Council's procurement policy and the Business Improvement team and Law and Governance are fully involved. The value of works is below the EU procurement thresholds.

### **Finance**

7. The current budget provision for the project is £4,286,000. The budgeted build cost was £3,485,726.
8. Two tenders were received under the procurement process undertaken. Neither of the tender sums received fell within the existing budget figure. After discussions with the tenderers it has become clear that neither would be able to deliver the proposed project within the existing budget. Thus this request is made for an increase of £478,000 to the project budget giving a revised total cost for the project of £4,764,000.
9. The project is funded on a 50/50 basis between the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and the General Fund, on the basis that the Community Centre is an amenity and shared by the community as a whole.
10. The additional costs will be incurred in 2015/16 and can be funded from de-prioritising or applying underspends from other schemes within

the capital programme, or borrowing. A decision on this will be made in February when Council considers the overall programme.

### **Risk**

9. A risk register is included in appendix one.

### **Climate change / environmental impact**

10. The new facility will be built to meet current building regulations and in line with planning policy. Officers are also seeking to maximise the use of photovoltaic panels (PV) which will be funded through Salix and a combined heat and power unit is also planned to be funded from the existing budget.

### **Equalities impact**

11. The new Community Centre has been designed for and will be used by the whole community. The process has engaged with the wider community in line with required equality focused building regulations.
12. See report to CEB of December 2012 for the relevant completed Equalities Impact Assessment.

### **Legal implications**

13. There are no direct legal implications arising from this report.

#### **Name and contact details of author:-**

Name - Mark Spriggs  
 Job title - Strategic Community Centres Coordinator  
 Service Area / Department: Leisure, Parks and Communities/ Communities and Neighbourhoods  
 Tel: 01865 252822 e-mail: mspriggs@oxford.gov.uk

#### **List of background papers:**

**Report to CEB 19<sup>th</sup> December 2012 – Rose Hill Community Facility**  
**Report to CEB 12<sup>th</sup> February 2014 – Delegated Authority to Executive Director Community Services to assign contract for construction of RHCC**

**Version 0.2**

## Appendix 1

## Risk Register

Item	Description of Risk/ Opportunity	Assessment			Degree of Risk	Consequence (Cost, Time, Fitness for Purpose)	Strategy to Control Risk
		LO	CR	RRN			
1	Programme slippage due to delay in construction contract completion	4	2	8	Very High	T	
2	Budget shortfall due to slippage in programme	2	3	6	High	C	

Key Likelihood of occurrence			Consequence of Risk		
4	Frequent	Likely to occur frequently, many times during the period of concern (e.g. project duration, life of building)	4	Catastrophic	Major failure in meeting prime project objectives
3	Probable	Several times in the period of concern	3	Critical	Significant failure in meeting prime project objectives
2	Possible	Some time in the period of concern	2	Serious	Failure to meet major project objectives
1	Remote	Unlikely but possible in the period of concern	1	Marginal	Failure to meet lesser project objectives
0	Improbable	So unlikely that it can be assumed that it will not occur or it cannot occur	0	Negligible	Minor effect on meeting project objectives

RISK	Negligible	Very low	Low	Significant	High	Very High	Extreme	Prohibitive
RRN	0	1	2	3-4	6	8	9	12+

# **CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD**

**Wednesday 24 September 2014**

**COUNCILLORS PRESENT:** Councillors Price (Chair), Turner (Deputy Leader), Simm, Kennedy, Lygo, Seamons and Tanner.

**OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT:** Councillor Fooks

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Peter Sloman (Chief Executive), Jackie Yates (Executive Director Organisational Development and Corporate Services), Ian Brooke (Head of Leisure, Parks and Communities), Nigel Kennedy (Head of Finance), Lindsay Cane (Law and Governance) and Sarah Claridge (Committee and Member Services Officer)

## **53. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillors Brown, Rowley and Sinclair

## **54. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were received

## **55. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

No public questions were received.

## **56. COUNCILLOR ADDRESSES ON ANY ITEM FOR DECISION ON THE BOARD'S AGENDA**

Councillor Fooks spoke during the discussion of the Rose Hill Community Centre Development (minutes 57).

## **57. ROSE HILL COMMUNITY CENTRE DEVELOPMENT**

The Head of Leisure, Parks and Communities submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended) which requested project approval for the construction of Rose Hill Community Centre at a total cost of £4,764,000.

The Head of Leisure, Parks and Communities explained that an additional £478,000 was needed to complete the construction of the Rose Hill Community Centre. Material costs had increased significantly since the original budget was agreed and the two tenders received did not fall within the existing budget. There is currently a lack of supply in materials as many local construction businesses have gone out of business since the recession. A lot of materials have to be imported from abroad which has increased costs. Half of the £478,000 would be set aside as contingency and was unlikely to be spent.

Councillor Turner, Executive Member for Finance, Asset Management and Public Health agreed with the rising price of materials being the cause of the project being over-budget. He felt that because the Council had consulted the public and had designed the building in line with the public's response. It was important that the Council complete the proposed work rather than reduce the scale of the building to meet costs.

Councillor Fooks was concerned with the Council's ability to manage the capital programme and if additional funding is given to complete this project what capital project misses out? Cllr Turner said that the capital programme would need to be re-prioritised.

Cllr Simm asked that officers analyse what mistakes were made in the budgeting of this project and should anticipate rising costs when budgeting future projects.

The City Executive Board resolved to:

1. Grant project approval for the construction of the Rose Hill Community Centre within a revised capital budget of £4,764,000;
2. Recommend to full Council the allocation of a revised capital budget of £4,764,000.

**The meeting started at 2.00 pm and ended at 2.25 pm**

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

### **1. To the Board member for Sports, Events and Parks(Councillor Mark Lygo) from Councillor Jean Fooks:Cotteslowe Park trees**

Volunteers, many of them children, have planted hundreds of trees in Cotteslowe Park and in other parks in the city. It is heartrending to see that many have been destroyed when nearby paths are mown; this has happened more than once. What steps are you taking to prevent this destruction? And what replacement trees are being planted to make up for those lost in this way?

#### **Response**

Having received this question the parks operations manager has undertaken an audit of Cotteslowe Park. None of the planted trees within Cotteslowe Park have been cut down and the staff are aware of the location of the trees. Pathways are cut infrequently due to the heavy footfall.

### **2. To the Board member for Sports, Events and Parks(Councillor Mark Lygo) from Councillor Jean Fooks:Cotteslowe Park rangers**

There have been several incidents in Cotteslowe Park which might have been prevented if the park rangers had been on site. What are you doing to ensure that the rangers are able to spend more time in the park, not just in the office?

#### **Response**

The team covers 266 hectares of parkland and also support the countryside rangers to manage 387 hectares of countryside. We have a seven day patrol service and undertake a range of tasks that help to make Oxford's green spaces vibrant, active and safe.

The team plan and change their patrols based on feedback from stakeholders and the public.

With the parks team being based Cotteslowe the park has by far the highest level of presence from the parks team and we are not aware of an increase in incidents at Cotteslowepark.

As such we are not planning to increase the patrols at Cotteslowepark. If Councillor Fooks has any feedback on incidents then the team are always very keen to receive this as soon as possible so we can take the appropriate action.

**3. To the Board member for Housing and Estate Regeneration (Councillor Scott Seamons) from Councillor Sam Hollick: Cuts to homelessness services**

Will the Leader join me in condemning the planned cuts to homelessness services recently consulted on by the County Council? What has been the City's response to this consultation?

**Response**

Yes, the City Council are deeply concerned about the impact of the proposed cuts to Housing related support budgets by the County Council. Detailed below is the City Council's detailed response to the consultation.

'Oxford City Council strongly opposes the scale of cuts this this area of service. It considers that this funding stream is essential in providing quality services to assist some of the most vulnerable members of our community, at a time when they need help most, and to help them move towards independent living. Many clients, in the adult homeless pathway in particular, have very high and complex needs that without suitable support, in a supported accommodation environment, will fail to achieve this goal. Failing to address the needs of the various client groups impacted by this change, has the potential to destroy lives. Furthermore, the impact of not making sufficient, responsive and timely interventions to achieve effective outcomes, will significantly add to the pressure on other services, statutory and non-statutory, including adult social care, homelessness, physical and mental health services, hospital admissions, police, community safety, courts, and food banks, to name but a few.

Whilst acknowledging that Oxfordshire County Council is under increasing financial pressure from Central Government, and needs to make savings and efficiencies, Oxford City Council considers that making a significant cut to services that impact on these most vulnerable people is inappropriate, and that cuts should be directed elsewhere. With an effective 38% cut to this funding stream, there are insufficient funds to be confident of ensuring the continued delivery of effective services. It should be noted that Oxford City Council is proposing to maintain its overall budget for homeless services in full because it regards them as a high priority, especially if shielding the most vulnerable is to have any real meaning. We very much regret that the County Council has not taken the same approach.

As a partner organisation in the commissioning of these services, Oxford City Council agrees that the broad principles and outcomes, as proposed are correct. We appreciate the additional funding contributions proposed from Public Health funds, and feel that these do acknowledge the broader impact, and the social investment outcomes that in these services achieve.

The Council feels that the consultation proposals, as they stand at present, represent a missed opportunity for more effective joint commissioning of these services, between all Oxfordshire Councils and the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group, with funding contributions from these organisations used to commission agreed joint outcomes, and we would welcome further consideration being given to this. Specifically, we are keen to offer a contribution at the same level as is currently provided to commission hostel services in Oxford City, subject to an appropriate local connection policy being available (as we cannot use our funds to support clients from outside Oxford), and to jointly commission this service. We would encourage the Clinical Commissioning Group to make a similar commitment and to be similarly involved.

In terms of the detail of the proposals, Oxford City Council would make the following comments:

- While we appreciate that there is no reduction in bed spaces to the adult homeless hostel provision in the City, we are concerned at the management implications of unsupported beds in hostels. This concern is heightened by the severe reductions proposed to floating support.
- We note that more support and accommodation is proposed in the neighbouring districts to Oxford, and acknowledge that a more dispersed model may reduce the draw of some vulnerable clients into Oxford City for services.
- We support the view that the drug treatment services will instead be commissioned under public health.
- We acknowledge that a strategic review of the domestic abuse services, including the helpline and outreach services, is to take place, and believe this is a better proposal than simply to reduce the service. We would want to ensure that refuge bed places are maintained at current levels. If the review shows that savings cannot be achieved in this area without harming victims of domestic abuse, we would encourage the County Council to reinstate funding to existing levels.
- We will work with fellow commissioners and providers to ensure that effective and high quality services can be maintained at the best value, and wish to ensure that support rates are set to ensure that quality staff can be recruited and retained to deliver these. Oxford City Council pays a living wage and would wish to see such a commitment included for these services.
- We understand that the 31% cut to floating support services will be implemented over two years rather than one, with a review after the first year to assess impacts and to draw lessons from any new models of delivering support, before further cuts are made. However, Oxford City Council remains gravely concerned, at the present time, that this level of cut will require a significant drop to the number of clients supported in their own homes, which risks higher numbers of people being evicted or falling out of accommodation, and increasing the demand on other services. Furthermore, the Council is concerned to ensure

that additional service demands for floating support can be met, for example, should some accommodation-based support be reduced.

Oxford City Council would also welcome a further review of the Social Impact Assessment of this proposal, as it assesses the impacts to be greater than those presently stated. Children are, for example, another protected group impacted, in the areas of domestic abuse and floating support, in particular.

These proposals are being implemented late in the day, and they would require a significant transition period, the timescale for which is not presently clear.

We would strongly encourage County Council members to reconsider their scale, and in doing so act decisively to protect the most vulnerable in our community.'

**4. To the Board member for Housing and Estate Regeneration (Councillor Scott Seamons) from Councillor Craig Simmons:**Empty homes

According to Government statistics, there are over 1,000 empty homes in Oxford City. What action is the City Council taking, and what more could it do, to put these homes back into use?

**Response:**

*Response to follow*

**5. To the Board member for Housing and Estate Regeneration (Councillor Scott Seamons) from Councillor Sam Hollick:**OxPAT charity box

In light of the recent rise in rough sleeping, why has the Oxford Poverty Action Trust collection box been removed from the Town Hall reception?

**Response**

The Oxford Poverty Action Trust was removed around 2 years ago. The Council have contacted OXPAT to see if they wish to relocate the box back at the Town Hall which we would be happy to accommodate. The OXPAT Secretary appreciated our contact and will follow it up with the Chair to check if they wish to do this, and respond in due course. The council is certainly aware of the gravity of the position with regards to rough sleeping and homelessness. For some months a collection box for the Oxford Homeless Medical Fund has been placed at the town hall reception. The Oxford Homeless Medical Fund supports a range of organisations working with homeless individuals, its main beneficiary being the Luther Street Medical Centre.

**6. To the Board member for Crime and Community Response (Councillor Dee Sinclair) from Councillor Craig Simmons: Late night levy**

Given that the Police and Crime Commissioner, Anthony Stansfeld, has made it clear that those local authorities in the Thames Valley that decide to introduce a 'late night levy' will be able to retain the entire sum – rather than hand over a portion to the Police – will the Councillor re-consider the decision NOT to introduce the levy in Oxford?

**Response**

Thank you for your question on the introduction of a Late Night Levy.

In 2012, the General Licensing Team identified the potential income that a levy in the city could raise. At that time the proscribed arrangements were for the council to receive 30% of the funds, with Thames Valley Police receiving 70%. The Police and Crime Commissioner has now indicated that local authorities can receive the full amount, approximately £100k. These funds would have to be spent on licensing-related activities to improve the late-night economy and assist in the prevention of disorder.

It is important to consider a number of issues. Firstly alcohol-related violent crime and disorder is falling in the city, driven down by the long running Nightsafe operation that takes place each weekend in the city centre and East Oxford. We are also in the midst of our Purple Flag assessment that recognises the breadth of offer in our night-time economy, transport infrastructure and levels of safety. We have received positive feedback so far and having been re-accredited each year since its inception we are hopeful of doing so again.

The biggest challenge we face of introducing a Late Night Levy are the legal implications this could have on our Special Saturation Policy. This policy restricts the number, capacity and opening hours of licensed premises in the city centre and East Oxford. It has been in place for many years and has been a very powerful tool in managing potential disorder. We need to better understand the legal challenges that a levy could pose to the existing SSPs.

The introduction of a levy would also impact on businesses. We are coming out of the longest economic depression in UK history and we have ambitious plans for the city. We want to see a vibrant city centre, economically strong and a range of offer second to none in the region.

In the light of the above, we are commissioning a review of the options that will help the Council establish the optimum course of action.

**7. To the Board member for Cleaner, Greener Oxford, Climate Change and Transport (Councillor John Tanner) from Councillor Jean Fooks:**Dial a Ride

Can you tell Council when you will be announcing the improved transport for the elderly and disabled, to be funded from the £50k contingency, originally intended for a second Dial-a-Ride bus?

**Response**

The City Council is still in discussion with the County Council and will look to bring negotiations to a conclusion shortly. We would like to see an improved Dial-a-Ride for elderly and disabled people in Oxford. But we are not prepared to hand over money unless as a result this County Council service improves'

**8. To the Board member for Cleaner, Greener Oxford, Climate Change and Transport (Councillor John Tanner) from Councillor Wolff:**Cycling schemes

In July, you stated that less than 5% of the £400,000 budget allocated more than two years ago for cycling schemes in the City has actually been spent. Can the Portfolio holder provide a list of the projects lined up for funding and indicate those being held up by the County Council?

**Response**

I'm pleased to say the budget associated with Cycle City is now fully allocated and significant progress has been made over the summer. I'm grateful for the many excellent ideas for cycling improvements suggested by the public.

Projects include new and improved cycle parking at our Park and Ride sites, upgrade of the surface in Hinksey Park and Meadow Lane, removal of barriers including in Queens Lane, and co-funding to the Canals and Rivers Trust to upgrade of the canal towpath near Aristotle Lane. The City Council will also co-fund a County Council led project to redesign The Plain Roundabout with on-road cycling improvements.

In addition, and this is extra money, we expect to make a financial contribution to the revamp of Frideswide Square which will include significant on and off-road improvements for cyclists.

Unfortunately the County Council is refusing to consider other cycle improvements until the new Transport Strategy for Oxford is consulted upon and agreed. This is likely to mean considerable delays to on-road schemes such as prohibiting parked cars from cycle lanes.

**9. To the Board member for Cleaner, Greener Oxford, Climate Change and Transport (Councillor John Tanner) from Councillor Ruthi Brandt: St Giles Fair**

Has any assessment ever been made regarding the effect that the St Giles Fair - and other city centre events which use many generators – might have on local air quality?

**Response**

The impact of the generators at St Giles Fair on pollution levels is likely to be negligible because they operate for only a few days and in a small area of Oxford. However this may be something we can look at in future years.

**10. To the Deputy Leader, Board member for Finance, Asset Management and Public Health (Councillor Ed Turner) from Councillor Ruthi Brandt: Covered market rent negotiations**

Can the Leader update Council on the latest regarding the Covered Market rent negotiations?

**Response**

The Council has met the Covered Market Traders Association (CMTA) and has written to the traders setting out formally two options; either an agreed settlement on the terms discussed at the meeting, or arbitration using an arbitrator agreed with the traders or an RICS appointment. The Council has asked for a decision by early October.

**11. To the Deputy Leader, Board member for Finance, Asset Management and Public Health (Councillor Ed Turner) from Councillor Jean Fooks: Covered market and financial planning**

Once the Covered Market rent issue has been settled, the City will be receiving extra income not allowed for in the Medium Term Financial plan. What will this extra revenue be spent on?

**Response**

The implications for the Council's budget of any eventual settlement of the rent determination for the Covered Market cannot be assessed until the terms are known.

**12. To the Deputy Leader, Board member for Finance, Asset Management and Public Health (Councillor Ed Turner) from Councillor Ruthi Brandt: Oxpens temporary car park**

How much is the Oxpens temporary car park costing to build and operate and who is paying for it?

**Response**

How much is the Oxpens temporary car park costing to build and operate and who is paying for it?

The budget for the new Redbridge coach parking bays and the city centre parking at Oxpens is £3.75m. The cost of operation is covered within the existing Westgate car park management budget. Both car parks are funded and operated by the City Council, and the full scheme is on time and within the budget.

**13. To the Leader of the Council, Corporate Strategy, Economic Development and Planning (Councillor Bob Price) from Councillor Dick Wolff: St Clements disruption**

Now that the works at St Clements Car Park are coming to a close, what is the Council doing to help promote the many local small businesses that suffered during the disruption?

**Response**

The Council budgeted £10,000 for advertising and promotion to support businesses in the St Clements area during the construction period, in addition to funding an alternative car park and a bus service. The building works have now been completed and there has been no indication of any need for further investment or support. Parking services report that the new car park is popular and well used.

**14. To the Leader of the Council, Corporate Strategy, Economic Development and Planning (Councillor Bob Price) from Councillor Ruthi Brandt: Gloucester Green retail area**

Can the portfolio holder update the Council about the current negotiations with New River Retail regarding Gloucester Green's retail area?

**Response**

The Council is not in negotiations with New River at the present time. The developer has approached the Council and expressed an interest in joint working and shown some initial concept drawings.

**15. To the Leader of the Council, Corporate Strategy, Economic Development and Planning (Councillor Bob Price) from Councillor David Thomas: Cost of living**

As Oxford is now one of the most expensive cities in the UK to live in, with numerous working men and women reliant on emergency food aid, does Councillor Price agree with me that Oxford City Council needs an action plan to see city jobs lifted out of minimum wages and onto living wages?

**Response**

Oxford City Council established the Oxford Living Wage in 2009. Currently, no directly hired employee or agency worker working for the Council earns less than £8.36. In early 2014 we agreed to tie the Oxford Living Wage to the London Living Wage by setting it at 95% of whatever the London Living Wage is – which safeguards its future value.

We are a large employer and major commissioner of services, with an annual third party spend of £56m, and actively use this position to influence others by demonstrating the business and longer term benefit of supporting the Oxford Living Wage. In all tenders over £100k anyone awarded a contract for services with us must pay their staff and sub-contractors our Living Wage.

We also promote the Oxford Living Wage at any conferences we present at, writing to local employers and meetings to encourage them to join the campaign. A procurement survey established that of 100 companies we used 80% paid at least the OLW and 50% of these were based in Oxfordshire.

We will continue to champion the initiative.

**16. To the Leader of the Council, Corporate Strategy, Economic Development and Planning (Councillor Bob Price) from Councillor Sam Hollick: Westgate new housing**

Can the portfolio holder explain whether/why the 2014 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment will reduce the estimate of new housing in the Westgate development from 122 to 75 new dwellings?

**Response**

The outline planning application from the Westgate Alliance only proposed a maximum of 75 residential units and this was approved by the WAPC. The current scheme has been developed with a very different approach and mix of uses than the earlier approved scheme from capital Shopping centres. The current proposals now have to be reflected in the SHLAA.

**17. To the Leader of the Council, Corporate Strategy, Economic Development and Planning (Councillor Bob Price) from Councillor Steve Goddard: Northern Gateway Area Action Plan consultation**

Many residents had great difficulty in responding to the consultation on the Northern Gateway Area Action Plan.

One would-be respondent said

*“The issue is that the pdf on your website claims to be editable and saveable: however it transpires that, whilst it is editable, the changes / text / insertions are not actually saved, so it appears to be an edited and saved file, but in fact contains no data.*

*There are two or three potential consequences of this:*

- *respondents may not realise that the saved file is in fact empty, so you receive empty and meaningless pdfs*
- *respondents do realise this, but have to then spend considerable extra time to re-do their replies, thus possibly missing the deadline*
- *respondents give up trying to respond"*

I know of several cases where each of these consequences came about. Would you agree that this is completely unacceptable and that the Council should at the very least have extended the consultation period to allow people to find a way to respond to this very important consultation?

## **Response**

Approximately 170 representations were received in relation to the Northern Gateway Proposed Submission Consultation. All have been accepted. The planning policy officers have responded promptly and helpfully each time that a member of the public reported a difficulty with the website. In cases where the form may have appeared blank to the respondent, when officers accessed the relevant field within the pdf form the comments were visible. Only five blank forms were received, and officers contacted those individuals in each case to explain that they would be able to resubmit their comments after the official close of the consultation.

It is worth noting that there were other ways to respond to the consultation: paper copies of the form were available in libraries, in council offices, and on request; the form could be printed from the website and filled in by hand; and responses by email or letter were accepted. We will of course continue to review our consultation methods in order to ensure an excellent customer experience.

## **18. To the Leader of the Council, Corporate Strategy, Economic Development and Planning (Councillor Bob Price) from Councillor Liz Wade: NOVSCA Appraisal**

### The North Oxford Victorian Suburb Conservation Area (NOVSCA) Appraisal

The Appraisal document was drafted and sent out for consultation some ten years ago. This draft now needs to be revisited and published as soon as possible so that the local community, City planners and developers have a clear evidence base from which all parties can articulate an argument. Currently every application requires separate research from which different conclusions can be drawn.

Can the Board member advise how this Appraisal can be progressed? The urgency of this is apparent from the fact that the draft is already used in Applications and in evidence by the Planning Inspectorate.

## **Response**

The Council is currently without a Conservation Team Leader. The vacant post has been advertised and it is planned to hold interviews shortly. Once the new post holder takes up their new role it will be possible to progress this important project.

**19. To the Leader of the Council, Corporate Strategy, Economic Development and Planning (Councillor Bob Price) from Councillor Craig Simmons: Resourcing planning services**

With recent departures and sickness absence, coupled with a high workload, the planning enforcement team appears under-resourced taking a long time to respond to casework. Can the Portfolio holder outline what action is being taken to address the situation?

**Response**

Planning enforcement workload has remained fairly constant, at just under 650 enforcement investigation cases per year.

In the last six months 2 of the 3 enforcement officer posts have fallen vacant. They proved difficult to fill, although two permanent appointments have now been made; one new officer started in September and another will be starting at the end of October. In the meantime cover was being provided by agency staff, albeit here too one temp left rather suddenly recently to take up a permanent job elsewhere and a temporary replacement is currently being sourced.

The Enforcement Service has kept abreast of the work by continuing investigating all complaints within the agreed timescales. Indeed the number of live investigations has recently been brought down to below 200. It is accepted however that with the above staff changes and recruitment pressures, there have been some instances where target dates have been exceeded. Where this has occurred officers have sought to keep service customers informed. The Head of City Development apologises for any such delays, but believes that now we are beyond summer holidays the impact on casework has been resolved.

**20. To the Leader of the Council, Corporate Strategy, Economic Development and Planning (Councillor Bob Price) from Councillor Ruthi Brandt: Planning applications**

Does the Planning Portfolio holder share my frustration that the planning systems does not seem to allow for the track record of applicants to be taken into account as a material consideration when determining new applications from these same applicants?

**Response**

The statutory framework for planning requires each application to be considered on its merits against the planning policy framework that is in force in the relevant local authority area. How members interpret the framework in relation to a particular application is of course a matter of personal judgment, and other factors, such as those mentioned in the question may be drawn into account.

**21. To the Leader of the Council, Corporate Strategy, Economic Development and Planning (Councillor Bob Price) from Councillor David Thomas: Festival of light lantern parade**

Given that the lantern parade was the single most popular aspect of last year's Festival of Light - as evidenced by Oxford City Council's own evaluation - can Councillor Price explain to the children of Oxford's primary schools why this event has been cancelled by the Council this year?

**Response**

Last year's Christmas Light Festival was an enormous success. Regrettably, however, there were also strong objections because of the impact that the road closures had on bus services, local businesses, and colleges. Following this feedback and a review of the draft budget for this year's event, it was decided that Christmas Light Festival 2014 would not involve road closures but would continue to be based on creating opportunities for young people to be involved, as well as engaging schools and communities from across the city.

This year's festival will be a collaboration between more than 20 venues in Oxford providing live music and dance performances, arts installations and free cultural activities with the overall theme of "See Your City in a Different Light." The Westgate Centre have taken over as this year's lead sponsors and, in particular, are supporting the Young Persons' Light Installation project. Children from six local schools will be working with education trainees from the Oxford University Museums to create six large light installations inspired by the museums' collections. The first meeting of the children involved was very exciting with the decisions about the subjects of the installations made very democratically. The giant structures will evolve in the school settings before being brought together for a private view before the Festival and then will be on show throughout the festival weekend.

The full range of participatory projects organised by the core festival team or in close partnership with our cultural partners are likely to involve up to 650 children and young people. In addition to the Light Installation project, these will include the Ice Station Digital project with Film Oxford, the Day of Song Schools Concert, the Ark T Stardust and Snowflakes dance project, and the Magdalen Road pop-up festival with Pegasus and Magdalen Road Studios.

**22. To the Leader of the Council, Corporate Strategy, Economic Development and Planning (Councillor Bob Price) from Councillor Elise Benjamin: Press releases**

Does the Leader think that it is acceptable for the Council to put out a press release promoting a ward party organised by residents without the knowledge or agreement of the organisers?

**Response**

No

**23. To the Leader of the Council, Corporate Strategy, Economic Development and Planning (Councillor Bob Price) from Councillor Sam Hollick: Councillor Champions**

Can the Leader explain what powers and responsibilities the Councillors who have been appointed as Champions have?

**Response**

Members who accept the role of 'champion' are asked to work closely with officers, other members and relevant people and organisations outside the Council to develop and promote our policies and services for the group or topic that is 'championed'. They have no constitutional powers. Recommendations and/or decisions are channelled through the appropriate portfolio holder.

**24. To the Leader of the Council, Corporate Strategy, Economic Development and Planning (Councillor Bob Price) from Councillor David Thomas: Outside bodies and partnerships**

In the interest of transparency and accountability, will the Leader commit to putting a full list of those Councillors and Officers who sit on outside bodies and partnerships on the Council's website? (Note: At the moment the 'Outside Bodies' list is incomplete).

**Response**

Yes

**25. To the Leader of the Council, Corporate Strategy, Economic Development and Planning (Councillor Bob Price) from Councillor Dick Wolff:**Staff exit interviews

Are staff exit interviews conducted and are these available for Councillors to scrutinise?

**Response**

Frequently but not invariably; and certainly not.

**26. To the Leader of the Council, Corporate Strategy, Economic Development and Planning (Councillor Bob Price) from Councillor Jean Fooks:**Printed agendas - supply

Many members have said that they prefer to have paper copies of agendas rather than have only electronic versions. As this is to enable them to fulfil their roles as councillors, would you agree that the Council should ensure that they receive their agendas in the form that is most convenient for them?

**Response**

Members do have a choice as to the format in which they receive agenda. Those who chose to have an iPad as their means of receiving and viewing Council documentation understood that they would not then receive paper copies as well. Because the majority of Members chose to receive and use iPads, efficiency savings of £13,000 over 3 years were agreed by Council. Members have a collective responsibility to take up the offers of training to make this choice work effectively for them and to assist in the delivery of the agreed savings.

**27. To the Leader of the Council, Corporate Strategy, Economic Development and Planning (Councillor Bob Price) from Councillor Jean Fooks:**Printed agendas - budget

Members have been told that there is insufficient budgetary provision to supply the paper copies they are requesting. How much is the budgetary shortfall and how much contingency money was kept back for just such an eventuality in the current budget?

**Response**

There is a forecast adverse variance on the printing budget in the present financial year of approximately £6,000. Having agreed the level of savings indicated in the previous answer, members have a duty to assist in avoiding unnecessary 'double' expenditure caused by taking an expensive iPad and then asking to also receive paper copies.

This page is intentionally left blank

## QUESTIONS TO COUNCIL FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 11.11 TO BE TAKEN UNDER AGENDA ITEM 14

### 1. Question to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Bob Price) from Andrew McKay.

#### Carfax by-election

The recent Carfax by-election was held at a time when the vast majority of the ward's electorate were not in residence. This is because the Carfax ward is dominated by a student population who are absent from Oxford during the summer. Registered voters in this ward who are students have complained that the by-election's timing meant they were unaware it was even being held. Given this and the by-election's historically low turnout, does the Council accept that this election failed effectively to capture the democratic will of the citizens of Carfax ward?

#### Response

Once the request for a poll is received from the requisite number of electors, who can be from any party or no party at all, the Returning Officer has no discretion in the timing of a by-election. It is of course impossible to know what the outcome of the by-election would have been if held at another time, and therefore not possible to tell whether the democratic will of the electorate that was expressed clearly on September 4th would have been the same if held later or earlier.

### 2. Question to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Bob Price) from Sietske Boeles

#### Oxford Core Strategy

Does the Leader of the Council agree with South Oxford(shire) District Council that the Oxford Core Strategy is out of date as is it has no regard for the Duty to Cooperate as set out in the Localism Act?

#### Response

The Core Strategy is not out of date. The Localism Act and National Planning Policy Framework establish criteria against which a Local Plan is tested for soundness. Our 20 year strategy has been re-assessed against these criteria and we have concluded that the Core Strategy that was adopted in 2011 after an independent public inquiry is fully compliant with national legislation and guidance.

The City Council undertook a considerable amount of engagement with its local authority neighbours and other stakeholders while the Core Strategy was being prepared. This amounted to the same process now being termed as the duty to cooperate by the Localism Act. This engagement with, in particular SODC, involved considerable dialogue about the need for support from other districts in meeting that part of Oxford's considerable housing need, which could not be accommodated within the City's administrative area. This led to the Central Oxfordshire chapter of the SE Regional Plan, that was adopted by the Secretary of State of the day, including a policy for a Strategic Development Area for 4,000 houses on land South of Grenoble Road. This was then picked up through in a specific section of the draft Core Strategy enabling such an urban extension to be integrated into the fabric of the City.

This page is intentionally left blank

## **MOTIONS ON NOTICE – Labour, Liberal Democrat, Green (with amendments proposed in advance of publication of this note)**

### **(1) Privatisation of the Probation Service – (proposed by Councillor John Tanner).**

#### Labour Group Member – Motion on Notice

Oxford City Council considers the planned privatisation of 70% of the Probation Service as reckless, dangerous and costly. It is likely to increase re-offending in Oxford, could compromise the safety of local residents and ignores the expertise of the local probation service.

Coming hard on the heels of the savage cuts in Legal Aid this attack on the Probation Service underlines the Coalition's lack of interest in tackling crime. We call on the Government to withdraw its proposals and negotiate with the National Association of Probation officers for a sensible way forward.

### **(2) Low Carbon Economy (proposed by Councillor Jean Fooks).**

#### Liberal Democrat Group Member – Motion on Notice

Council notes the progress so far made to develop Oxfordshire's Low Carbon Economy, worth more than £1.15bn pa in sales, employing nearly 9000 people in more than 570 businesses.

It welcomes the award for Oxford's Community energy work, including the innovative loan of £2.3m to the Low Carbon Hub for solar panels on schools.

Council believes that Oxford can do more to develop the Low Carbon Economy, to the benefit of its citizens. It therefore asks the Executive Board to work with the LEP to:

- Investigate sources of funding for supporting researchers in winning grants from EU and UK research councils.
- Prioritise training for skilled jobs in the low carbon building sector.
- Develop the business case for investment in the Smart City concept.
- Focus support on growth sectors such as alternative fuelled vehicles.
- Appoint a 'champion' to co-ordinate all the strands necessary for success.

#### **AMENDMENT TO MOTION**

##### **Amendment from Councillor John Tanner – Motion 2**

Councillor John Tanner will propose an amendment to Motion 2 as follows:

In paragraph 3, after LEP insert 'and others' before 'to'. Change last bullet point to read: 'Become champions to ensure all the strands necessary for success'.

**The amended Motion would read:**

*Council notes the progress so far made to develop Oxfordshire's Low Carbon Economy, worth more than £1.15bn pa in sales, employing nearly 9000 people in more than 570 businesses.*

*It welcomes the award for Oxford's Community energy work, including the innovative loan of £2.3m to the Low Carbon Hub for solar panels on schools.*

*Council believes that Oxford can do more to develop the Low Carbon Economy, to the benefit of its citizens. It therefore asks the Executive Board to work with the LEP and others to:*

- *Investigate sources of funding for supporting researchers in winning grants from EU and UK research councils.*
- *Prioritise training for skilled jobs in the low carbon building sector.*
- *Develop the business case for investment in the Smart City concept.*
- *Focus support on growth sectors such as alternative fuelled vehicles.*
- ***Become champions to ensure all the strands necessary for success.***

**(3) The Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership and its possible effect on local service provision(proposed by Councillor Sam Hollick, seconded by Councillor Ruthi Brandt).**

Green Group Member – Motion on Notice

Proposals under the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) to govern trade relations between the EU and USA are currently being negotiated in secret.

UNISON believes TTIP is: “a profound threat to public services, which will not only lead to further liberalisation but will make it harder for government to regulate private companies providing public services. It could effectively prevent a future government bringing those services back in-house.”

and that it “threatens to restrict the ability of local authorities and other public bodies to source and employ locally. This undermines their ability to use public money to achieve social and environmental outcomes through their supply chain and employment practices.”

The TTIP will open up local authority procurement processes (already under scrutiny from EU Regulation) to US corporations meaning that contracts for some services could be challenged by US companies in such a way so as to undermine local democracy, threaten staff pay, the Council's commitment to a living wage and employment conditions.

Amongst its provisions, the TTIP includes an Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) mechanism which allows multinational corporate investors to challenge government actions which they perceive as threatening to their investment. The cost to the Council of fighting any such legal action, were they to be challenged, could be immense.

Council therefore RESOLVES to call upon the leader of the council and the leaders of the two opposition groups to write to Oxford's MPs and MEPs, and to the Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister, asking them to reject the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP).

**(4) Proposed by Councillor Bev Clack, seconded by Councillor Tom Hayes.**

Labour Group Member – Motion on Notice

While many ordinary people face falling household income and rising costs of living, some multinational companies are avoiding billions of pounds of tax from a tax system that fails to make them pay their fair share. Local governments in developing countries and the UK alike would benefit from a fairer tax system where multinational companies pay their fair share, enabling authorities around the world to provide quality public services. This council asks the UK government to listen to the strength of public feeling and to act to end the injustice of tax dodging by large multinational companies, in developing countries and the UK.

**(5) Municipal bonds (proposed by Councillor Jean Fooks).**

Liberal Democrat Group Member – Motion on Notice

Council notes:

- that local authorities across the country and across political parties want to have more powers to raise their own funds. This is particularly relevant at present as Governments of all complexions are likely to be reducing central grant as local demand for services increases
- that the Local Government Association believes that having a council-owned agency could save local authorities over £1bn in borrowing cost compared to the Public Loans Board
- that by July 2014 22 councils of all kinds had pledged almost £3m towards the setting up of a municipal bonds agency.

Council further notes that although the City Council is not looking to borrow at present, there could be big gains in the future from being able to access funds for capital investment in such 'invest-to-save' projects as renewable energy installation and specialist housing.

Council therefore asks the Executive Board to investigate the opportunities offered by joining the agency now rather than wait and be left behind.

**AMENDMENT TO MOTION**

**Amendment from Councillor Bob Price – Motion 5**

Councillor Bob Price will propose an amendment to Motion 5as follows:

Delete the last paragraph and replace with: ' Council asks the Chief Executive and Directors to keep under review the opportunities for cost savings that the new

agency might offer in future, and to bring back recommendations to members if and when such savings are possible.'

**The amended Motion would read:**

*Council notes:*

- *that local authorities across the country and across political parties want to have more powers to raise their own funds. This is particularly relevant at present as Governments of all complexions are likely to be reducing central grant as local demand for services increases*
- *that the Local Government Association believes that having a council-owned agency could save local authorities over £1bn in borrowing cost compared to the Public Loans Board*
- *that by July 2014 22 councils of all kinds had pledged almost £3m towards the setting up of a municipal bonds agency.*

*Council further notes that although the City Council is not looking to borrow at present, there could be big gains in the future from being able to access funds for capital investment in such 'invest-to-save' projects as renewable energy installation and specialist housing.*

***Council asks the Chief Executive and Directors to keep under review the opportunities for cost savings that the new agency might offer in future, and to bring back recommendations to members if and when such savings are possible.***

**(6) Making Oxford a Social Enterprise City(Proposed by Cllr Dick Wolff, seconded by Cllr David Thomas)**

**Green Group Member – Motion on Notice**

This Council welcomes the announcement that Oxfordshire has become the UK's first Social Enterprise County and congratulates the Oxfordshire Social Enterprise Partnership (OSEP), an innovative new partnership set up by Oxford Brookes University, the University of Oxford and Student Hubs to foster and support social enterprise locally.

This Council recognises the value of Social Enterprises to the Council and the local economy and aspires to join other cities in becoming one of the UK's first Social Enterprise Cities.

This would require, amongst other things, that the Council:

- Establish business rate policies which support long-term and sustainable social and economic value creation.
- Explore the possibility of creating "Meanwhile Enterprise Zones" and "Social Enterprise Zones".
- Review its policies to ensure that it is commissioning, procuring and buying goods and services in a manner which maximises social value (under the Social Value Act).

- Provide funding support for social innovations and social enterprises
- Look at ways and means of stimulating and supporting social enterprise in the area

Council therefore asks CEB to instruct officers to draw up a draft Social Enterprise Strategy for Oxford City.

### **AMENDMENT TO MOTION**

#### **Amendment from Councillor Bob Price – Motion 6:-**

Councillor Bob Price will propose an amendment to Motion 6 as follows:

Delete from ‘aspires to join...’ in para 2 , to the end of the second bullet point and replace with ‘agrees therefore to’.

Delete the rest of the motion and replace with the following:

- Review current policies for commissioning and buying goods and services with a view to assessing how far it would be possible to maximise social value by changes to those policies
- Review the ways in which the Council could stimulate and support social enterprises in Oxford and discuss them with OSEP with a view to publishing guidance and advice material that will promote the development of this economic sector.

#### **The amended Motion would read:**

*This Council welcomes the announcement that Oxfordshire has become the UK’s first Social Enterprise County and congratulates the Oxfordshire Social Enterprise Partnership (OSEP), an innovative new partnership set up by Oxford Brookes University, the University of Oxford and Student Hubs to foster and support social enterprise locally.*

*This Council recognises the value of Social Enterprises to the Council and the local economy and **agrees therefore to.***

***. Review current policies for commissioning and buying goods and services with a view to assessing how far it would be possible to maximise social value by changes to those policies***

***. Review the ways in which the Council could stimulate and support social enterprises in Oxford and discuss them with OSEP with a view to publishing guidance and advice material that will promote the development of this economic sector.***

This page is intentionally left blank