

# Agenda

www.oxford.gov.uk



## Scrutiny Committee

Date: **Monday 27 March 2017**

---

Time: **6.00 pm**

---

Place: **St Aldate's Room, Town Hall**

---

For any further information please contact:

**Sarah Claridge, Committee Services Officer**

Telephone: 01865 529920

Email: [democraticservices@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:democraticservices@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.

# Scrutiny Committee

## Membership

**Chair** Councillor Andrew Gant

**Vice Chair** Councillor Tom Hayes  
Councillor Jamila Begum Azad  
Councillor Nigel Chapman  
Councillor James Fry  
Councillor David Henwood  
Councillor Jennifer Pegg  
Councillor Craig Simmons  
Councillor Sian Taylor  
Councillor Marie Tidball  
Councillor Ruth Wilkinson

The quorum for this Committee is four, substitutes are permitted.

### **HOW TO OBTAIN A COPY OF THE AGENDA**

In order to reduce the use of resources, our carbon footprint and our costs we will no longer produce paper copies of agenda over and above our minimum requirements. Paper copies may be looked at the Town Hall Reception and at Customer Services, St Aldate's and at the Westgate Library

A copy of the agenda may be:-

- Viewed on our website – [mycouncil.oxford.gov.uk](http://mycouncil.oxford.gov.uk)
- Downloaded from our website
- Subscribed to electronically by registering online at [mycouncil.oxford.gov.uk](http://mycouncil.oxford.gov.uk)

# AGENDA

## Pages

### 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

### 2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

### 3 MINUTES

9 - 16

Minutes from 28 February 2017

**Recommendation:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 28 February 2017 be APPROVED as a true and accurate record.

### 4 WORK PLAN AND FORWARD PLAN

17 - 24

#### Background Information

The Scrutiny Committee operates within a work plan which has been set for the 2016/17 council year. This plan will be reviewed at every meeting so that it can be adjusted to reflect the wishes of the Committee and take account of any changes to the latest [Forward Plan](#) (which outlines decisions to be taken by the City Executive Board or Council).

#### Why is it on the agenda?

The Committee is asked to:

1. Review and note the Scrutiny work plan for the 2016/17 council year;
2. Suggest items for inclusion on the work plan for 2017/18 including priority topics for review;
3. Consider how other members will be consulted in the development of the next Scrutiny work plan;
4. Appoint a lead member to develop lines of inquiry for the local plan preferred options item.

This is also an opportunity for scrutiny panel chairs to update the committee on the work of their panels.

There have been no changes to the Forward Plan since the previous meeting.

#### Who has been invited to comment?

- Andrew Brown, Scrutiny Officer

**5 PUBLIC SAFETY AND ADDRESSING ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR ON OXFORD'S WATERWAYS. (6.10 PM) 30 MINS**

25 - 36

Contact Officer: Richard Adams, Community Safety Service Manager Tel: 01865 252283 [rjadams@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:rjadams@oxford.gov.uk)

Background Information
The Scrutiny Committee has asked for this item to be included on the agenda for pre-decision scrutiny.
Why is it on the agenda?
The City Executive Board will be asked to not progress the draft Waterways Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) instead officers are being asked to identify localised solutions to public safety concerns for issues found on the waterways. This report will be going to the CEB meeting on 6 April 2017. This is an opportunity for the Scrutiny Committee to make recommendations to the City Executive Board.
Who has been invited to comment?
Councillor Dee Sinclair, Board Member for Community Safety and Richard Adams, Community Safety Service Manager will attend to answer the Committee's questions.

**6 UPDATE ON THE CITY CENTRE AND FORESTERS TOWER PSPOS (6.40 PM) 20 MINS**

37 - 40

Contact Officer: Richard Adams, Community Safety Service Manager Tel: 01865 252283 [rjadams@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:rjadams@oxford.gov.uk)

Background Information
The Scrutiny Committee requested a report on to update them on the impacts of public spaces protection orders (PSPOs) in the city including the numbers and types of early interventions and enforcement actions.
Why is it on the agenda?
For the Scrutiny Committee to monitor the impacts of PSPOs in the city centre and Foresters Tower. The Committee is asked to note and comment on the report.
Who has been invited to comment?
Councillor Dee Sinclair, Board Member for Community Safety and Richard Adams, Community Safety Service Manager will attend to answer the Committee's questions.

**7 RECOMMENDATION MONITORING - GUEST HOUSES (7.00 PM) 20 MINS**

41 - 48

Contact Officer: Richard Adams, Community Safety Service Manager Tel: 01865 252283 [rjadams@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:rjadams@oxford.gov.uk)

Background Information
------------------------

The Scrutiny Committee requested a report on progress following the recommendations of the Guest Houses Review Group.
Why is it on the agenda?
For the Scrutiny Committee to monitor progress in improving safeguarding arrangements in city guest houses. The Committee is asked to note and comment on the report.
Who has been invited to comment?
Councillor Dee Sinclair, Board Member for Community Safety, Richard Adams, Community Safety Service Manager and Linda Ludlow, Human Exploitation Co-ordinator will attend to answer the Committee's questions.

## 8 **GRAFFITI PREVENTION (7.20 PM) 25 MINS**

49 - 52

Background Information
In April 2016 the Committee considered how the Council reacts to and removes unwanted graffiti. The Scrutiny Committee requested a separate report on proactive initiatives to prevent and reduce unwanted graffiti in the city.
Why is it on the agenda?
For the Scrutiny Committee to receive a briefing on initiatives to reduce unwanted graffiti in the city. The Committee is asked to note and comment on the report.
Who has been invited to comment?
Councillor Dee Sinclair, Board Member for Community Safety, Richard Adams, Community Safety Service Manager and Alison Cassidy, Anti-Social Behaviour Investigation Team - Case Manager will attend to answer the Committee's questions.

## 9 **OXFORD FLOOD ALLEVIATION SCHEME (7.45 PM) 25 MINS**

53 - 58

Contact Officer: Helen Vaughan-Evans, Northway & Marston Flood Scheme Project Manager [hvaughanevans@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:hvaughanevans@oxford.gov.uk)

Background Information
The Scrutiny Committee has asked for this item to be included on the agenda for pre-decision scrutiny.
Why is it on the agenda?
The City Executive Board will be asked to approve the report at its meeting on 6 April 2017. This is an opportunity for the Scrutiny Committee to make recommendations to the City Executive Board.
Who has been invited to comment?
Councillor Bob Price, Board Member for Corporate Strategy and Economic Development and Helen Vaughan-Evans, Northway & Marston Flood Scheme Project Manager will attend to answer the Committee's questions.

## **10 REPORTS FOR APPROVAL (8.10 PM) 15 MINS**

59 - 90

Contact Officer: Andrew Brown, Scrutiny Officer Tel: 01865 252230  
abrown2@oxford.gov.uk

The Committee is asked to approve the following reports for submission to the City Executive Board on 6 April 2016:

- Health inequalities (report of the Health Inequalities Panel)
- University housing needs (report of the Housing Panel)
- Air quality
- Workplace Parking levies
- Police and Crime Panel

## **11 MATTERS EXEMPT FROM PUBLICATION**

If the Committee wishes to exclude the press and the public from the meeting during consideration of any of the items on the exempt from publication part of the agenda, it will be necessary for the Committee to pass a resolution in accordance with the provisions of Paragraph 21(1)(b) of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2000 on the grounds that their presence could involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as described in specific paragraphs of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

The Committee may maintain the exemption 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.

## **12 EXEMPT APPENDIX 1\_ OXFORD FLOOD ALLEVIATION SCHEME**

91 - 92

Contact Officer: Helen Vaughan-Evans, Northway & Marston Flood Scheme  
Project Manager [hvaughanevans@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:hvaughanevans@oxford.gov.uk)

## **13 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

Meetings are scheduled as followed:

### **Scrutiny Committee**

2 May 2017  
6 June 2017 – Special for Local Plan  
8 June 2017  
4 July 2017  
31 July 2017 - Provisional

All meetings start at 6.00 pm.

**Standing Panels**

Housing Standing Panel – 26 April 2017, 5pm

Finance Standing Panel – 29 March 2017, 5.30pm

## **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.



## MINUTES OF THE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

**Tuesday 28 February 2017**

www.oxford.gov.uk



**COUNCILLORS PRESENT:** Councillors Gant (Chair), Hayes (Vice-Chair), Chapman, Fry, Henwood, Pegg, Simmons and Taylor.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Councillor John Tanner (A Clean and Green Oxford) and Councillor Dee Sinclair (Community Safety)

**INVITEES AND OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Martin Kraftl (Oxfordshire County Council), Stewart Wilson (Oxfordshire County Council) and Clare Gray (Police and Crime Panel Scrutiny Officer)

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Jo Colwell (Service Manager Environmental Sustainability), Andrew Brown (Scrutiny Officer) and Sarah Claridge (Committee Services Officer)

### **89. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Wilkinson, Councillor Coulter, Councillor Azad and Councillor Tidball

### **90. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest made.

### **91. WORK PLAN AND FORWARD PLAN**

The Chair presented the report.

#### **Work Plan**

The Committee reviewed and noted the following changes in its work plan for the 2016/17 council year.

- Agreed to schedule a special meeting for the Local Plan on 6 June 2017, in addition to a normal meeting on 8 June.

- The Scrutiny Committee appointed a new sub-committee to monitor the shareholder function. Cllr Simmons offered to give his group's seat to Cllr Fry to provide a link with Audit and Governance. The Committee agreed the sub-committee's membership to be Cllr Gant (Chair of Scrutiny Committee, Cllr Hayes\* (Vice Chair of Scrutiny Committee), Cllr Henwood (Chair of Housing) and Cllr Fry.

*\*After the meeting, Cllr Hayes advised that he would not be able to take up this seat so it was offered back to Cllr Simmons, who accepted.*

## **Forward Plan**

The Committee requested the following items from the Forward Plan

- Oxford Flood Alleviation -March
- Community Leases - May

## **92. REPORT BACK ON RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Chair presented the report on recommendations.

Cllr Simmons explained that all the recommendations on the budget were agreed except one.

The Chair said that all the other report's recommendations were accepted except the one about replacing the cycling signs on the Cowley Road. Cllr Simmons said he would like to look further into the reason why the signs on the Cowley Road hadn't been replaced as the Ministry of Transport approved them at the time.

The Scrutiny Officer agreed to circulate the advice note he had received from Direct Services to the committee.

## **93. AIR QUALITY**

Councillor John Tanner, Board Member for a Clean, Green Oxford presented the report. He said the County Council was committed to a zero emission zone by 2020. The City and County councils had appointed a consultant to look into practical ways to achieve this in the city centre. Ideas are still being formulated. When the low emission zone was introduced it was buses that caused most of the air quality problems but they have mostly been changed to produce only low emission.

Martin Kraftl from Oxfordshire County Council addressed the committee. The County's Local Transport Strategy 2015-2030 plans to start implementing a zero emission zone in 2020. How quickly it can be rolled out will depend on what vehicles will be affected. Improved technology will assist the move to zero emission.

The Environmental Sustainability Manager said that the City monitors air quality based on DEFRA advice. Diffusion tubes are placed in areas in the city known to have poor air quality. These are places with high levels of traffic close to residential homes and businesses. There are 75 diffusion tubes in the city which officers check every month and analyse results. Data needs to be collected, analysed and audited over a 12 month period to show the long term trend of air quality at the site. The exact location of tubes is listed in the air quality report.

The Committee asked why there were so many diffusion tubes in close proximity in the city centre and why none were positioned near the bypass.

Cllr Tanner said it was important to have lots of diffusion tubes in the city centre to monitor the situation main street by main street. Often 2 diffusion tubes were put close together to act as a control. We need to monitor the different sites to inform the County Council of areas of concern.

There is no evidence to show that air quality from traffic on the ring road is as bad as the city centre.

Cllr Simmons asked what specific steps could be taken to improve air quality in the worst areas, e.g. St. Clements and are there plans for additional monitoring or public signage? Cllr Tanner said he'd much prefer to focus on the causes of the problem rather than tell people how bad it is.

The Environmental Sustainability Manager said that daily air quality levels are already available on the Council's website.

Cllr Simmons said that as a planning authority we don't put any mitigating measures (in regards to air pollution) on applications approved on sites in high air pollution areas ie Westgate or Northern Gateway<sup>1</sup>.

Martin Krafft from Oxfordshire County Council said that the Transport Strategy includes working on creating better cycling and walking routes in Headington. There is a huge amount to be done but we must be doing something right as there is 25% less traffic in the city than there was 20 years ago.

Cllr Simmons asked how the City Council comments on the County's Local Transport Strategy were taken. Cllr Tanner said the County agreed with the City Council's comments. It's going to take a lot of co-operation to deal with the ongoing problems. If we clean up the city centre it will have a knock on effect in other areas of city.

The Committee asked about the reason why Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) levels had risen since 2014. The Environmental Sustainability Manager said that road works contributed to some of these increases – eg the re-development of Frideswide Square. However the long term trend is reduction.

Is NOx contributed to one type of fuel?

---

<sup>1</sup> The Environmental Sustainability Manager confirmed after the meeting that the Council does require mitigation where air quality is forecast to be impacted and we did secure measures and a full air quality action plan for the Westgate.

Cllr Tanner said that all combustion engines produce NOx emissions that are harmful to people's health however diesel produces more. The government needs to stop tax incentives for diesel vehicles. It should give tax incentives for electric vehicles.

The Chair said the City Council has the power to adopt parking zones with differentiated charges. We could offer free parking for electric vehicles (up to 5 spaces). Cllr Tanner said it would be hard to enforce a differentiated parking zone and he would prefer focusing on the prime cause of the problem and how to improve air quality in the city.

Cllr Chapman said he would like to see officers review the measures in the City's Air Quality Annual Status report for the measures that have not progressed to date. The key performance indications also need to be provided. Cllr Tanner to progress.

The Scrutiny Committee made the following recommendations to CEB

1. Consider implementing a differentiated parking charges for car-parking in the city to offer cheaper car parking for electric vehicles
2. As part of the Local plan review to consider a policy that mitigate the effect of worsening air quality for development in poor air quality zones of the city.
3. For officers to review the feasibility and impact of measures in the City's Air Quality Annual Status report that have not progressed to date.

#### **94. WORKPLACE PARKING LEVIES**

Stewart Wilson from Oxfordshire County Council explained that the County's cabinet had approved the work for a congestion charge and a workplace levy at its last meeting. Officers are at the pre-planning phase of the project and haven't started engagement yet.

Nottingham City Council had used the money raised through a workplace levy to fund a tram system and connected bus service. Overall private vehicle numbers are down. Oxfordshire County Council has had a discussion with a previous director of Nottingham to understand issues.

Cllr Taylor asked how work place levies operate for people who need to take their car for work uses. Mr Wilson said that Nottingham's levy has exemptions eg for hospital workers and places with fewer than 10 workers. Not sure yet whether Oxfordshire will have any exemptions.

Cllr Fry asked what the charge would be. Nottingham charges around £375 – £400 per space per year. Employers are liable for the charge and it is up to

them if they pass it onto their employees. Businesses only pay for spaces they use.

Cllr Henwood said he was concerned with people parking their car in Cowley and then catching the bus into the city. Would a city centre levy be followed up with a citywide CPZ? Mr Wilson said it was something to consider, the proposed levy was likely to be applicable to the whole of Oxford.

Cllr Chapman said that there will have to be significantly better public transport to convince people that a levy was a good idea.

Cllr Tanner said that if we do nothing parking and traffic jams will get worse. Its unlikely things will improve unless the County can bring in the levy to pay for the new schemes. eg high speed rapid buses.

We need to ask employers “do they want workers to come to work on time?” If yes, then they need to pay for dead space of car parks for more productive means. Businesses can avoid it by not providing car parking.

Cllr Fry asked if we could price variations by zones eg higher in city centre, than surrounds. Mr Wilson said it was worth considering, however businesses might move out of the city to surrounding areas to avoid the higher costs. This would mean the city could lose vitality.

Cllr Simmons asked why the County was looking at a workplace levy and not congestion charge. Mr Wilson said the County Council was looking at both. Initial report is that a congestion charge wouldn't have the same impact or benefits as a levy. A congestion charge costs a lot to run. The County's focus is to raise money to improve transport links into city.

The Scrutiny Committee made the following recommendations to CEB

1. Encourage continued exploration of both a congestion charge and a workplace parking levy.
2. Welcomes the additional money that a levy charge would bring to improve the transport structures in the City
3. Need to manage the Impact on the surrounding areas of a levy scheme and consider the case for additional controlled parking zones.

## **95. POLICE AND CRIME PANEL UPDATE**

Cllr Dee Sinclair, Board Member for Community Safety and Oxford City Council's representative on Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel (PCP) presented the report.

She explained that the Panel consists of 20 members from across the Thames Valley, 18 councillors and 2 independents. The Independent members have backgrounds in victim support and cybercrime. The panel is predominately made up of conservative members and meets in Aylesbury 6 times a year. Each meeting is themed.

The PCC has appointed Matt Barber, Leader of the Vale of White Horse as deputy. The position of deputy has been around since 2012 but the panel has not yet been informed of Mr Barber's specific responsibilities.

Clare Gray, Police and Crime Panel Scrutiny Officer said the Thames Valley PCC budget had reduced by £88m over 6 years, a 25% saving of overall budget. Part of the budget is to consider reducing the assets of the police force eg St Aldate's police station with proviso that there is a city centre police presence.

The Panel ran a taxi licensing themed meeting where they looked at taxi licensing issues across the Thames Valley and discussed the need for a regional database. The PCC is trying to raise the issues of the taxi licensing regime at the national level but is not getting much response.

Cllr Sinclair said she uses the panel to inform the representatives from the other districts of the issues faced in the city ie safeguarding, human trafficking. However the Panel's powers are limited by the legislation and can only bring things to the attention of the PCC. There is very limited public interest in the process.

Cllr Henwood asked whether there were plans to have a themed meeting on safeguarding across the area. Cllr Sinclair said that the Panel's Scrutiny Officer could propose it but safeguarding is touched on in a lot of what we already do.

The Scrutiny Committee agreed the following recommendations to CEB

That CEB suggest to the PCC that the Panel meetings are rotated around the Thames Valley to encourage public engagement and to focus on local issues.

That the PCC meetings are promoted through council media outlets.

## **96. PERFORMANCE MONITORING - QUARTER 3**

Cllr Fry, Lead Member for Performance monitoring presented the report. He said he did get an officer response from the previous scrutiny comments. However there are still a lot of issues with the way that performance is monitored and presented in these reports.

He made the following comments on the performance report:

- BI002a and B1002b – why are the targets 0?
- CE002 – commentary – why can't Finance provide a figure for income excluding VAT – not very useful?

- CS003 – Presentation of information – why does commentary have to fill 2 pages.
- PC027 – The result is 73,390 but the target is 420. And the result from last year was 2,500. It should be explained that the target is an error.
- PC004 – Grow in level of active participation in dance – why so specific? Would it not be better to measure How much people are using leisure centres.
- B1001 – commentary states they have not received any data for several months – why doesn't the officer do more to find it out?
- Indicators that are reported only annually (LG002) need to be presented in a separate report to quarterly one.
- There's a real mix of comparisons some indicators compare performance with month before others compare with the same month of year before, which was often more useful.

Cllr Simmons said that the local business spend is off target and needs to be raised with CEB

Cllr Hayes said that it feels that a strategy is developed, and the evaluation and monitoring measures are done as an afterthought. Is there a good reason for monitoring to be done by one individual?. Is training given to assist these officers?

Cllr Pegg said it appears to be a huge time serving exercise. People need to consider it important and not try and fit everything into the same box.

Cllr Henwood suggested that the relevant performance indicators should be presented at the beginning of all reports going to members.

The Scrutiny Officer explained that collating the performance monitoring report is the responsibility of the Head of Business Improvement.

Cllr Hayes said it was very important for officers to do this well and for scrutiny to see these reports.

#### Recommendation

Cllrs Fry and Chapman to meet with the Head of Business Improvement and discuss their concerns and how they reports could be improved.

## 97. MINUTES

The Committee resolved to APPROVE the minutes of the meeting held on 30 January as a true and accurate record.

Cllr Pegg asked that this item be moved to the top of agenda for future meetings. The Committee agreed.

**98. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

The next meeting is scheduled for 27 March 2017.

**The meeting started at 6.00 pm and ended at 8.11 pm**



## SCRUTINY WORK PLAN

### March 2017 - April 2017

Published on: 17/03/17

The Scrutiny Committee agrees a work plan every year detailing selected issues that affect Oxford or its inhabitants. Time is allowed within this plan to consider topical issues as they arise throughout the year as well as decisions to be taken by the City Executive Board. This document represents the work of scrutiny for the remainder of the 2016-17 council year and will be reviewed monthly by the Scrutiny Committee.

The work plan is based on suggestions received from all elected members and senior council officers. Members of the public can also contribute topics for inclusion in the scrutiny work plan by completing and submitting our [suggestion form](#). See our [get involved webpage](#) for further details of how you can participate in the work of scrutiny.

The following criteria will be used by the Scrutiny Committee to evaluate and prioritise suggested topics:

- *Is the issue controversial / of significant public interest?*
- *Is it an area of high expenditure?*
- *Is it an essential service / corporate priority?*
- *Can Scrutiny influence and add value?*

Some topics will be considered at Scrutiny Committee meetings and others will be delegated to two standing panels. Items for more detailed review will be considered by time-limited review groups.

The Committee will review the Council's [Forward Plan](#) at each meeting and decide which executive decisions it wishes to comment on before the decision is made. The Council also has a "call in" process which allows decisions made by the City Executive Board to be reviewed by the Scrutiny Committee before they are implemented.

### Scrutiny Committee and Standing Panel responsibility and membership

Committee / Panel	Remit	Nominated councillors
Scrutiny Committee	Overall management of the Council's scrutiny function.	Cllrs Azad, Chapman, Coulter, Fry, Gant (Chair), Hayes, Henwood, Pegg, Simmons, Taylor, Tidball & Wilkinson
Finance Panel	Finance and budgetary issues and decisions	Cllrs Fooks, Fry, Simmons (Chair) & Taylor
Housing Panel	Strategic housing and landlord issues and decisions	Cllrs Goff, Henwood (Chair), Pegg, Sanders, Thomas & Wade, Geno Humphrey (tenant co-optee)
Scrutiny Shareholder Panel	To scrutinise shareholder decisions relating to wholly Council-owned companies.	Cllrs Fry, Gant, Henwood & Simmons

### Current and planned review groups and one-off panels

Topic	Scope	Nominated councillors
Budget review 2017/18	To review the Council's 2017/18 draft budget and medium term financial strategy	Cllrs Fooks, Fry, Simmons (Chair) & Taylor
Devolution plans for Oxfordshire review	To scrutinise devolution proposals for Oxfordshire	Cllrs Coulter, Gant, Hayes, Simmons & Tidball (Chair)
Health inequalities (one- off panel)	To consider the council's response to the recommendations of the Independent Commission on Health inequalities	Cllrs Coulter (Chair), Taylor, Thomas, Wade

### Indicative timings of 2016/17 review panels

Scrutiny Review	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March	April	May
Devolution plans for Oxfordshire										
Budget review 2017/18										

	Scoping
	Evidence gathering
	Reporting

## SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

### 27 MARCH 2017 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS

19

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Waterways Public Space Protection Order	Yes	To update the Board on the outcome of phase one of the consultation process and proposals for the way forward.	Community Safety	Richard Adams, Community Safety Service Manager
Public Spaces Protection Orders	No	To monitor the impacts of PSPOs the city, including the numbers and types of early interventions and enforcement actions.	Community Safety	Richard Adams, Community Safety Service Manager
Graffiti prevention	No	To consider the appreciative inquiry and focus group around graffiti and other initiatives to solve the issues long term.	Climate Change and Cleaner Greener Oxford	Liz Jones, Interim ASBIT Team Leader
Recommendation Monitoring - Guest Houses	No	To monitor progress and implementation following the recommendations of the Guest Houses Review Group to the City Executive Board in December 2015.	Corporate Strategy and Economic Development	Richard Adams, Community Safety Service Manager
Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To update Members on the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme;</li> <li>To request approval to revise Oxford City Councils' project contribution;</li> <li>To request delegated authority to enter a funding agreement with Environment Agency.</li> </ul>	Corporate Strategy and Economic Development	Helen Vaughan-Evans, Northway & Marston Flood Scheme Project Manager

### 2 MAY 2017 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Oxford Railway Station Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)	Yes	To seek approval to consult on the draft Oxford Railway Station Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).	Planning and Regulatory Services	Fiona Piercy, Regeneration Programme Director

Fusion Lifestyle's Annual Service Plan 2017/18	Yes	The report will recommend that the City Executive Board endorse Fusion Lifestyle's Annual Service Plan for the management of the Council's leisure facilities for 2017/18.	Leisure, Parks and Sport	Lucy Cherry, Leisure and Performance Manager
City Centre Strategy	Yes	To approve the strategy which aims to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• create and promote a strong investment proposition</li> <li>• facilitate ongoing dialogue with those involved in the management and future of the city centre</li> <li>• provide a framework for collaboration and action</li> <li>• assist in the allocation of resources</li> </ul>	Planning and Regulatory Services, Corporate Strategy and Economic Development	Fiona Piercy, Regeneration Programme Director
Community leases	Yes	This report requests CEB to agree an approach to community leases	Culture and Communities	Ian Brooke, Head of Community Services
Safeguarding Report 2017/18	Yes	An annual report to monitor the progress made on Oxford City Council's Section 11 Self-assessment Action Plan 2016-2017 and to approve the Action Plan for 2017-2018.	Finance, Asset Management and Public Health	Val Johnson, Policy and Partnerships Team Leader

## 6 JUNE 2017 - PROVISIONAL REPORT

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Local Plan Preferred Options	Yes	Progress of the review of the Local Plan	Planning and Regulatory Services	Sarah Harrison, Senior Planner

## 8 JUNE 2017 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Assessing disabled impacts in planning	No	To consider how the Council fulfils its duty to assess the impacts on disabled people of new developments and changes of use, including for businesses and private and social sector housing.	Planning and Regulatory Services	Patsy Dell, Head of Planning & Regulatory Services
Design Review Panel	No	To consider the work and effectiveness of the Oxford Design Review Panel.	Planning and Regulatory Services	Patsy Dell, Head of Planning & Regulatory Services
Planning and Regulatory Services improvement plan	No	To update the committee on the progress of implementing the improvement plan for Planning and Regulatory Services.	Planning and Regulatory Services	Patsy Dell, Head of Planning & Regulatory Services
Grant Allocations to Community & Voluntary Orgs 2016/17	Yes	A monitoring report on the reported achievements resulting from grants allocations will be submitted to the City Executive Board in June 2017.	Customer and Corporate Services, Culture and Communities	Julia Tomkins, Grants and External Funding Officer

## 7 SEPTEMBER 2017 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
East Oxford Community Centre improvement scheme	Yes	To present an improvement scheme for the East Oxford Community Centre following public consultation.	Culture and Communities	Vicky Trietline, Development Project Management Surveyor
Commissioned Advice Strategy 2018-2021	Yes	To update the Board on the progress made in developing a new commissioned advice strategy during 2017/18	Customer and Corporate Services	Paul Wilding, Programme Manager Revenue & Benefits
Sustainability Strategy 2017	Yes	The report will recommend approval of the draft strategy for public consultation.	A Clean and Green Oxford	Mai Jarvis, Environmental Quality Team Manager
Governance implications of Council-owned companies	No	To receive an update following the Audit and Governance Committee's consideration of the long term risks and governance implications associated with Council-owned companies.	Corporate Strategy and Economic Development	Nigel Kennedy, Head of Financial Services.

## SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - TO BE SCHEDULED

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Disabled Students' Allowance	No	To consider the impacts of cuts to Disabled Students' Allowance on disabled students in the City.	Corporate Strategy and Economic Development	Andrew Brown, Scrutiny Officer
NHS Sustainability and Transformation Plan	No	To receive a briefing on the emerging STP for Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West.	Finance, Asset Management and Public Health	Andrew Brown, Scrutiny Officer

## FINANCE PANEL

22

### 29 MARCH 2017 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
The implications of Brexit	No	To consider an updated report on the impacts of Brexit on the City Council.	Finance, Asset Management and Public Health	Nigel Kennedy, Head of Financial Services
Fundamental service reviews	No	To consider the outcomes of comprehensive reviews of a number of service area budgets undertaken as part of this year's budget setting process.	Finance, Asset Management and Public Health	Jan Heath, Business Development and Support Manager

## HOUSING PANEL

### 26 APRIL 2017 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Great Estates update	No	To receive an update on progress made in developing masterplans for estates and working up and delivering an improvement programme.	Housing	Martin Shaw, Property Services Manager
Empty garages and former garage sites	No	To receive an update on how the Council deals with empty garages and former garage sites.	Housing	Martin Shaw, Property Services Manager
Empty Property Strategy	No	To receive a briefing on approaches to dealing with empty properties ahead of a refresh of the Council's Empty Property Strategy 2013-18.	Housing	Frances Evans, Strategy and Service Development Manager
Tower block refurbishment	No	To receive a progress update on the Tenant Scrutiny Panel's review of the tower block refurbishment project.	Housing	Stephen Clarke, Head of Housing and Property

### HOUSING PANEL - TO BE SCHEDULED

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Leaseholder relationships	No	To consider relationships with leaseholders including the views of individual leaseholders.	Housing	Bill Graves, Landlord Services Manager
Private sector licensing	Yes	To pre-scrutinise any decisions on proposals to extend licensing to the non-HMO private rented sector.	Planning and Regulatory	Ian Wright, Environmental Health Service Manager
Flexible tenancies	Yes	To pre-scrutinise any decisions on the local implementation of plans to prevent councils in England from offering secure tenancies for life to new council tenants in most circumstances.	Housing	Bill Graves, Landlord Services Manager
Management of void properties	No	To consider how the Council manages properties that become void.	Housing	Bill Graves, Landlord Services Manager

This page is intentionally left blank



**To:** City Executive Board  
**Date:** 6 April 2017  
**Report of:** Executive Director for Community Services  
**Title of Report:** Public safety and addressing anti-social behaviour on Oxford's Waterways

Summary and recommendations	
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	Report back on the outcome of the consultation regarding the proposal to make a Public Spaces Protection Order in respect of the waterways of Oxford and make recommendations as to the way forward.
<b>Key decision:</b>	Yes
<b>Executive Board Member:</b>	Cllr Dee Sinclair, Board Member for Community Safety
<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Strong, Active Communities
<b>Policy Framework:</b>	Corporate Enforcement Policy
<b>Recommendations:</b> That the City Executive Board resolves to:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>not progress</b> the proposal for a Public Spaces Protection Order for the generality of the waterways of Oxford;</li> <li>2. <b>Commission</b> officers to develop localised solutions to public safety concerns for four identified priority areas;</li> <li>3. <b>Commission</b> officers to further develop policy proposals that will address public safety and antisocial behaviour problems and improve public enjoyment of the city's waterways resources.</li> </ol>	

Appendices	
Appendix 1	Overview of the four areas of concern
Appendix 2	Equalities Impact Assessment

## Introduction and background

1. Oxford City Council began preliminary consultation on a draft Public Spaces Protection Order for the waterways of Oxford in May 2016. The draft Order proposed area included the parts of the River Thames and its main tributaries, the

River Cherwell and the Oxford Canal that lie within Oxford City Council's boundaries.

### **Consultation**

2. The consultation process sought views on the proposal and to elicit any further evidence of behaviour relevant to the proposed restrictions.
3. The consultation process was split into two phases. Phase 1 sought the views of key stakeholders who:
  - owned land next to the waterways (riparian land owners)
  - lived on the waterways
  - clubs or businesses who relied on the waterways
  - statutory partners involved in the management of the waterways or in addressing behaviour on the waterways.
4. Phase 2 of the consultation was to involve a public survey.
5. In September 2016, Phase 1 of the consultation process was extended to February 2017 to allow officers more time to engage with these issues. Councillors visited the waterways, hosted by the Environment Agency, to gain some first-hand knowledge of the issues facing this important Oxford feature.

### **Consultation analysis**

6. Over thirty responses were received. In addition a series of meetings took place with boat dwellers, businesses and riparian owners. Many of the responses raised concerns not directly concerned with public safety or anti-social behaviour.
7. Analysis of the consultation found that the evidence does not support the proposal for a PSPO for the Waterways, both in terms of the extensive area covered and its suggested prohibitions. Analysis of the engagements supports the view that the nature of problems identified differs across locations and requires bespoke solutions, many of which are already available through existing legislation. Other findings included:
  - There are a wide range of waterways concerns and opportunities including mooring provision, carbon emissions, public safety, safeguarding, tourism and community engagement.
  - A small number of locations on the waterways generate most public safety concerns. These concerns include alcohol-related disorder, unauthorised mooring and camping, fire lighting, vulnerable adults living on poorly maintained boats, squalid living conditions, dog fouling, fly-tipping, drug misuse and the safety of river users.
  - The need to improve safety and safeguarding of the vulnerable on and near the waterways was accepted by most respondents; there were widely differing views on the methods to achieve this.
  - Riparian landowners who responded tended to be in favour of a PSPO that addressed mooring and anti-social behaviour affecting their land.

- The Oxford Canal is owned and managed by the Canal and Rivers Trust (CaRT) who had concerns over all the prohibitions in the draft PSPO on their land, due to lack of evidence or the use of existing interventions.
- Oxford has numerous riparian owners and the added complexity that much of the River Thames south of Folly Bridge to the Southern By-pass is unregistered in terms of ownership and interests.
- The provision of additional temporary and permanent mooring sites is proposed as being integral to addressing the safety issues in the locations set out in this report.

## **Proposals**

8. The consultation process has been very fruitful and leads to a conclusion that a blanket Public Spaces Protection Order for the Waterways is not necessary or desirable to deal with the identified issues of anti-social behaviour, public safety and health. It is therefore proposed that the draft PSPO is not progressed and the consultation process should not continue onto Phase 2.
9. The work on the draft Order has indicated that there are four specific areas in which there are significant problems of public safety and anti-social behaviour, and it is proposed to work with partners and stakeholders to develop localised action plans to deal with the problems that have been identified. Consideration will also be given to the possible displacement effects of any local interventions. The four areas identified are:
  - Castle Mill Stream
  - Aristotle Lane
  - Aston's Eyot
  - The south bank of the River Thames between Folly Bridge and the southern Ring Road
10. In addressing the problems in these areas a range of possible interventions will be considered, including area-specific Public Spaces Protection Orders, referrals to support agencies, statutory abatement notices, Community Protection Notices, injunctions, the removal of derelict vessels, the regulation of mooring locations and boat licensing enforcement.
11. In tandem with these area reviews, it is proposed to undertake a review of the ways in which the city's waterways are being used and how the opportunities which they present could be developed. This review will include carbon emissions, public safety, safeguarding, tourism and community engagement and an assessment of the temporary and permanent mooring locations.
12. The timetable for addressing the four areas listed in paragraph 9, and the undertaking of a review into the wider use of the waterways is dependent upon identifying resources to take this work forward.
13. The Community Safety Team has begun initial discussions with the Friends of Aston's Eyot and the team are also taking forward the project at Castle Mill Stream. Aristotle Lane will be dealt with using a case management approach where there is evidence of environmental nuisance. The Private Sector Safety Team provides this service.

14. The tow path area from Folly Bridge to the southern bypass is a significantly larger project that will need consultation with a wide range of interested parties. This is the most significant recreational area of the waterways in Oxford and public safety interventions must address the needs of all river users in this busy section of the river.

### **Financial implications**

15. There are no financial implications at present. Work within the areas identified will be funded through existing budgets. If further financial considerations are identified the appropriate report will be presented.

### **Legal issues**

16. There are no legal issues.

### **Equalities impact**

17. An Equalities Impact Assessment can be found in Appendix 2. Whilst it is not possible to provide an in-depth assessment of the equalities concerns relating to each of the localities identified, early indications are that persons affected by the reports proposals will include those with vulnerabilities or proscribed characteristics.

<b>Report author</b>	Richard Adams
Job title	Community Safety Manager
Service area or department	Community Services
Telephone	01865 252283
e-mail	<a href="mailto:rjadams@oxford.gov.uk">rjadams@oxford.gov.uk</a>

**Background Papers:** None

## **Appendix 1: Overview of the four areas of concern.**

### **Castle Mill Stream**

#### *Current concerns*

- Vulnerable adults living on poorly maintained and potentially unsafe boats
- Environmental issues including dog fouling, fly tipping, broken glass
- Drug use, discarded needles and drug dealing

#### *Intervention options*

- Land ownership to be registered by land owner.
- Work is undertaken to improve the condition of the area including the removal of dilapidated boats.
- Case by case assessment of residents' vulnerability and appropriate support put in place.
- Boat safety to be assessed and appropriate insurance, safety certificates and licensed to be checked.
- Community Protection Notices served for environmental issues including detritus in the water.
- Application of the City Centre PSPO where applicable
- Enforcement of no camping in the area

### **Aristotle Lane**

#### *Current concerns*

- Complaints from residents of smoke and fumes from boats on the mooring.

#### *Intervention options*

- Quiet Zone in place and managed by the CaRT
- Diffusion tube in place to assess pollution levels.
- Statutory nuisance notices served if applicable.

### **Aston's Eyot**

An area owned by Christ Church, accessible by the public for recreation.

#### *Current concerns*

- Unauthorised mooring and camping
- Alcohol consumption and associated litter
- Drug misuse
- Unauthorised fires and destruction of habitat
- Unauthorised camping

#### *Intervention options*

- Restrictions on unauthorised camping, unauthorised mooring, unauthorised fires, alcohol consumption and litter.
- Actions for trespass by the landowner

### **Folly Bridge – Iffley Lock**

A long stretch of the River Thames south bank containing a mix of registered and unregistered land.

#### *Current concerns*

- Alcohol-related disorder
- Safety of rowers training on the water due to double mooring and lack of access to the water from the towpath for throw lines
- Noise issues affecting residents
- Anti-social behaviour and criminal activities.
- Vulnerable adults living on poorly. maintained and potentially unsafe boats
- Lack of mooring access for visiting vessels
- Extensive “permanent” mooring location with no services contrary to planning guidance on the suitability of mainline river residential moorings.

#### *Intervention options*

- A PSPO for this stretch of the water to regularise long term mooring, including free mooring for a reasonable period on unregistered towpath in accordance with the Thames Conservancy Act 1932 Part III, s79. Consultation on the Order would need to include both banks of the river due to the high risk of displacement.
- Land owners to consider using a company to manage their permitted mooring times.
- Community Protection Notices, injunctions and other legislative actions against individuals who cause anti-social behaviour and criminal activities.
- Case by case assessment of residents’ vulnerability and appropriate support put in place.
- Boat safety to be assessed and appropriate insurance, safety certificates and licensed to be checked.
- Planning enforcement options to be assessed.



## Form to be used for the Full Equalities Impact Assessment

<b>Service Area:</b> Community Services		<b>Section:</b> Community Safety	<b>Date of Initial assessment:</b> 14 February 2017	<b>Key Person responsible for assessment:</b> Richard Adams	<b>Date assessment commenced:</b> 14 February 2017
<b>Name of Policy to be assessed:</b>			Draft Waterways Public Spaces Protection Order		
<b>1. In what area are there concerns that the policy could have a differential impact</b>			<b>Race</b>	✓ <b>Disability</b>	<b>Age</b>
			<b>Gender reassignment</b>	<b>Religion or Belief</b>	<b>Sexual Orientation</b>
			<b>Sex</b>	<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b>	<b>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnership</b>
<b>Other strategic/ equalities considerations</b>			✓ <b>Safeguarding/ Welfare of Children and vulnerable adults</b>	✓ <b>Mental Wellbeing/ Community Resilience</b>	
<b>2. Background:</b>  Give the background information to the policy and the perceived problems with the policy which are the reason for the Impact Assessment.			<p>Oxford City Council consulted on a draft Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) for the waterways of Oxford, restricting a number of behaviours. A breach of the order is a criminal offence that can result in the offender being reported to the court or the breach being discharged through a £100 Fixed Penalty Notice.</p> <p>This CEB report recommends not progressing the proposal for a Public Spaces Protection Order for the generality of the waterways of Oxford, and recommends taking a bespoke approach to localities where public safety or anti-social behaviour is a concern. This approach is likely to have an impact</p>		

## Appendix 2: Equalities Impact Assessment – Public Safety on Oxford’s waterways

	<p>on protected characteristics or other strategic equalities considerations. Without further information on the individuals involved it is hard to say the extent to which these characteristics could be impacted. Operating in accordance with the Council’s Corporate Enforcement Policy, all activities will need to consider the vulnerabilities and needs of those affected, including the safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults, mental well-being and community resilience, and disability. The assessment makes due regard to whether consultation on the draft order will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited under the Equalities Act;</li> <li>• Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;</li> <li>• Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Methodology and Sources of Data:</b></p> <p>The methods used to collect data and what sources of data</p>	<p>Data used to identify the types of behaviours within the proposed PSPO has come from complaints to the City Council and police, and responses to the consultation. In addition, site visits by officers have further identified the needs of some individuals.</p>
<p><b>4. Consultation</b></p> <p>This section should outline all the consultation that has taken place on the EIA. It should include the following.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why you carried out the consultation.</li> <li>• Details about how you went about it.</li> <li>• A summary of the replies you received from people you consulted.</li> </ul>	<p>Implementation of a Public Spaces Protection Order requires public consultation as set out in the Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014.</p> <p>The consultation methodology suggested is described in the reported and agreed by the city council’s Public Involvement Board.</p> <p>This assessment does not offer a comprehensive insight into the needs and considerations of the persons affected as details of those have not been identified.</p>



## Appendix 2: Equalities Impact Assessment – Public Safety on Oxford’s waterways

33

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>An assessment of your proposed policy (or policy options) in the light of the responses you received.</li><li>A statement of what you plan to do next</li></ul>				
<b>5. Assessment of Impact:</b> Provide details of the assessment of the policy on the six primary equality strands. There may have been other groups or individuals that you considered. Please also consider whether the policy, strategy or spending decisions could have an impact on safeguarding and / or the welfare of children and vulnerable adults	<b>Bespoke local interventions to address public safety and anti-social behaviour.</b> We know that a number of people resident in the localities identified as contained risks to public safety or anti-social behaviour have protected characteristics as set out below.			
	<table><tr><td><b>Race</b> Neutral</td><td><b>Disability</b> Negative Mental health considerations will be taken into account by officers.</td><td><b>Age</b> Neutral</td></tr></table>	<b>Race</b> Neutral	<b>Disability</b> Negative Mental health considerations will be taken into account by officers.	<b>Age</b> Neutral
	<b>Race</b> Neutral	<b>Disability</b> Negative Mental health considerations will be taken into account by officers.	<b>Age</b> Neutral	
	<table><tr><td><b>Gender reassignment</b> Neutral</td><td><b>Religion or Belief</b> Neutral</td><td><b>Sexual Orientation</b> Neutral</td></tr></table>	<b>Gender reassignment</b> Neutral	<b>Religion or Belief</b> Neutral	<b>Sexual Orientation</b> Neutral
	<b>Gender reassignment</b> Neutral	<b>Religion or Belief</b> Neutral	<b>Sexual Orientation</b> Neutral	
<table><tr><td><b>Sex</b> Neutral</td><td><b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b> Neutral</td><td><b>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnership</b> Neutral</td></tr></table>	<b>Sex</b> Neutral	<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b> Neutral	<b>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnership</b> Neutral	
<b>Sex</b> Neutral	<b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b> Neutral	<b>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnership</b> Neutral		
<table><tr><td><b>Safeguarding/ Welfare of Children and vulnerable adults</b>  Negative Mental health considerations and other vulnerabilities will be taken into account by officers.</td><td colspan="2"><b><i>Mental Wellbeing/ Community Resilience</i></b>  Negative Mental health considerations will be taken into account by officers.</td></tr></table>	<b>Safeguarding/ Welfare of Children and vulnerable adults</b>  Negative Mental health considerations and other vulnerabilities will be taken into account by officers.	<b><i>Mental Wellbeing/ Community Resilience</i></b>  Negative Mental health considerations will be taken into account by officers.		
<b>Safeguarding/ Welfare of Children and vulnerable adults</b>  Negative Mental health considerations and other vulnerabilities will be taken into account by officers.	<b><i>Mental Wellbeing/ Community Resilience</i></b>  Negative Mental health considerations will be taken into account by officers.			
<b>6. Consideration of Measures:</b>	The individual’s needs will be assessed as is practical and considerations made. Areas of need are			

## Appendix 2: Equalities Impact Assessment – Public Safety on Oxford’s waterways

34

This section should explain in detail all the consideration of alternative approaches/mitigation of adverse impact of the policy		likely to include mental health support, housing need, drug and alcohol dependency. Council officers have undertaken a range of training related to safeguarding and people with support needs, including safeguarding vulnerable adults, safeguarding children, personal safety training, Mental Capacity Act and communication training. Other agencies involved in this work could include Oxford Outreach Team, housing advice, the police, mental health services and other health services.			
<b>6a. Monitoring Arrangements:</b>  Outline systems which will be put in place to monitor for adverse impact in the future and this should include all relevant timetables. In addition it could include a summary and assessment of your monitoring, making clear whether you found any evidence of discrimination.		Each case will be managed through a well-established case management approach.			
<b>7. Date reported and signed off by City Executive Board:</b>		April 2017			
<b>8. Conclusions:</b>  What are your conclusions drawn from the results in terms of the policy impact		The approach to addressing public safety and anti-social behaviour is complex. The Council’s Corporate Enforcement Policy clearly sets out the need to intervene at the lowest effective level and consider the needs of those affected. Often solutions lie in support for the individual, sometimes they hinge on a joint support and enforcement approach, and sometimes an enforcement option is the only workable solution.			
<b>9. Are there implications for the Service Plans?</b>	NO	<b>10. Date the Service Plans will be updated</b>		<b>11. Date copy sent to Equalities Officer in HR &amp; Facilities</b>	14 Feb 2017

## Appendix 2: Equalities Impact Assessment – Public Safety on Oxford’s waterways

<b>13. Date reported to Scrutiny and Executive Board:</b>	April 2017	<b>14. Date reported to City Executive Board:</b>	April 2017	<b>12. The date the report on EqlA will be published</b>	April 2017
---	------------	---	------------	--	------------



Signed (completing officer)

Signed (Lead Officer)

**Please list the team members and service areas that were involved in this process:**

Jarlath Brine, Organisational Development & Learning Advisor  
Richard Adams, Service Manager  
Jeremy Franklin, Litigation Team Leader, Law & Governance

This page is intentionally left blank

**To: Scrutiny Committee**

**Date: 27 March 2017**

**Report of: Head of Community Services**

**Title of Report: Update on the City Centre and Foresters Tower PSPOs**

## **Summary**

**Purpose of report:** To update the Scrutiny Committee on the use of Public Spaces Protection Orders in Oxford.

**Key Decision:** No

**Executive lead member:** Cllr Dee Sinclair, Board Member for Community Safety

**Report author:** Richard Adams, Community Safety Manager

**Corporate Priority:** Strong, Active Communities

## **Background**

1. Public Spaces Protection Orders (PSPOs) were introduced by the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014. They specify an area in which activities that are, or may likely to be, detrimental to the local community's quality of life are restricted. The maximum term of an Order is three years, unless they are amended or extended.
2. Oxford City Council have implemented two PSPOs in the city centre and Foresters Tower.
3. A breach of a PSPO can result in a £100 Fixed Penalty Notice or prosecution at court.

## **Foresters Tower PSPO**

4. The Order came into effect on 20 February 2015 to restrict young people who were not legally resident in the block from entering unless visiting a resident, or have a reasonable excuse.

5. The Order was in response to complaints of anti-social behaviour by a group of young people in the block. During the implementation of the Order the young people were referred to the City Council's Youth Ambition Programme and most successfully engaged in activities.
6. The young people did not access the block following the Order and their involvement with youth programmes, hence there have been no breaches of the Order since its inception.

### **City Centre PSPO**

7. The Order came into effect on 1 February 2016. It contains eight restrictions:
  - Aggressive begging including sitting near cash point machines
  - Inappropriate use of public toilets
  - Urination and defecation in public spaces
  - Cycling restrictions in Queen Street and Cornmarket Street
  - Loud noise and obstruction of the highway by street entertainers
  - Illegal street trading
  - Alcohol consumption in a public place linked to anti-social behaviour
  - The control of dogs
8. The area of the Order includes all public space within the area of Folly Bridge, the Botley Road railway bridge, the northern end of St Giles and The Plain.
9. People found to be breaching the Order are spoken to and receive a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) factsheet with the full Order on the reverse.
10. 284 FAQs have been issued since the Order was introduced for the following reasons:

Aggressive begging	15
Inappropriate use of public toilets	0
Urination and defecation in public spaces	0
Cycling restrictions in Queen Street and Cornmarket Street	234
Loud noise and obstruction of the highway by street entertainers	7
Illegal street trading	22
Alcohol consumption in a public place linked to anti-social behaviour	3
The control of dogs	3

11. 4 Fixed Penalty Notices have been issued for further breaches. These were all in regards to trading as a pedlar.
12. Joint patrols of the city centre were introduced at the beginning of March. Police officers, PCSOs, City Centre Ambassadors and the Community Response Team patrol in pairs to engage with people and address issues they come across.

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

Name: Richard Adams

Job title: Community Safety Manager

Service Area / Department: Communities Services

Tel: 01865 e-mail: [rjadams@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:rjadams@oxford.gov.uk)

**Background papers:** None

**Version:** 1.0

This page is intentionally left blank



**To: Scrutiny Committee**

**Date: 27 March 2017**

**Report of: Head of Community Services**

**Title: Guest House Review Group – progress update**

**February 2016 CEB response:**

Guest houses are an important part of the visitor and tourist economy in Oxford and the City Council wishes to encourage guest house owners to play their part in keeping users safe. The Say Something If You See Something campaign highlights safeguarding risks to vulnerable adults and young people and has identified the guest house accommodation sector as having an important part to play in successfully securing progress in this domain. The campaign aims to increase the awareness of people employed in the sector, by training them in what to look for, how to report concerns and where to turn to for help.

A code of conduct for guest houses seems likely to make a useful contribution if it is widely respected and publicised. The Board will discuss with senior officers the serious resource implications of the agenda set out in the Scrutiny report and seek to identify the how to effectively deliver the actions proposed within current administrative resources. Additionally, the Board will draw on the expertise of key partner agencies to assess the viability of a worthwhile initiative in this important area of safeguarding and personal safety.

**March 2017 progress update:**

<b><i>Recommendation</i></b>	<b><i>Agree?</i></b>	<b><i>March 2017 progress update</i></b>
1. That the City Council should maintain an accurate list of guest houses operating in the Oxford area that is updated at least annually (The Human Exploitation Co-ordinator has produced a basic list which could be developed into an accurate list).	In part	<p>Prior to Oxford City Hotel Watch launch in March 2016 a comprehensive list was compiled using TVP, Oxford City Licensing and Food Hygiene. The list is currently being reviewed and updated to take account of new premises and those that have closed.</p> <p>All establishments are automatically added to the Thames Valley Alert system and receive regular updates of any related crimes and events.</p>

<p>2. That the City Council should, in consultation and collaboration with other relevant statutory, commercial and voluntary agencies, lead on the introduction of a voluntary code of good practice for owners of guest houses in the Oxford area to sign up to. This code should be jointly branded and linked to existing initiatives such as the Say Something if you See Something campaign.</p>	Y	<p>Working with representatives from the Hotel/ Accommodations sector, TVP, Fire &amp; Rescue and Oxford City Council a 'Statement of Intent for Hoteliers' was developed and launched in October 2016. It is aimed at all hotel staff members and has been branded with Hotel Watch brand developed by TVP HQ. The brand is the TVP Thames Valley wide branding and does not include Say Something if you See Something (SSSS) brand. Wherever possible locally the SSSS is applied.</p>
<p>3. That, subject to further consultation, the voluntary code of good practice should commit owners of guest houses operating in Oxford to the following practices which would help to protect guest house owners and their businesses as well as guests and the wider community. These practices should extend to subcontractors working in guest houses where relevant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Signing up to a basic safeguarding policy statement;</li> <li>b) Providing details of an identified 'single point of contact' who has oversight of the running of the guest house and is responsible for ensuring compliance with the code of good practice;</li> <li>c) Having an identified responsible person on duty at the guest house at all times during its hours of operation;</li> <li>d) Providing Basic Disclosure certificates for the single point of contact and responsible person(s) and if possible, obtaining certificates for all staff who permanently or regularly work in the guest house;</li> <li>e) Having a free crime prevention check every 3 years and implementing recommendations</li> </ul>	In part	<p>'Say Something if you See Something' leaflet has been developed and provided to all Hotels/Guesthouses/Bed &amp; Breakfast and Short Let in the city. Copies were issues at every Hotel Watch event. An information pack including the SSSS leaflet and Statements of Intent for Hoteliers is given to any first contact visits made by Neighbourhood Police Teams, Fire &amp; Rescue, City Licensing teams and joint Crime Prevention &amp; Reduction Advisor and Oxford City Council's Strategic Lead for Human Exploitation.</p> <p>The Oxford City Hotel Watch has set up a Working Group which meets 4 times a year. The Group is made up of Chair (TVP volunteer), TVP Inspector, Sergeant, Neighbourhood Watch &amp; Thames Valley Alert Coordinator and Oxford City Council's Strategic Lead for Human Exploitation, representatives from Travelodge, Holiday Inn Express, River Hotel, Greengables Guesthouse, Bijoux Apartments and Short Lettings. A professionals meeting is also held to discuss any hotels of concern and how to resolve those concerns.</p> <p>The SSSS leaflet provides information on; what to look-out for, Other signs that may raise concern, How can you help? Keeping children and vulnerable people safe from abuse. It also includes who to report concerns to. (a-c &amp; f)</p> <p>d) This has not been discussed and unsure if applicable for this sector.</p>

<p>made by the Crime Prevention and Reduction Advisor;</p> <p>f) Cooperating with the police, including by providing available CCTV footage upon request and allowing the police to freely enter the premises where illegal behaviour is suspected to be taking place;</p> <p>g) Registering with Thames Valley Alert and participating in the hotel partnership to strengthen two-way information sharing between guest houses and the authorities;</p> <p>h) Retaining records of the single point of contact and responsible person(s) completing the ECPAT 'Every Child, Everywhere' e-learning course, and providing all staff working in the guest house with the Thames Valley Police Staff Guide for the hotel trade;</p> <p>i) Having a 'no cash without ID' policy, recording vehicle registration numbers where relevant and requiring visitors to register with reception;</p> <p>j) Holding and restricting access to master keys for all rooms and ensuring that guest rooms are checked daily;</p> <p>k) Having suitable and proportionate arrangements in place for monitoring comings and goings at the premises, including during the night, and where relevant, retaining CCTV footage for a minimum of 28 days.</p>	<p>e) A joint visit is carried out by the Crime Prevention &amp; Reduction Advisor, relevant area PCSO and Oxford City Council Strategic Lead for Human Exploitation if identified as a venue identified through Intelligence or as a result of a warrant.</p> <p>f) A number of hoteliers has been very proactive and report any concerns immediately and provide photographic evidence of any persons of concern.</p> <p>h) ECPAT 'Every Child, Everywhere' is currently not available as being updated.</p> <p>A Thames Valley Police Staff Guide for the Hotel Trade has not been developed.</p> <p>All establishments attending any Hotel Watch event or visited by any member of the Working Group are provided with a Hotel Watch pack which includes a training resources list.</p> <p>TVP and Oxford City Council's Strategic Lead for Human Exploitation have been collaborating with Oxford Brookes University and their partners in promoting COMBAT Trafficking in Human Beings in the Hotel Industry. This material will be made available to members of the Oxford City Hotel Watch at the next members' conference being held on Monday 27<sup>th</sup> March 2017.</p> <p>i) As a result of previous concerns raised by the membership at the October 2016 bi-annual conference representatives from the National Fraud Agency and Santander gave presentations on how to tackle credit card fraud. Since this meeting a letter is under development from the Oxford Hotel sector highlighting these issues and how to protect their businesses. This has been escalated to a national and governmental level.</p>
---	---

		<p>j) Not covered</p> <p>k) See f)</p>
4. That the owners of guest houses in the Oxford area should be asked to self-certify that they comply with the voluntary code of good practice on an annual basis. This process could be prompted by a letter signed by the Local Policing Area Commander, as well as through the hotel partnership and any other relevant channels.	Y	The City of Oxford – Hotel Watch – Statements of Intent for Hoteliers is given to hotel premises within the city. It is signed by Supt Christian Bunt and Tim Sadler and was launched at the October 2016 bi-annual conference held at the Holiday Inn Express, Grenoble Road, Oxford.
5. That guest house owners signed up to the code should be signposted to sources of advice and guidance.	Y	A pack is provided to all hoteliers at the launch and any subsequent visits carried out by TVP Crime Prevention & Reduction Advisor and Oxford City Strategic Lead for Human Exploitation if there has been no previous contact or change in management
6. That the City Council asks Thames Valley Police to give prompt attention to requests for assistance at local guest houses.	Y	This will depend on Police resourcing but Neighbourhood Police teams will always visit and provide advice along with Crime Prevention & Reduction Advisor and Oxford City Strategic Lead for Human Exploitation.
7. That relevant agencies including City Council functions such as Environmental Health and Community Safety, and those provided by partner organisations such as the Thames Valley Police, Oxfordshire Fire and Rescue Service and Trading Standards, should be asked to report to the code administrator if they have reason to believe that, having been signed up to the voluntary code of good practice, the management of a guest house is non-compliant with it. The single point of contact should then be asked to demonstrate that they have	In part	There is a mechanism in place to include visits from the agencies identified. This work has been expanded to include visits from Oxford City Council's Licensing Team allowing the scheme to have eyes and ears from a number of aspects.

addressed the concerns raised or risk being suspended from the code.		
8. That the administration of the voluntary code of good practice should be adequately resourced. Consideration should be given to where in the organisation this responsibility should sit but the Strategic lead for Human Exploitation Manager should have oversight of this administrative function.	In part	The scheme is shares between TVP and Oxford City Council. Majority of the administration eg minute taking and typing development and sharing of master list sits within Oxford City.
9. That a suitable logo should be created for the voluntary code of good practice that could be displayed on guest house websites.	N	This has not been actioned due to TVP logo 'Hotel Watch' being launched and promoted across the region without taking account of national and local schemes. Other measures have been put into place eg City of Oxford – Hotel Watch – Statements of Intent for Hoteliers.
10. That a list of guest houses covered by the voluntary code of good practice should be displayed on the City Council's website together with details of what the owners of these guest houses have signed up to. The introduction of the code should also be promoted to targeted institutions, such as language schools, as well as more widely, including through a City Council press release.	N	Not actioned to date due to representatives of the Working Group wished to focus on other matters affecting the local industry. This has resulted in the sector fully engaging with the Working Group and identifying issues not previously known and giving other options on how to tackle issues related to Organised Crime, CSE, Human trafficking & Exploitation and Prostitution.
11. That Experience Oxfordshire should be informed which guest houses are covered by the voluntary code of good practice and asked to display the logo next to participating guest houses on their website.	N	Not actioned to date.
12. That the City Council should encourage the larger tour operators and hotels operating in Oxford to sign up to the Code of Conduct for the Protection of Children from Sexual Exploitation in Travel and Tourism.	In part	Rather than Code of Conduct for the Protection of Children from Sexual Exploitation in Travel and Tourism other avenues have been pursued locally.
13. That the City Council should ask	N	Not actioned to date do to other demands related to Hotel Watch

organisations such as Experience Oxfordshire and the local Chamber of Commerce to do more to promote the Say Something if you See Something campaign, including through existing relationships.		
<p>14. That the City Council should look for opportunities to join with partners, perhaps through the National Working Group, in pressing government to:</p> <p>a) Grant additional powers to local authorities to require the embedding of good practices in guest houses,</p> <p>b) Do more to involve the hotel accreditation agencies and major travel website companies, as well as guest houses, in efforts to promote good safeguarding practices in the hospitality sector;</p> <p>c) Introduce a public awareness campaign that empowers people to come forward with safeguarding concerns.</p>	N	The NWG been contacted and made aware of Oxford City Say something if you See Something - Hotel Watch Scheme. The NWG have been approached to provide support and advice on who to tackle Credit card fraud in relation to Organised Crime.



## **CITY OF OXFORD - HOTEL WATCH**

### **Statements of Intent for Hoteliers**

#### **General Principles**

Oxford City Hotel Watch is a partnership between hoteliers, the Police, Oxford City Council and other statutory partners to promote public safety and safeguard our customers. We will achieve this through the sharing of relevant information and the development of new initiatives that keeps Oxford a safe place to live, work and visit.

#### **Specific Goals**

- We will maintain a record of all guests and visitors, aged 16 years or older, regardless of nationality, who stay in our premises.
- We will require a pre-authorisation from a credit card in the name of the person making the booking upon check-in.
- We recognise, when appropriate, the need to obtain for each guest/visitor, details of their vehicle registration and/or passport or other identity document.

We will preserve the above records for a minimum of 12 months and, if requested, make them available for inspection by the police.

This information will be passed onto the police and other relevant partners when appropriate, to assist in the prevention or detection of crime, or the safeguarding of children and adults.

#### **Partnership Intent**

This initiative is supported by Thames Valley Police and Oxford City Council.

**Superintendent Christian Bunt**  
**Oxford LPA Commander**  
**Thames Valley Police**

**Tim Sadler**  
**Executive Director**  
**Oxford City Council**

This page is intentionally left blank



**To: Scrutiny Committee**

**Date: 27 March 2017**

**Report of: Head of Community Services**

**Title of Report: Graffiti prevention**

## **Summary**

**Purpose of report:** To update the Scrutiny Committee on activities aimed at preventing graffiti in the city.

**Key Decision:** No

**Executive lead member:** Cllr Dee Sinclair, Board Member for Community Safety

**Report author:** Alison Cassidy, Anti-Social Behaviour Investigation Team - Case Manager

## **Background**

1. The Scrutiny Committee requested a report to update them on activities aimed at preventing graffiti in the city. Doug Loveridge the Street Scene Service Manager presented a report on graffiti removal to the Scrutiny Committee in April 2016; a reactive report on graffiti. The current report presents a proactive approach to preventing unwanted graffiti.
2. Graffiti appears in different forms; tagging (where a person has an identifiable signature), defacement and street art. Graffiti can be identified as criminal damage when it is unwanted; however it is extremely difficult for the police to prosecute a tagger as they have to be caught in the act. The police and ASBIT attempted to tackle the problem using civil remedies. Three taggers were issued with Community Protection Notices in 2015, but again a breach could only be actioned if they are witnessed. It was clear that a different approach was needed and ASBIT looked to other areas, in particular Bristol, which has a long history of intervention, to bring back good practice. Bristol are hosting their 7<sup>th</sup> street art festival, Upfest, this July. It is attended by over 300 street artists from all over the world and attracts 35,000 visitors. Tagging has not been eradicated in Bristol

however it has significantly reduced. Its street art is world renowned.

3. ASBIT organised an Appreciative Inquiry to ask the public, stakeholders, taggers and street artists how they could collectively tackle unwanted graffiti. The event in November 2015 was attended by over 70 people including Jack Ritchens from the Oxford Wheels project. He works with the young people who were involved with Meadow Lane free wall site. The attending street artists put forward a convincing argument to having a free wall site which would enable them to demonstrate their form of art within a controlled environment. They in turn would be able to self-police within their community to reduce unwanted tags on buildings and properties.
4. The outcome of the event was to provide a free wall space for the street artists. A disused toilet block in South Park was identified in January 2016. It continues to be well used by street artists.
5. In 2016 Tesco awarded a £8K grant for artwork in North Oxford at Elizabeth Jennings and Frenchay Road Bridge. An artist was commissioned to paint murals. Once the artwork was completed it was then treated with a graffiti resistant varnish. It has not been targeted and it is unlikely for an art piece to be vandalised with tagging.

## **Update**

6. In the past year there have been some incidents of washable paint on trees in South Park and is believed to be connected to a public event. In addition a bus stop near the site has been targeted; the bus company have been made aware. In reality a free wall site will not prevent all graffiti however the free wall has been utilised and to good effect. The street artists say there are very few places for them to demonstrate their art form. They would like to use the underpasses which are currently being vandalised, for example under Donnington Bridge, BMW underpass and the Rose Hill/Littlemore underpass.

## **Current Proposals**

7. The Murco garage closed in November 2016 and a temporary wooden wall was erected around the site. It had not been targeted by taggers until the 4<sup>th</sup> March. A working party is being established to consider the Murco site as a potential, temporary, free wall. It is anticipated another Appreciative Inquiry will be held with invites to stakeholders, taggers, street artists, Councillors and schools. St Gregory the Great and Oxford Academy have both shown interest in being part of the project. Councillors Simm and Henwood have also given their support towards a street art project at this site. It is expected that there will be an eclectic mix of art on the wall which has relevance to Cowley and its residents.
8. The Community Centre in Barton presents as worn and unwelcoming. Lauren Parker, Great Estate Project Surveyor, is meeting with ASBIT to discuss a street art project. The meeting will discuss how members of the community, including the young people, can be involved in deciding what will be created. The underpasses in Barton will also be discussed as potential free walls for street art.

9. Polly Smart, Graffiti Removal Supervisor, is supportive of additional free wall space around the city. She attended the original Appreciative Inquiry and has been involved in working with ASBIT throughout the project. She has also agreed to be involved in the Murco Garage site project.
10. Andrew Manson a local street artist who sells his art work in the Town Hall has been a huge supporter of free wall space. He has been instrumental in the success of South Parks free wall space and was commissioned to provide an art piece for the Common People Festival. He is currently working out of West Oxford Community Centre and has worked with Mathew Arnold School to produce art work at the front of West Oxford Community Centre. The funding from this came from Councillor Pressel. Andrew is applying for funding from Oxford City Culture Fund in order to complete a piece of art to support the Cowley Road Carnival. He is eager to be involved in extending the free wall space in Oxford and is the main contact ASBIT have with local graffiti/street artists.
11. Oxford City is not without street art. Excellent examples of can be viewed on Cowley Road, Stockmore Street, Marston Street and in the side roads. It can be said that this has added to the vibrancy and diversity of the area for example local school children from Oxford Academy have recently completed a street art tour with Youth Ambition.
12. ASBIT are looking at existing structures for further free wall sites. We would also consider temporary structures such as hoardings, for example local school children have designed and painted a hoarding erected outside West Oxford Community Centre. Once free wall spaces are available the artwork will follow. The police will be informed of any further free wall sites and continue to work in partnership with ASBIT. They are fully supportive of the new way of tackling unwanted graffiti.
13. It is proposed for appropriate spaces to be made available and to be used freely by professional artists, graffiti writers, beginners, charity teams, arts and schools projects. ASBIT will continue to monitor the success of the free wall sites to ensure they do not encourage further unwanted tagging.



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

Name: Alison Cassidy

Job title: Anti-Social Behaviour Investigation Team - Case Manager

Service Area / Department: Communities Services

Tel: 01865 252745 e-mail: [acassidy@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:acassidy@oxford.gov.uk)

**List of background papers:** None

**To:** City Executive Board  
**Date:** 6 April 2017  
**Report of:** Executive Director for Community Services  
**Title of Report:** Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme

Summary and recommendations	
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	To request approval to increase Oxford City Council's project contribution towards Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme by up to £1,000,000 funded from in-kind contributions in terms of land disposal and compensation values foregone.
<b>Key decision:</b>	Yes
<b>Executive Board Member:</b>	Cllr Bob Price, Board Member for Corporate Strategy and Economic Development
<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Clean and Green Oxford
<b>Policy Framework:</b>	None
<b>Recommendations:</b> That the City Executive Board resolves to:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Approve</b> the increase of Oxford City Council's project contribution towards Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme by up to £1,000,000 funded from in-kind contributions from land disposal and compensation foregone; and</li> <li>2. <b>Grant</b> delegated authority to Executive Director for Community Services, in consultation with the Heads of Financial Services and Law and Governance, to be able to enter a funding agreement with Environment Agency.</li> <li>3. <b>Note</b> that a detailed report on proposed disposals to facilitate the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme and discounts proposed will be made to the City Executive Board in due course.</li> </ol>	

Appendices	
Appendix 1	Partnership Contributions- CONFIDENTIAL
Appendix 2	Risk Register

## **Introduction and background**

1. At its meeting on 29 January 2015, the City Executive Board authorised the Council's entry into a Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") with the Environment Agency in regard to bringing forward a major flood relief scheme for the city ("the Scheme"). Under the provisions of the MOU, the City Council indicated its general support for the Scheme and its intention to provide certain funding in support of it, subject to contributions also being made by other relevant bodies, and the contract conditions being otherwise satisfactory.
2. At its meeting on 24 March 2016, the City Executive Board authorised the Council's entry into an agreement with the Environment Agency, under which the Council would play an active role in the establishment of the business case and provide funding to a capped sum of £1.5 million.
3. In the period since March 2016 the preferred route has been identified and Outline Business Case drafted for the preferred option (medium channel and defences) which will reduce the likelihood of flooding to 1,500 properties. Total scheme cost is £121.11m, which includes £116.36m for design and construction and £4.75m for future maintenance. The cost benefit ratio is 1:10.
4. Central Government Grant is being sought for majority of cost of scheme. However in addition, substantial partnership funding contributions have been secured or still in negotiation to ensure the costs of the scheme can be met. The Outline Business Case that has been submitted has identified a number of potential sources to close the current funding gap for scheme. Without these sources the scheme is at risk of not being fully funded and therefore a risk of scheme not being approved by HM Treasury. Appendix 1 sets out the current position in respect of funding, it is held to be confidential at present as it includes sums currently being negotiated.
5. As part of the 'partnership funding contribution in negotiation', the Environment Agency is asking landowners to facilitate the scheme by gifting their land and/or land compensation. In the case of the City Council the land interests are substantial and it is proposed that a cap on any land disposal or/and compensation gifted is made. Doing so at this stage provides certainty to the scheme in terms of partnership contributions and to the Council in its land dealings. It is proposed that a cap is imposed at the value of £1m.
6. Following the Outline Business Case, the Environment Agency will develop their Full Business Case where further efficiencies could be found. It is at Full Business Case stage that the Environment Agency must be putting forward a fully funded scheme to HM Treasury in order to secure approval to commence delivery of the Scheme we expect that this will be later in 2017

## **Financial Issues**

7. The City Council has already provided for the initial £1.5 million contribution to the scheme within its Medium Term Financial Plan. The background for which is stated in paragraph 2.
8. The additional contribution of up to £1 million will be funded from in-kind contributions by which we mean waiving land disposal and compensation costs which would be incurred to the Environment Agency by Oxford City Council in the delivery of the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme.

9. The in-kind contributions that would be accounted for as part of the Councils' up to £1 million does not include adoption of assets with future maintenance liability or waiving of compensation payable to tenant farmer of Manor Farm nor the tenants of allotments at Bullstake Close (Botley Road) or Cowmead. The principle will be for these tenants to seek compensation directly from the Environment Agency

## **Legal Issues**

10. A legal agreement between the Council and the Environment Agency will be entered into under which the principles for the in-kind provision up to the value of £1 million will be explicit. This will include an agreed definition of in-kind along the lines described in paragraph 4. This agreement will be entered into by Executive Director- Communities in consultation with the Heads of Finance and Law and Governance.
11. There may be a need for separate legal arrangements for specific in-kind contributions which make up this £1 million, in particular in the case of a *“direct provision of land that will form part of the scheme”*. It is proposed that this would be done via a disposal of land order under market value as approved by Secretary of State under the General Disposal Consent (England) 2003 powers. The reasons for the potential disposal of land at an undervalue would be as follows:
- a. The Council considers that the disposal for the purposes of delivering the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme is likely to contribute to the achievement of:
    - i) the promotion or improvement of economic well-being;
    - ii) the promotion or improvement of social well-being;
    - iii) the promotion or improvement of environmental well-being; and
  - b. the best price reasonably obtainable for each of the parcels of land does not exceed £2,000,000.
12. In circumstances where the Council wishes to retain the freehold, the in-kind provision of land could be done via issuing a rent free lease to OFAS for the duration of construction.
13. Any specific and separate legal agreements will be entered into by Executive Director- Communities in consultation with the Heads of Finance and Law and Governance.

## **Other implications**

14. OFAS will reduce the flood risk of 1,500 properties in Oxford. The in-kind contribution of up to £1 million will represent the Councils' continued commitment to the scheme and assist in proving the schemes affordability.

## **Environmental**

15. Whilst the Scheme will create a new riverside environment between North Hinksey and South Hinksey, during the construction of this Scheme there will inevitably be significant environmental implications. These are being evaluated and mitigated against by the Scheme via the Planning process. Opportunities to improve biodiversity are being included within the Schemes design including wetland features, scrapes and backwaters, wet woodland planting, tree and hedgerow planting.

## **Equalities impact**

16. No Equalities Impact Assessment is considered necessary after undertaking the screening process.

## **Risk**

17. The risk involved to the Council is primarily financial, due to its commitment to make a substantial financial contribution to the Scheme. This risk should be mitigated by the provisions of the Agreement itself, the on-going management of agreement between the Council and the EA and the Council's on-going presence on the Sponsor and Programme Boards.
18. The secondary risk is reputational if the Council's contribution is perceived to be lacking. This risk should be mitigated by the Council's on-going presence on the Scheme as a named Partner and standing member on Programme Executive, Programme Board and Project Board.
19. There is a risk that if the Council does not contribute, along with other potential sources of funding identified to bridge the funding gap, that the scheme will not be fully funded and therefore does not go ahead and thus not reducing the flood risk to 1500 properties. This risk could be mitigated by the Council contributing and/or continuing to advocate the project to other potential funders in its capacity as a named Partner and standing member on Programme Executive, Programme Board and Project Board.

<b>Report author</b>	Helen Vaughan-Evans
Job title	Project Manager
Service area or department	Environmental Sustainability
Telephone	01865 252156
e-mail	<a href="mailto:hvaughanevans@oxford.gov.uk">hvaughanevans@oxford.gov.uk</a>

**Background Papers:** None



Appendix 2: Risk Register

Title	Risk description	Opp/ threat	Cause	Consequence	Date Raised	Owner	Gross		Current		Residual		Comments	Controls				
							I	P	I	P	I	P		Control description	Due date	Status	Progress %	Action Owner
Financial	Council committing to waive monetary value by up to £1 million	Threat	Direct provision of land that will form part of the scheme. Waiving of known expenditure incurred such as land owner compensation, professional fees and increased costs of associated projects to accommodate the scheme.	Reduction of asset value and loss of income putting pressure on MTFP.	09.01.17	Nigel Kennedy	3	4	-	-	2	2	This risk only materialises if CEB approve the Contribution.	Prioritising costs that will be accounted for against the £1m which without the scheme the Council would not have enjoyed (e.g. lost rental and other land compensation costs).	2020	n/a	n/a	Nigel Kennedy Lyn Barker Helen Vaughan-Evans
Environmental/ Social/ Economic	Council does not agree to additional financial contribution and Environment Agency do not bridge funding gap and therefore scheme does not go ahead.	Threat	Funding gap as Central Government will not fully fund the scheme and expect partnership funding contributions.	Scheme does not go ahead and 1500 properties remain at risk of flooding.	09.01.17	Environment Agency	4	4	-	-	2	2		Council agreeing to contribute. Council continuing to advocate the project to other potential funders in its capacity as a named Partner and standing member on Programme Executive, Programme Board and Project Board.	17/04/17 August 2017	n/a G	50% ongoing	CEB Tim Sadler Jo Colwell Helen Vaughan-Evans
Reputational	Council's contribution perceived to be lacking compared to other funders	Threat	Lack of understanding as to City Council's role in relation to Flooding. County Council are the Lead Local Flood Authority not the City Council.	Poor publicity for the Council.	09.01.17	Tim Sadler	2	3	-	-	2	2		Council's on-going presence on the Scheme as a named Partner and standing member on Programme Executive, Programme Board and Project Board. Have clear messaging regarding the scope of City Council responsibility around flooding.	ongoing 17/04/17	G G	ongoing 100%	Tom Jennings Tim Sadler Jo Colwell Helen Vaughan-Evans

This page is intentionally left blank

**To: City Executive Board**

**Date: 6 April 2017**

**Report of: Scrutiny Committee**

**Title of Report: Health Inequalities**

## **Summary and Recommendations**

**Purpose of report:** To present the recommendations of the Health Inequalities Panel on health inequalities

**Executive lead member:** Councillor Ed Turner, Council Leader and Board Member for Corporate Strategy and Economic Development

**Recommendation** of the Scrutiny Committee to the City Executive Board:

**That the City Executive Board states whether it agrees or disagrees with the ten recommendations set out in the body of this report.**

## **Appendices**

*Appendix 1: Health Inequalities recommendations relevant to Oxford City Council.*

## **Background**

1. The Health Inequalities Panel followed on from the work of the Inequalities Panel by meeting on 7 March 2017 to consider the report of the Oxfordshire Health Inequalities Commission. The Panel comprised of Councillors Van Coulter (Chair), Sian Taylor, David Thomas and Liz Wade. The Panel would like to thank the following people for attending the meeting and contributing to the discussion:
  - Professor Sian M Griffiths, Independent Chair of the Oxfordshire Health Inequalities Commission;
  - Cllr Gill Sanders, Older People's Champion;
  - Val Johnson, Policy and Partnerships Manager;
  - Frances Evans, Strategy and Service Development Manager (Housing Services);
  - Chris Harvey, OD, Learning and HR Support Manager.

## Summary and recommendations

2. The Chair of the Health Inequalities Commission said the fact that the meeting was taking place represented exactly the sort of response that the Commission had hoped for. She said health is not just a matter for the health service because it is a product of wider socio-economic factors and joint working is essential to addressing inequalities. Although inequality is easier to understand in a city context the County Council should not dismiss this work because inequality is an issue for the whole of Oxfordshire and some aspects need to be addressed at county council level or on a county-wide basis.
3. The Panel heard that the Commission took evidence from various sources and held a number of public meetings. There had been difficulties in obtaining data on particular groups due to national data gaps and this had made it difficult to accurately assess needs. The first eleven recommendations in the Commission's report relate to five common principles: strong partnership engagement, recognising the impact of poverty on health, a commitment to prevention, data collection and utilisation, and the need to allocate resources to reduce inequalities. These themes run through the Commission's report, as do the themes of beginning well, living well and aging well. The challenge is to focus on helping the poorest and knowing whether you have made a difference over time. Some measurable data is available on some indicators such as healthy life expectancy, low life satisfaction and educational attainment but there is a need to specifically monitor inequalities, keep it on the agenda and influence partners at a time when it is getting harder to do so due to funding cuts.
4. The Panel noted that almost all Council services can be seen as having some impact on health inequalities. Housing, homelessness and the work of the welfare reform team are the most obvious ones, but green spaces, safeguarding, anti-social behaviour, environmental health, licensing and air quality are also important. The main themes as far as the council is concerned are about income, education, employment, the material environment (including housing) and lifestyle (e.g. promoting physical activity). The Council is very active in these areas and does a lot of good work but there is a need to work in partnership, share knowledge and define gaps in order to reduce inequalities. The Panel voiced support for a number of specific council initiatives, such as; the council's approach to health and wellbeing for council employees, proposals to develop a food poverty action plan, the Healthy New Town at Barton Park, and the proposed extension of licensing across the private rented sector.
5. The Policy and Partnerships Manager provided a list of the Commission's recommendations that are most relevant to district councils (see Appendix 1). The Panel note that some of these recommendations require a partnership approach and that leading on their implementation would potentially have resourcing implications for the City Council (e.g. making benefits advice available in all health settings). The Panel hope however that the Council can support and embed these recommendations as far as possible within existing resources.

***Recommendation 1 - That the recommendations of the Health Inequalities Panel that have been identified as being most relevant to district councils***

***(see appendix) are supported as far as possible by the Council within existing resources.***

6. The Chair of the Health Inequalities Commission said that the Council was doing lots of good work but was being hit by external factors, such as cuts to supported housing. The Council should continually ensure that it prioritises its resources in order to reach the most affected groups and maximise its impacts on health inequalities. She also urged the Council to also look at adopting the 'health in all policies' approach, as recommended by the Commission for all NHS and local authority organisations. This approach is about systematically taking into account the health implications of decisions, seeking synergies and avoiding harmful health impacts to improve the health of the population and health equity.

***Recommendation 2 - That the Council supports reducing health inequalities and will adopt the 'Health in All Policies' approach, which is supported by government and the World Health Organisation.***

7. The Policy and Partnerships Manager said that there is a challenge in measuring the impacts of numerous council activities through a health inequalities lens. The Council employs a data analyst but is limited in what it can measure due to national data gaps (e.g. health data specific to BME groups). The high level of population churn in the city is also a factor. The Council is however very aware of health inequalities. Officers do look at data and try to create measures when introducing new policies or refreshing existing policies. There are opportunities to join up better with other agencies and the stronger communities groups – involving the Council, CCG, Public Health and DWP – are good examples of this partnership approach already happening.
8. The Housing Strategy and Service Development Manager said that Housing Services have a duty of care and are required to take account of health issues when housing people. Housing Services also do a lot of work with the Welfare Reform Team and organisations such as Shelter and CAB. They have referral systems in place and provide information on accessing services to people in housing need such as those living in temporary accommodation and those at risk of homelessness. Where people are placed in private sector accommodation, Tenant Liaison Officers act as mediators if problems occur and tenants are provided with coaching on how to sustain tenancies. Landlords are subject to fit and proper person tests and properties are inspected for suitability and hazards. All of this support can help people through or prevent suffering but the impacts on health and wellbeing are not currently measured. A health and wellbeing impact question could potentially be added to existing satisfaction surveys.

***Recommendation 3 - That the Council looks at how it can improve monitoring the health and wellbeing impacts of key services that impact on health and wellbeing.***

9. The Older Person's Champion said that loneliness amongst the elderly is a huge issue in the city and that the withdrawal of subsidised buses has compounded this problem. There is a need to build accommodation that older people want to live in if they are to be tempted to move out of larger properties and potentially

further from their friends and soft networks. The Council has been doing a lot of work in this area and overall is working very hard supporting things like supported accommodation, which has been cut by the County Council. However, the Council needs to be realistic about the task ahead and what can be achieved given that funding will continue to diminish and the demographic challenges facing public services will continue to increase. The advice agencies are doing a brilliant job in encouraging people to claim benefits they are entitled to and the Council should continue to support them.

***Recommendation 4 - That consideration is given to whether more could be done within existing resources to tackle loneliness and isolation among the city's growing elderly population through community services.***

***Recommendation 5 - That the Council continues to support and encourage advice agencies in helping people to claim the benefits they are entitled to.***

10. The Panel raised the importance of early years and child health. The 1001 Days Critical Manifesto highlights the importance of acting early to enhance outcomes for children, and supports that every child deserves an equal opportunity to lead a healthy and fulfilling life. County Council cuts to children's centres are a big concern and the Council has committed some money to mitigate some of the worst impacts in the city. The Panel heard that the Commission visited a children's centre in Banbury, looked at a range of data and tried to reflect these serious issues in their report.

***Recommendation 6 - That consideration is given to how the 1001 Critical Days Manifesto, which focuses on the importance of the conception to age 2 period, is relevant to the work of the Council.***

11. The Panel commented that some schools in the city are really suffering due to a lack of funding and heard that the Council is involved with partners in looking at attainment in the city. Proposals are being developed and there is a small budget but addressing poor educational attainment in city schools is a huge challenge. The Panel also noted that the introduction of universal free school meals has made it very difficult for schools to maximise their pupil premium funding.

***Recommendation 7 - That the Council looks again at whether it could provide funding for struggling city schools with poor levels of attainment, perhaps focused on sports provision or other activities that can reduce health inequalities.***

12. The Panel commented that low income combined with the very high cost of housing is a major issue for many people in the city who typically pay 50-60% of their income in housing costs. The Panel questioned whether the Council can do more to promote the Oxford Living Wage (OLW) to other employers in the city given that one in five jobs don't pay the OLW, and considered whether this would be a good use of Council resources. The Panel heard that the Council requires payment of the OLW through procurement and grant funding and has convinced the local health trust, which has some 1400 employees, of the benefits of paying the OLW to their staff. The Panel noted that there is an opportunity to push the

OLW again given that the Westgate Shopping Centre will be reopening later in the year, creating 3000 jobs, and that shops and restaurants are reportedly struggling to fill these posts. The Panel suggest that the OLW should become a more widely recognised scheme for employers to sign up to, with increased visibility of the scheme online and in shop windows around the city, for example.

***Recommendation 8 - That the Council redoubles efforts to publicise, promote and enhance the visibility of the Oxford Living Wage scheme (as well as other good employment practices), given that the new Westgate Shopping Centre will reopen in autumn 2017.***

13. The Panel also noted that there may be opportunities for the Council to maximise social value through procurement in other ways, for example by requiring that contractors adopt other progressive employment policies. The Panel commented that Manchester City Council has developed good procurement practices that the Council should look to learn from.

***Recommendation 9 - That the Council uses procurement as a tool for tackling poverty and to extracting measurable social value, drawing on good practice from Manchester City Council, and reinforces rules for contractors to pay Oxford Living Wage***

14. The Panel questioned the progress of a social prescribing pilot at Bury Knowle Health Centre and heard that while there is a strong local interest in social prescribing, the national evidence base supporting such interventions is not yet particularly strong. The Panel noted that the most deprived communities tend to be the areas with the fewest facilities to support social prescribing and suggest that the Council-owned community assets could be utilised to support health services.

***Recommendation 10 - That the Council continues to engage constructively with partners about delivering more health services in community facilities and improving access to health and other services in estates.***

15. In discussion the Panel identified the following actions for the Scrutiny Committee to consider:
- a) Keeping health as an underlying principle when considering issues of inequality;
  - b) Considering the emerging food poverty action plan at a future meeting (expected in autumn 2017);
  - c) Requesting a 12 month progress report on the implementation of agreed recommendations.

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

Andrew Brown on behalf of the Scrutiny Committee  
Scrutiny Officer  
Law and Governance  
Tel: 01865 252230 e-mail: [abrown2@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:abrown2@oxford.gov.uk)

**List of background papers: None**

**Version number: 0.1**



## Appendix 1: OCCG Inequalities Commission Recommendations Relevant to Oxford City Council

	Recommendations	Work already underway	Comments
<b><u>1</u></b>	Statutory funding bodies need to do more to demonstrate their commitment to reducing inequalities. Their policies and plans should be scrutinized by HWB on an annual basis	The City Council Corporate Plan has addressing inequalities as a key priority. The council targets its resources to reduce health inequalities and to promote life chances, across all service areas.	
<b><u>3</u></b>	Local indicators on progress towards reducing inequalities should be developed, with regular reporting on progress to the Health and Wellbeing Board. This should be in place by the end of 2017	The City Council fully supports the recommendation. Local indicators are essential for targeting resources effectively in geographic areas or to different community needs.	
<b><u>12.</u></b>	Benefits Advice should be available in all health settings, including GPs networked into local areas to support CABs	Oxford City Council provides @£500k in grants to Advice Centers and part of this funding is to enable people to access the benefits that they are entitled to.  The City Council Welfare Report Team also provides benefit advice and support to those affected by the changes to the benefit system.	
<b><u>13</u></b>	A sub group working on income maximization should be established, and asked to report back to the HWB/CCG within a year	If a sub group on income maximization is established the City Council would be happy to participate and actively contribute to its work.	
<b><u>14.</u></b>	District Councils should be approached to seek matched funding for benefits in	See above.	

	Practice, dependent on existing contribution (for benefits maximization)		
<b>16.</b>	<p>Public agencies, universities and health partners should work together to develop new models of funding and delivery of affordable homes for a range of tenures to meet the needs of vulnerable people and key workers.</p> <p>Specifically, public agencies should work together to maximise the potential to deliver affordable homes on public sector land, including provision of key worker housing and extra care and specialist housing by undertaking a strategic review of public assets underutilized or lying vacant</p>	<p>The City Council has established a Housing Company, to deliver new affordable homes with a range of tenures to help address the city's acute housing need.</p> <p>It has invested £20m in refurbishment of the city's tower blocks to improve their appearance and structure, upgrade insulation, windows, heating, and electrics and refurbish lifts.</p> <p>Construction of 900 new homes in Barton is underway through our joint venture company with Grosvenor Developments Ltd.</p> <p>There are agreed plans for the construction of new homes in Cowley and Oxpens, and the redevelopment of Blackbird Leys District Centre, and Knight's Road.</p>	
<b>17.</b>	Consideration should be given to the potential of social prescribing for improving the health and wellbeing of Oxfordshire residents, addressing health inequalities in particular, and learning from other areas	<p>There is an OCCG pilot scheme at the Burry Knowles Health Centre.</p> <p>The City Council is keen to pursue social subscribing in other areas and to develop closer relationships between our community and leisure centers and local GP surgeries and health centers.</p>	
<b>18</b>	In 2014 9.1% of households were fuel poor. This should be reduced in line with the targets set by the Fuel Poverty	The City Council has improved energy efficiency in private homes so they are warmer and cheaper to heat. We have provided grants and encouraged positive action by landlords.	The Health Improvement Boars is due to hold a workshop on addressing

	Regulations of 2014.	We work closely with the Affordable Warmth Network.	<p>fuel poverty and health inequalities in March/April (date tbc)</p> <p>The aims are:</p> <p>To encourage greater join up between organisations tackling fuel poverty and identify areas for further targeted work.</p> <p>To set the strategic direction for Oxfordshire fuel poverty work.</p>
<b>19.</b>	<p>All public authorities are encouraged to continue their collaboration and invest in supporting rough sleepers into settled accommodation, analyzing the best way of investing funding in the future.</p> <p>Homelessness pathways should be adequately resourced and no cut in resources made with all partners at the very least maintaining in real terms the level of dedicated annual budget for housing support.</p>	<p>The City Council provide £1.4m grants to homelessness organisations.</p> <p>It has invested £5m in a £10m fund for our Real Lettings Scheme to acquire properties to house local families in temporary accommodation.</p> <p>It has launched a new Rent Guarantee Scheme to provide access to the private rented sector, for 40 households a year.</p> <p>It has protected services for homeless people to mitigate reductions in county funding through joint commissioning of services with the County Council, NHS and district councils.</p>	<p>There is the Homelessness Support Sub Group of the Health Improvement Board who oversees and coordinates homelessness activities across the county and report to the health Improvement Board annually.</p>

		It has secured £790K of government funding to help prevent homelessness and improve services for homeless people.	
<b><u>20.</u></b>	The numbers of people sleeping rough in Oxfordshire should be actively monitored and reduced.	The numbers of people sleeping rough are monitored at the Health Improvement Board. Monitoring and activities to address homelessness is planned and coordinated through the Supported Housing Group (see above).	
<b><u>25.</u></b>	Funding for locally enhanced services for refugees and asylum-seekers should be made available to all GP practices, with the expectation that funding for this service would primarily be drawn on by practices seeing large numbers of refugees and asylum seekers.	<p>The City Council is actively engaged in the VPRS scheme to support the resettlement of Syrian refugees. To date it has helped 14 families.</p> <p>The City Council facilitates a Refugee and Asylum Seeker Group aimed at improving the coordination of services to refugee and asylum seekers. This group is actively working with the OCCG to identify resources to provide enhanced services at GP practices with large numbers of asylum seekers and refugees.</p>	
<b><u>27.</u></b>	Outreach work in communities with high numbers of refugees, asylum seekers and migrants, should be actively supported and resources maintained, if not increased, especially to the voluntary sector, to improve access to the NHS, face to face interpretation /advocacy and awareness	<p>The City Council Communities Team undertakes outreach into areas of the city with high numbers of refugee and asylum seekers.</p> <p>The City Council is also working with voluntary sector organizations to improve access to ESOL provision and to improve access to health provision</p>	

	raising amongst health care professionals	and other services.	
<b><u>28.</u></b>	A set of Oxfordshire-grounded targets for increasing activity should be developed, targeting people living in deprived areas, older people, and vulnerable groups.	<p>Oxford City Council already has a range of targets to promote increased activity for people living in deprived areas and for particular groups, such as young people, older people and other vulnerable groups.</p> <p>These are targets are set for the delivery of:</p> <p>Leisure services Cultural services Youth provision</p>	
<b><u>29.</u></b>	Continuing investment and coordination of existing initiatives should be maintained supported by social marketing and awareness-raising of the benefits of physical activity to targeted populations.	<p>The City Council has a Wellbeing Strategy to ensure that services are delivered in line with county-wide strategies, such as the Healthy Weight Strategy.</p> <p>The City Council uses a host of social marketing techniques to promote its leisure, cultural and youth activities. These include Facebook, Twitter and Instagram. Each building has its own Facebook account, including the Museum and community centers.</p> <p>Posts are targeting particular communities are made almost daily.</p>	
<b><u>58.</u></b>	Promoting general health and wellbeing through a linked all ages approach to physical activity, targeting an increase in	The City Council has a Wellbeing Strategy promoting general health and wellbeing in the city	

	activity levels in the over 50s, especially in deprived areas, using innovative motivational approaches such as 'Good Gym' and Generation Games	aimed at all ages.  See above.	
<b><u>42.</u></b>	Use of food banks needs to be carefully monitored and reported to HWB	The City Council is working closely with 'Good Food Oxford' and 'Managing the Gaps' to map services which support those in food poverty.  These will be made available on Good Food Oxford Website.  The information will also be used to identify any gaps in provision.	
<b><u>47.</u></b>	Promoting the health of those in work should be a priority and examples of good practice shared by establishing a county wide network.	The City Council has a comprehensive programmer of support and activities to promote the good health of their staff.	

**To: City Executive Board**

**Date: 9 February 2017**

**Report of: Housing Panel (Panel of the Scrutiny Committee)**

**Title of Report: University Housing Needs**

### **Summary and Recommendations**

**Purpose of report:** To present the recommendation of the Housing Panel on University Housing Needs

**Scrutiny Lead Member:** Councillor David Henwood, Chair of Housing Panel

**Executive lead member:** Councillor Alex Hollingsworth, Board Member for Planning and Regulatory Services

**Recommendation** of the Scrutiny Committee to the City Executive Board:

**That the City Executive Board states whether it agrees or disagrees with the recommendation set out in the body of this report.**

### **Introduction**

1. The Panel convened a discussion with representatives of both universities to hear their plans for accommodating students in the city and consider the impacts of the council's current adopted planning policies on their growth proposals. This meeting took place on 9 November 2016 and the Panel would like to thank William James and Carolyn Puddicombe from the University of Oxford, and Paul Large and Sue Holmes from Oxford Brookes University. The Panel would also like to thank Councillor Alex Hollingsworth, Board Member for Planning and Regulatory Services, David Edwards (Executive Director for Housing and Regeneration) and Mark Jaggard (Planning Policy and Specialist Services Manager). The Panel also held an informal follow-up meeting with the Board Member and Executive Director to reflect on the evidence provided.

### **Summary of discussions with the University of Oxford**

2. The Pro Vice-Chancellor for Planning and Resource Allocation at the University of Oxford said that the University has over 10,000 under-graduate students who

are mostly housed in university-provided accommodation, plus about 10,000 graduate students including 4,500 postdoctoral researchers. The University is within its planning policy target of having no more than 3,000 full-time students living in the city outside of university-provided accommodation (Core Strategy Policy CS25). The Panel heard that the University of Oxford has two asks of the City Council:

- a) That postdoctoral researchers be exempt from Oxford University's target of having no more than 3,000 students living in the city outside of university-provided accommodation.
  - b) That the development of employee housing schemes (including purpose built accommodation for postdocs) be exempt from planning policies requiring the delivery of new affordable housing (either onsite or via financial contributions).
3. The Pro Vice-Chancellor said that postdocs are typically young professionals from around the world who need to live close to their research for 3-4 years, and should be treated differently from taught students because their accommodation requirements are different, for example they are more likely to live with a partner or have a family. Postdocs are the group most adversely affected by the housing situation in the city, spending up to 60% of their earnings on housing costs. The Panel heard that the University is looking to develop 2,000 new units of purpose built accommodation for postdocs to rent at affordable rates. The only impediment to doing so is the council's current affordable housing policy, which makes such schemes unviable by requiring the delivery of at least 50% of the proposed new dwellings as affordable housing to meet wider needs such as social rent.
  4. The Executive Director for Housing and Regeneration said that the adopted affordable housing planning policy includes a mechanism for reducing affordable housing contributions if the proposal demonstrates in a clear and transparent way why the requirement makes the scheme unviable. The University's proposals to develop 2,000 units have not been tested against this policy or proper viability evidence provided. There is no impediment to the University of Oxford entering into pre-application discussion to look at viability or submitting a planning application if it has the evidence to justify departing from the policy. The Board Member for Planning and Regulatory said that during the Core Strategy period (2006/07 to 2015/16), affordable housing completions have accounted for 30% of all net dwellings completed; a significant achievement given that small scale developments have been exempt.
  5. The Panel commented that the delivery of new affordable housing is a key priority for the City Council and questioned whether the University of Oxford could use some of its own land to support affordable housing delivery, given that staff members employed by the University are also affected by the high cost of housing. The Pro Vice-Chancellor said that it would not be in the University's interests to provide loss-leading social housing that would be subject to Right to Buy after a period of time. However, the proposed developments totalling 2,000 units would have wider benefits for the housing sector in the city because they would free up private market rented homes for the wider market, relieving some of the pressure on the lower end of the private rented sector. The University and its partners have land available and can access very competitive interest rates to



finance the delivery of 2,000 units across multiple locations in the city, with the first tranche at Osney Mead. The University would not be seeking to make a profit from these schemes but where university-owned land is sold for commercial development the affordable housing policies would be applied to developments on those sites.

6. The Panel asked whether 2,000 new units will be sufficient if the number of postdocs in the city continues to grow (the number of undergraduates at the University has remained steady since 2000/01). The Pro Vice-Chancellor said that this sector has grown by about 7% per year since the global financial crisis, and that this growth had not been anticipated in the early 2010s. Further expansion is expected and 2,000 units should be seen as a start. Lenders are keen to finance these types of developments and if they are successful, more schemes could come forward in time.
7. The main areas of disagreement between the University of Oxford and the Housing Panel can be summarised as centring on:
  - The University's claim that the Council had not delivered new housing.
  - The University's claim that sites in Wolvercote and Northern Gateway are too far from university facilities to be suitable for student or postdoc accommodation.
  - The Panel's view that the University should do more to maximise accommodation on sites they own.
  - The Panel's view that the University should do more to ensure that their lower paid support staff can be suitably accommodated in the City.

### **Summary of discussions with Oxford Brookes University**

8. The Director of Infrastructure Investment at Oxford Brookes University said that Brookes is currently breaching the target of having no more than 3,000 full-time students living in the city outside of university-provided accommodation. While the number of undergraduates at Brookes has been on an upward trajectory since 2000/01, the increase in students living in houses of multiple occupations (HMOs) was not what Brookes wanted to see because HMO accommodation was expensive and often of poor quality. Brookes has three asks of the council:
  - a) The allocation of additional sites for university student housing and the recognition that Brookes would need to develop/fund new student accommodation in partnership with private sector developers, as Brookes does not have the same extensive level of land ownership as the University of Oxford does.
  - b) That nursing and teaching students be exempt from the council's planning policy target to have no more than 3,000 Brookes students living in the city outside of university-provided accommodation.
  - c) Tougher regulation to improve standards in the HMO sector.
9. The Panel heard that Oxford Brookes University is focused on investing in its academic estate over the coming decade following years of under-investment. Brookes wants to provide an attractive accommodation offer to its students but the lack of land availability and high cost of housing presents a double whammy.

Land values in the city are incredibly expensive and Brookes have no land or significant capital to fund the construction of new student accommodation.

10. Brookes plan to decamp from the Wheatley campus over the coming 10 years and redevelop their facilities at Harcourt Hill Campus (in the Vale of White Horse). A Student Residences Strategy (2016) has recently been published by Brookes which sets out the aims of increasing the capacity and improving the quality of older halls, but without available new sites or capital then Brookes would need to work with private sector developers. The 3,000 target is seen as a blunt instrument that should be revisited to ensure there are no perverse impacts on local services. For example, Brookes could train their share of the government's planned 10,000 additional nurses, who would spend half of their time working in local placements. In 10 or 20 years' time Brookes may be in a position to consider new developments that include a proportion of social housing.

## **Conclusions and recommendations**

11. The Panel support the continued success and expansion of the two universities and note the positive contributions that students from the two universities make to the city, and in particular groups such as postdocs and nursing and teaching students.
12. The Panel recognise that the housing situation in Oxford is now affecting everybody including university staff and students. The continued growth of the city needs to be carefully managed, with a package of policy measures that encourage and balance new student and keyworker accommodation as well as new social housing. The Panel agree that while the current planning policies have generally been effective in helping to deliver much-needed affordable housing, they are fairly rigid and there is a strong case for reviewing how the policies could be improved and strengthened to ensure they are fit for the future as we move forward with the new Oxford Local Plan 2036. The Panel support strong regulation of the private rented sector and the proposed extension of licensing to non-HMO private rented sector accommodation.
13. The Panel note that some land-owning colleges have taken a very commercial approach to new developments in order to maximise their profits. This contrasts to the approach taken to developing new student and keyworker housing in Cambridge. The Panel also note that the University of Oxford had prioritised private residential developments at the Wolvercote Paper Mill site, taking the view that it was too far away from research sites to be suitable for student or postdoc accommodation. The Panel also noted that one of the Colleges has an option to develop one of their City centre sites for speculative student accommodation, rather than using it for University of Oxford student or key worker accommodation.
14. The Panel suggest that officers discuss potential alternative policy positions with the universities at an early stage in the local plan review process. Given that a number of colleges have significant land holdings outside of the city, there is also a need to engage with neighbouring authorities and where possible, agree cross-

border policies that incentivises colleges to bring forward land for development to help meet Oxford's housing needs including student accommodation.

### **Student accommodation**

15. The Panel would wish to encourage flexibility on both sides in respect of new developments of student accommodation for the two universities, given that increasing supply would help relieve pressure on the wider housing market in the city. The Panel is mindful however that that new student accommodation should not be built at the expense of new general needs housing.
16. The Panel note that the council's planning policies set criteria for determining which locations are suitable for student accommodation. This limits new student accommodation to district centres or areas adjacent to main thoroughfares or existing academic or research sites. The Panel suggest that specific sites should be allocated for new university student accommodation during the local plan processes.
17. The Panel suggest that consideration should be given to exempting post-doctoral researchers and nursing and teaching students from the planning policy target of having no more than 3,000 full-time students from each university living outside of university-provided accommodation in the city. This may require the 3,000 figure to be reviewed at the same time, through the Local Plan review. Any exemptions should be balanced by a decrease in the target figures and careful consideration would need to be given to the new levels of those targets. The Panel support maintaining the existing sanction, which is that the universities are unable to increase their academic floor space without complying with the policy.
18. The Panel note that the targets for no more than 3,000 full-time students from each university living outside of university-provided accommodation in the city do not apply to other large educational institutions based in the city that have significant numbers of students living in private rented accommodation. The Panel suggest that consideration should be given to options for extending this policy to other educational institutions if it is considered that there is a strong case for extending these obligations as the best means of reducing pressure on the private rented sector. This approach would need to be balanced against placing restrictions on the usage of new student accommodation by such organisations.
19. The Panel understand that the previous Local Plan limited the use of new student accommodation only to the University of Oxford and Oxford Brookes University. The Planning Inspector for the Oxford Core Strategy removed this requirement. The Panel suggest that the new Oxford Local Plan 2036 could seek to reintroduce this policy given the constrained nature of the Oxford, and the competing demands on the limited availability of sites. (Note: student accommodation needs to provide an affordable housing contribution). The Panel heard that covenants could restrict the use of new student accommodation to university students and this would prevent them being used by language school students for example.

20. The Panel note that there is an increasing trend for private developers to build speculative student accommodation and rent units to students of various educational institutions including but not limited to the two universities. University students housed in private student accommodation are counted as living outside of university-provided accommodation because those units are not always guaranteed as available to the university. Consideration should be given to the case for addressing this anomaly when the policy is reviewed and refreshed.
21. The Panel heard that it may be desirable to prioritise accommodating more students of the two universities in any new private developments of student accommodation, to manage the competition from other institutions. Consideration should also be given to how private developers could be encouraged to work more closely with the universities and where possible, for the universities to collaborate as co-developers to help ensure that developments meet their students' needs.

### **Key worker housing**

22. Local areas are allowed to define what constitutes a key worker. The current definition used by the City Council includes employees of the universities who are lecturers, academic research staff or laboratory technicians, as well as qualified teachers and all NHS clinical staff (apart from doctors and dentists) and a range of other professional occupations. This definition could be broadened to include additional specific groups such as post-doctoral researchers, nursing and teaching students, and university support staff.
23. The Panel recognise that there is a case for doing more to encourage employee housing schemes, including but not limited to the postdoc accommodation schemes proposed by the University of Oxford. Currently the council's policies support key worker housing where its provision is in addition to the required level of social rent affordable housing (set at 80% of the 50% affordable housing target), so there may be a case for allowing some flexibility to substitute some of the social housing obligations with key worker housing obligations on some specific sites. Any changes to affordable housing contributions would be applied across the board to all residential development proposals, not just to the two universities, so the degree of flexibility and precise mechanism for enabling this flexibility would need to be carefully considered and balanced with the need to continue to encourage new social housing and other forms of affordable housing for wider needs in the city than just the two universities.
24. Encouraging key worker housing schemes could also involve making changes to the balance of dwellings policy, given that there is likely to be less demand from larger properties amongst groups such as postdocs. There may be a case for stipulating separate and more flexible balance of dwellings requirements for key worker housing schemes.

***Recommendation – That options are explored through the new Local Plan 2036 processes relating to student accommodation, and that early discussions are sought with the two universities (and neighbouring authorities where relevant) aimed at building shared concerns and shared***

**efforts to improve the housing situation in the city. Consideration should be given to:**

- a) Encouraging the University of Oxford to present proposals for accommodating postdocs in the city; (para. 4)**
- b) Allocating specific sites for new student accommodation for the two universities; (paras. 8a & 16)**
- c) Exempting groups such as post-doctoral researchers and nursing and teaching students from the target of no more than 3,000 students from each university living outside of university-provided accommodation in the city, balanced by a reduction in the target figures; (paras. 2a, 8b & 17)**
- d) Extending the targets for students living outside of provided accommodation to other large educational institutions based in the city; (para. 18)**
- e) Limiting the use of new student accommodation to the two universities; (para. 19)**
- f) Whether university students housed in non-university provided student housing should count towards the 3,000 target figure; (para. 20)**
- g) Encouraging private developers of student accommodation to work closely with the universities; (para. 21)**
- h) Reviewing the local key worker definition to potentially include post-doctoral researchers, nursing and teaching students and lower-paid university support staff; (para. 22)**
- i) Providing some flexibility to substitute some of the social rent planning obligations with key worker housing obligations in order to encourage key worker housing schemes (including accommodation for post-doctoral researchers and lower-paid university support staff); (para. 23)**
- j) Providing additional flexibility in the balance of dwellings policy specifically for key worker housing schemes. (para. 24)**

25. It is noted that these recommendations would also need to be supported with action from the universities to address the housing needs of their students and lower paid workers, as discussed earlier in this paper. For example using university or college-owned land to provide student and key worker accommodation, rather than selling it for private residential development.

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

Andrew Brown on behalf of the Housing Panel  
Scrutiny Officer  
Law and Governance  
Tel: 01865 252230 e-mail: [abrown2@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:abrown2@oxford.gov.uk)

**List of background papers: None**  
**Version number: 1.0**

This page is intentionally left blank

**To: City Executive Board**

**Date: 6 April 2017**

**Report of: Scrutiny Committee**

**Title of Report: Air Quality**

### **Summary and Recommendations**

**Purpose of report:** To present the recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee on Air Quality

**Scrutiny Lead Member:** Councillor Andrew Gant, Chair of Scrutiny

**Executive lead member:** Councillor John Tanner, A Clean Green Oxford

**Recommendation** of the Scrutiny Committee to the City Executive Board:

**That the City Executive Board states whether it agrees or disagrees with the three recommendations set out in the body of this report.**

### **Background**

1. The Scrutiny Committee held a discussion on air quality at a meeting on 28 February 2017, having previously considered this topic in November 2016. The Committee would like to thank Cllr John Tanner, Board Member for A Clean Green Oxford, Martin Kraftl and Stewart Wilson from Oxfordshire County Council, and Jo Colwell, Environmental Sustainability Service Manager, for attending and contributing to this discussion.

### **Findings and recommendations**

2. The Board Member presented the report. He said the County Council was committed to introducing a zero emission zone by 2020. The City and County councils had appointed a consultant to look into practical ways to achieve this in the city centre and ideas were still being formulated. When the low emission zone was introduced buses caused the majority of the air quality problems but buses now produced lower emissions.
3. Martin Kraftl from Oxfordshire County Council addressed the committee. He said the Oxford Transport Strategy 2015-2030 included plans to begin implementing a

zero emission zone by 2020. How quickly it could be rolled out would depend on what types of vehicles would be affected. Improved technology will assist the move to zero emissions. There was now 25% less traffic in the city than there was 20 years ago so progress had been made but there was still a huge amount to do. The Oxford Transport Strategy set out the priorities, which included working on creating better cycling and walking routes as well as a zero emissions zone.

4. The Committee asked how the City Council's comments on the Oxford Transport Strategy had been received by the County Council. Cllr Tanner said the County agreed with the City Council's comments. It was going to take a lot of co-operation to deal with the ongoing problems but improving air quality in the city centre would have a knock on benefits for other parts of the city.
5. The Environmental Sustainability Manager said that the City monitored air quality based on DEFRA advice. Diffusion tubes were placed in areas in the city known to have poor air quality. These were places with high levels of traffic close to residential homes and businesses. There were 75 diffusion tubes in the city which were checked every month. Data needed to be collected, analysed and audited over a 12 month period to show the long term trend of air quality at a site.
6. The Committee asked why there were so many diffusion tubes in close proximity in the city centre and why few were positioned close to the bypass. The Board Member said it was important to have lots of diffusion tubes in the city centre to monitor the situation on a number of main streets. Often two diffusion tubes were put close together to act as a control. The monitoring of different sites informed the City Council areas of concern and provided the basis of reporting on Air Quality in Oxford to DEFRA. Diffusion tubes were placed along the ring road (e.g. on the A40 near Sunderland Avenue), main traffic corridors and the city centre. There were location specific hotspots that were set out in the Annual Monitoring Report.
7. The Committee asked what specific steps could be taken to improve air quality in the worst areas, e.g. St. Clements, and whether there were plans for additional monitoring or public signage. The Board Member said he'd much prefer to focus on the causes of the problem rather than tell people how bad it was. The Environmental Sustainability Manager added that daily air quality levels were already publically available on the City Council website.
8. The Committee questioned whether as a planning authority the City Council put mitigating conditions on major planning applications approved at sites with poor air quality, such as the Westgate Shopping Centre or Northern Gateway. The Environmental Sustainability Manager confirmed after the meeting that the Council did require mitigation where air quality was forecast to be impacted by development and had secured mitigation measures and a full air quality action plan for the Westgate.

***Recommendation 1 – That as part of the Local Plan review consideration is given to policies to mitigate the negative impacts of development in areas with poor air quality.***



9. The Committee asked about the reason why Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) levels had risen since 2014 and whether they were attributable to a particular type of fuel. The Committee heard that all combustion engines produced NOx emissions that were harmful to human health but diesel engines produced more. The Environmental Sustainability Manager said that road works at Frideswide Square and elsewhere were thought to have contributed to some of these increases. However the long term trend was one of reducing levels on NOx. The Board Member commented that the government needed to stop offering tax incentives for diesel vehicles and incentivise electric vehicles instead.
10. The Committee noted that the City Council had the power to adopt parking zones with differentiated charges and questioned whether the Council could offer free parking for electric vehicles (e.g. up to 5 spaces). The Board Member said it would be hard to enforce differentiated parking zones in the city and that he would prefer focusing on improving air quality by tackling its primary cause.

***Recommendation 2 – That consideration is given to implementing differentiated car-parking charges in order to offer cheaper parking for electric vehicles.***

11. The Committee commented that they would like to see officers review the measures in the City's Air Quality Annual Status that had not progressed and the feasibility and impact of progressing these. The Environmental Sustainability Manager advised that a review and update of actions was carried out annually as part of the Annual Status Report for DEFRA. The City Council went some way beyond its statutory responsibilities to monitor and report on air quality and had developed an array of initiatives and funding to improve air quality.

***Recommendation 3 – That the feasibility and impact of measures contained in the City's Air Quality Annual Status report that have not been progressed to date are reviewed annually.***

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

Andrew Brown on behalf of the Scrutiny Committee  
Scrutiny Officer  
Law and Governance  
Tel: 01865 252230 e-mail: [abrown2@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:abrown2@oxford.gov.uk)

**List of background papers: None**  
**Version number: 0.2**

This page is intentionally left blank

**To: City Executive Board**

**Date: 6 April 2017**

**Report of: Scrutiny Committee**

**Title of Report: Workplace parking levies**

### **Summary and Recommendations**

**Purpose of report:** To present the recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee on workplace parking levies

**Scrutiny Lead Member:** Councillor Andrew Gant, Chair of Scrutiny

**Executive lead member:** Councillor Alex Hollingsworth, Board Member for Planning and Regulatory Services

**Recommendation** of the Scrutiny Committee to the City Executive Board:

**That the City Executive Board states whether it agrees or disagrees with the recommendations set out in the body of this report.**

### **Background**

1. The Scrutiny Committee considered the County Council's decision to develop proposals for a workplace parking levy (WPL) and a congestion charge in Oxford. This item took place at a meeting on 28 February 2017 and the Committee would like to thank Martin Kraftl and Stewart Wilson from Oxfordshire County Council, and Jo Colwell, Environmental Sustainability Service Manager, for attending and contributing to this discussion.

### **Findings and recommendations**

2. The Committee heard that County Council's cabinet had approved the development of proposals for both a WPL and a congestion charge at their meeting in November 2016. Officers were at the pre-planning phase of the project and hadn't yet started any engagement activities. The County Council had however held discussions with a former director of Nottingham City Council, which was the only local authority in England to have implemented a WPL.

3. In response to questions about the Nottingham WPL scheme the Committee heard that the charge was approximately £375 to £400 per space per year. Nottingham had used the proceeds of their WPL scheme to fund a tram system and a connected bus service. Employers were liable for the charge and it was up to them whether the charge was passed on to employees. Businesses were only charged for the spaces they used and Nottingham City Council had exempted groups such as hospital workers and employers with fewer than ten employees. As no proposals had yet been developed for a WPL scheme in Oxford no decisions had been taken about what sorts of exemptions might be applied here.
4. The Committee commented that public transport would have to be significantly improved for a WPL scheme to be widely supported in Oxford. The Board Member responded that if nothing was done then the issues with parking and traffic jams in the city would only get worse and it was unlikely that improvements such as high speed rapid buses could be funded without such a scheme. Businesses would benefit from more staff getting to work on time and had the option of avoiding the charge by not providing car parking spaces, which could instead be used for more productive means.
5. The Committee questioned whether a congestion charge could have the same benefits and impacts as a WPL. The Committee heard that the County Council was looking at both but that initial findings were that the running costs of a congestion charging scheme would be higher and it would therefore raise less revenue for improving transport links into the city.

***Recommendation 1 – That the City Council supports the County Council's development of proposals for a workplace parking levy and a congestion charge given that both approaches have the potential to generate significant additional funding for transport improvements in the city and reduce congestion.***

6. The Committee raised concerns that a WPL could encourage more people to park their vehicles in residential areas and catch buses to work in the city. The Committee heard that a WPL was likely to be applicable to the whole of the city and potentially to parts of neighbouring local authority areas that border the city as well. The Committee suggest that consideration would need to be given to how people could be discouraged from parking in residential areas to avoid the WPL, perhaps through the introduction of a citywide controlled parking zone.
7. The Committee questioned whether it would be possible to vary the price of a WPL in different parts of the city, e.g. charging higher rates in the city centre. The Committee heard that this suggestion was worth considering but could have unintended consequences, such as city centre businesses deciding to relocate away from the city centre.

***Recommendation 2 – That consideration is given to how the City Council could help to mitigate and manage the wider impacts of the future implementation of either a workplace parking levy or a congestion charge on parking in the city, for example through additional controlled parking zones.***

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

Andrew Brown on behalf of the Scrutiny Committee  
Scrutiny Officer  
Law and Governance  
Tel: 01865 252230 e-mail: [abrown2@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:abrown2@oxford.gov.uk)

**List of background papers: None****Version number: 0.1**

This page is intentionally left blank

**To: City Executive Board**

**Date: 6 April 2017**

**Report of: Scrutiny Committee**

**Title of Report: Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel**

### **Summary and Recommendations**

**Purpose of report:** To present the recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee on Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel

**Scrutiny Lead Member:** Councillor Andrew Gant, Chair of Scrutiny

**Executive lead member:** Councillor Dee Sinclair, Board Member for Community Safety

**Recommendation** of the Scrutiny Committee to the City Executive Board:

**That the City Executive Board states whether it agrees or disagrees with the three recommendations set out in the body of this report.**

### **Background**

1. The Scrutiny Committee considered the work of the Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel at a meeting on 28 February 2017. The Committee would like to thank Councillor Dee Sinclair and Clare Gray, Police and Crime Panel Scrutiny Officer, for attending the meeting to present the report and answer questions.

### **Findings and recommendations**

2. The Board Member for Community Safety and Oxford City Council's representative on Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel (PCP) presented the report. She explained that the PCP existed to scrutinise the work of the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) for Thames Valley, who attended every PCP meeting with the Chief Constable. The PCP consisted of 18 councillors from across the Thames Valley region, mostly Conservatives, and 2 independents with backgrounds in victim support and cybercrime. The PCP was funded by a £65k grant from the Home Office and had one dedicated member of staff.

3. The Board Member said that PCC had recently appointed Matt Barber, Leader of the Vale of White Horse District Council, as Deputy PCC but the PCP had not yet been informed of Mr Barber's specific responsibilities. The idea of having Associate PCCs had also been floated and it was possible that these would have a specific geographical focus.
4. The Police and Crime Panel Scrutiny Officer, said the Thames Valley Police budget had reduced by £88m over 6 years, an overall saving of 25%, at a time when crime was changing and becoming more complex. As a result, police assets were being reviewed and St. Aldate's police station in Oxford could be closed, with proviso that there was still a city centre police presence.
5. The Board Member for Community Safety said she used the PCP as an opportunity to inform the PCP and the representatives from the other local authorities of the issues faced in the city, e.g. safeguarding and human trafficking. However the PCP's powers were limited by legislation and the PCP could only bring things to the attention of the PCC. The PCP felt that they were hampered by legislation whereas the PCC thought the PCP were limited by resourcing constraints.
6. In response to a question the Committee heard that there were few tangible examples of the PCP having influenced the PCC. The PCP had recently held a themed meeting where they had looked at taxi licensing issues across the Thames Valley and discussed the need for a regional database. The PCC was trying to raise the issues of the taxi licensing regime at the national level but the attendees were unaware of the PCC having successfully influenced national policing, although he was engaged in a number of national groups. The PCC was able to set the local policing agenda through his Police and Crime Plan. A new plan would be launched in April but to date there had been no consultation on it. The Committee commented that the PCC should be encouraged to consult on his emerging plan.

***Recommendation 1 – That the Council encourages the Thames Valley Police and Crime Commissioner to publicise and consult on his new Police and Crime Plan.***

7. The Committee heard that the PCP met in Aylesbury 6 times a year and most meetings were themed. The Committee asked whether meetings could be held in different locations across the Thames Valley and perhaps include a focus on more local issues. The Police and Crime Panel Scrutiny Officer said that this had happened originally and that one meeting had been held in Oxford. However, this had required some members of the PCP to travel a long way to meetings so the PCP had settled on Aylesbury on the basis that it was fairly central.

***Recommendation 2 – That the PCP are asked to look again at rotating meetings around the Thames Valley area to encourage public engagement and focus on local issues.***

8. In response to a question the Committee heard that there was very limited public engagement in the PCP, with only one member of the public having attended any



meeting to date. This may be reflective the fact that the powers available to the PCP were very limited. The Committee considered how public engagement could be encouraged and suggested that he Council could help to promote meetings through its own media channels.

***Recommendation 3 – That consideration is given to whether the Council could help to raise awareness of the PCP e.g. by publicising meetings of the PCP through Council media channels.***

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

Andrew Brown on behalf of the Scrutiny Committee  
Scrutiny Officer  
Law and Governance  
Tel: 01865 252230 e-mail: [abrown2@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:abrown2@oxford.gov.uk)

**List of background papers: None**  
**Version number: 0.1**

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank