

Agenda

City Executive Board

Date: **Tuesday 14 August 2018**

Time: **5.00 pm**

Place: **The Old Library - Oxford Town Hall**

For any further information please contact:

John Mitchell, Committee and Member Services Officer

Telephone: 01865 252217

Email: executiveboard@oxford.gov.uk

Details of how City Councillors and members of the public may engage with this meeting may be found on page 7 of this agenda.

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

City Executive Board

Membership

Chair/ Leader	Councillor Susan Brown	Leader of the Council, Board Member for Economic Development and Partnership
Vice Chair/ Deputy Leader	Councillor Linda Smith	Deputy Leader (Statutory), Board Member for Leisure and Housing
	Councillor Ed Turner	Deputy Leader, Board Member for Finance and Asset Management
	Councillor Nigel Chapman	Board Member for Customer Focused Services
	Councillor Mary Clarkson	Board Member for Culture and City Centre
	Councillor Tom Hayes	Board Member for Safer, Greener, Environment
	Councillor Alex Hollingsworth	Board Member for Planning and Transport
	Councillor Mike Rowley	Board Member for Housing
	Councillor Christine Simm	Board Member for Supporting Local Communities
	Councillor Louise Upton	Board Member for Healthy Oxford

The quorum for this meeting is three, substitutes are not allowed.

Future items to be discussed by the City Executive Board can be found on the Forward Plan which is available on the Council's [website](#)

Copies of this agenda

Reference copies are available to consult in the Town Hall Reception. Agendas are published 6 working days before the meeting and the draft minutes a few days after.

All agendas, reports and minutes are available online and can be:

- viewed on our website – mycouncil.oxford.gov.uk
- downloaded from our website
- viewed using the computers in the Customer Services, St Aldate's, or
- subscribed to electronically by registering online at mycouncil.oxford.gov.uk

AGENDA

PART ONE PUBLIC BUSINESS

Pages

- | | | |
|---|--|--------|
| 1 | APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE | |
| 2 | DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST | |
| 3 | ADDRESSES AND QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC | |
| 4 | COUNCILLOR ADDRESSES ON ANY ITEM FOR DECISION ON THE BOARD'S AGENDA | |
| 5 | COUNCILLOR ADDRESSES ON NEIGHBOURHOOD ISSUES | |
| 6 | ITEMS RAISED BY BOARD MEMBERS | |
| 7 | SCRUTINY COMMITTEE REPORTS | |
| 8 | CITY WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW - BOUNDARY COMMISSION'S INITIAL PROPOSALS FOR COMMENT | 9 - 14 |

Lead Member: Leader, Economic Development and Partnership
(Councillor Susan Brown)

The Electoral Registration Officer has submitted a report to brief the City Executive Board on the ward boundary review and ask it to comment on the draft ward scheme as published by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.

Recommendations: That the City Executive Board resolves to:

Propose amendments to the new scheme of wards published by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England as follows:

1. in East Oxford the boundaries move from north of St Mary's Road to south of it, and from the east of Bullingdon Road to the west;
2. in Headington the boundary reverts to the City Council's original proposal so the boundary runs up the middle of Old Road. Holyoake Road simply reverts to Quarry and Risinghurst as it would not need to move to enable electoral equality reasons;
3. to amend the proposed name of St. Clement's to Bannister

9	APPROVAL TO PLACE CONTRACT FOR COVERED MARKET ROOF WORKS	15 - 24
	<p>Lead Member: Deputy Leader - Finance and Asset Management (Councillor Ed Turner)</p> <p>The Head of Housing Services has submitted a report to seek approval to place a Contract in the sum £1.3m for a rolling four year programme to replace the covered market roof coverings which have reached the end of their life. Work in connection with which includes redecoration at high level and ensuring safe access for maintenance into the future.</p> <p>Recommendation: That the City Executive Board resolves to:</p> <p>Approve the placing of the contract to Croft Building and Conservation Ltd following the procurement of repair and refurbishment works to the Covered Market roofs in the sum of £1.3m over a four year period.</p>	
10	COURT PLACE FARM CAR PARK	25 - 36
	<p>Lead Member: Planning and Transport (Councillor Alex Hollingsworth)</p> <p>The Executive Director of Sustainable City has submitted a report to implement a coherent parking policy at the Court Place Farm car park.</p> <p>Recommendations: That the City Executive Board resolves to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduce a pay & display parking scheme at Court Place Farm car park; 2. Add Court Place Farm car park to the existing Parks Traffic Order; 3. Agree that the level of penalty charges is kept in accordance with all other City Council operated car parks; and 4. Agree the tariff level at the car park 	
11	APPOINTMENT OF AN OXFORD CITY COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE TO THE OXFORDSHIRE ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL COUNCILS	37 - 40
	<p>The Head of Law and Governance has submitted a report to include the Oxfordshire Association of Local Councils on the list of Oxford City Council Outside Bodies and to appoint a representative for the 2018/19 Council Year; and to note changes in representation to three other organisations.</p> <p>Recommendations: That the City Executive Board resolves to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agree to include the Oxfordshire Association of Local Councils on the list of Oxford City Council Outside Bodies; 2. Appoint Councillor Tanner as the Oxford City Council 	

representative to the Oxfordshire Association of Local Councils for the 2018/19 Council Year;

3. **Note** the appointment of Councillor Howlett as the Oxford City Council representative on the City of Oxford Charity;
4. **Note** the appointment of Councillor Curran as the Oxford City Council representative on the Donnington Community Centre Association; and
5. **Note** the appointment of Councillor Garden as the Oxford City Council representative on the Headington Parish Charity.

12 MINUTES

41 - 44

Recommendation: The City Executive Board NOTES the minutes of the meeting held on 11 July 2018 as a true and accurate record.

13 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Meetings are scheduled for the following dates:

18 September 2018
16 October 2018
14 November 2018
18 December 2018

All meetings start at 5pm.

14 MATTERS EXEMPT FROM PUBLICATION

If the Board 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 Board to pass a resolution in accordance with the provisions of Paragraph 4(2)(b) of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 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 Board 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.

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.

Member's 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.

HOW OXFORD CITY COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC CAN ENGAGE AT THE CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD

Addresses and questions by members of the public, (15 minutes in total)

Members of the public can submit questions in writing about any item for decision at the meeting. Questions, stating the relevant agenda item, must be received by the Head of Law and Governance by 9.30am two clear working day before the meeting (eg for a Tuesday meeting, the deadline would be 9.30am on the Friday before). Questions can be submitted either by letter or by email (executiveboard@oxford.gov.uk).

Answers to the questions will be provided in writing at the meeting; supplementary questions will not be allowed. If it is not possible to provide an answer at the meeting it will be included in the minutes that are published on the Council's website within 2 working days of the meeting.

The Chair has discretion in exceptional circumstances to agree that a submitted question or related statement (dealing with matters that appear on the agenda) can be asked verbally at the meeting. In these cases, the question and/or address is limited to 3 minutes, and will be answered verbally by the Chair or another Board member or an officer of the Council. The text of any proposed address must be submitted within the same timescale as questions.

For this agenda item the Chair's decision is final.

Councillors speaking at meetings

Oxford City councillors may, when the chair agrees, address the Board on an item for decision on the agenda (other than on the minutes). The member seeking to make an address must notify the Head of Law and Governance by 9.30am at least one clear working day before the meeting, stating the relevant agenda items. An address may last for no more than three minutes. If an address is made, the Board member who has political responsibility for the item for decision may respond or the Board will have regard to the points raised in reaching its decision.

Councillors speaking on Neighbourhood issues (10 minutes in total)

Any City Councillor can raise local issues on behalf of communities directly with the Board. The member seeking to make an address must notify the Head of Law and Governance by 9.30am at least one clear working day before the meeting, giving outline details of the issue. Priority will be given to those members who have not already addressed the Board within the year and in the order received. Issues can only be raised once unless otherwise agreed by the Board. The Board's responsibility will be to hear the issue and respond at the meeting, if possible, or arrange a written response within 10 working days.

Items raised by Board members

Such items must be submitted within the same timescale as questions and will be for discussion only and not for a Board decision. Any item which requires a decision of the Board will be the subject of a report to a future meeting of the Board

This page is intentionally left blank

To: City Executive Board

Date: Date of the meeting: 14 August 2018

Report of: Electoral Registration Officer

Title of Report: City Ward Boundary Review 2018

Summary and recommendations	
Purpose of report:	To brief the City Executive Board on the ward boundary review and ask it to comment on the draft ward scheme as published by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.
Key decision:	Yes
Executive Board Member:	Councillor Susan Brown, Leader of the Council
Corporate Priority:	None
Policy Framework:	None
Recommendations: That the City Executive Board resolves to:	
<p>Propose amendments to the new scheme of wards published by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in East Oxford the boundaries moves from north of St Mary's Road to south of it, and from the east of Bullington Road to the west; • in Headington the boundary reverts to the City Council's original proposal so the boundary runs up the middle of Old Road. Holyoake Road simply reverts to Quarry and Risinghurst as it would not need to move to enable electoral equality reasons; and • to amend the proposed name of St. Clement's to Bannister 	

Appendix	
Appendix 1	Risk Register

Introduction

1. At its meeting on 20th March 2018 the City Executive Board agreed to recommend a scheme of wards to the Local Government Boundary Commission. The Commission has now published its draft ward scheme and invites comments on it.

Stages of the review

2. The review is carried out under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 and is split into six stages.
3. The timetable is shown below:

Stage	Timing	Function
Preliminary	June–December 2017	Now complete.
Stage One	9 th Jan-2 nd April 2018	The Commission published a council size it was minded to recommend and invited ward proposals based on that council size. Now complete.
Stage Two	5 th June-13 th August 2018	The Commission has published a draft ward scheme for consultation.
Stage Three	2 nd October 2018	The Commission will publish its final recommendations.
Stage Four	October-December 2018	The Commission's draft order giving effect to its recommendations is laid in both houses of parliament. Parliament can either accept or reject the recommendations. It cannot modify them.
Stage Five	May 2020	The new electoral arrangements will come in to force.

4. The review is now in Stage Two. The consultation ends on 13th August. As the Board meets the day after the Commission has agreed to give the Council a one day extension.
5. The Commission has made various relatively minor amendments to the scheme as submitted by the City Council. Some are around the boundaries in the proposed wards in north Oxford and they bring those areas closer to the average ward size across the city.

Others include in east Oxford where they have made amendments to the proposed new wards of St. Clement's, Donnington and Bartlemas, again for electoral equality reasons.

Cross-party working group

6. As the Board knows a cross-party member working group has been set up in order to make recommendations. The Working Group is made up of members of all groups on the Council (Councillors Hollingsworth, Tanner, Simmons and Wilkinson

[since replaced by Councillor Gotch]). The Working Group met on 18th June and 3rd July 2018 and has made various suggested amendments to the Commission's draft scheme.

It accepts the small changes as proposed by the Commission in the north of the city.

It had concerns about its change in east Oxford and in the eastern part of Old Road.

The Working proposes that:

- in East Oxford the boundaries moves from north of St Mary's Road to south of it, and from the east of Bullingdon Road to the west;
- in Headington the boundary reverts to the City Council's original proposal so the boundary runs up the middle of Old Road. Holyoake Road simply reverts to Quarry and Risinghurst as it would not need to move to enable electoral equality reasons.

Below are the Working Group's proposals in table form.

Street	LGBCE Proposal	Counter-Proposal Option	No. of electors
Bullingdon Road	St Clements	Donnington	356
St Mary's Road (E of Bullingdon Rd)	Donnington	St Clements	157
St Mary's Road	Donnington	St Clements	
Old Road (south side – 114-166)	Quarry and Risinghurst	Churchill	36
Holyoake Road	Headington	Quarry and Risinghurst	
Dorchester Close	Quarry and Risinghurst	Churchill	48
Old Road (south side - 168-Dracena)	Quarry and Risinghurst	Churchill	28
Upper Meadow	Quarry and Risinghurst	Churchill	31

The Working Group believes that these counter-proposals retain electoral equality and provide better and more legible boundaries than the Commission has proposed.

In the proposed St Clement's ward the electoral would be 5157 (6% variance) and Donnington (-2% variance).

The Working Group considered an alternative scheme from the Green Group for the area covered by proposed wards of St. Clement's, Donnington and Bartlemas. The Working Group did not adopt that scheme and the Green Group reserved the right to make a separate submission.

In Old Road, the Working Group considers the Council scheme to be more easily understandable. The Commission argued that it would need new parish wards because of the county division boundaries in the area. The Working Group thought this was a minor issue and indeed the county divisions may well be under a Commission review in the very near future so could change again.

The Working Group felt that the Commission could make minor amendments to parish ward boundaries in the area to reflect the new arrangements, moving the south side of Old Road and the other streets there from the Risinghurst South parish ward into the Wood Farm parish ward. Holyoake Road could then return to the proposed Quarry and Risinghurst ward.

The Working Group proposes to change the proposed name of St. Clement's and replace it with Bannister. This is because the new St. Clement's ward is significantly different from the current one. So to avoid confusion and to acknowledge the recently-deceased Sir Roger Bannister's historic race at the Iffley Road track (within the new ward) the new name of Bannister is proposed.

The Liberal Democrat and Green Groups support the proposals, as amended by the Working Group, except as they cover the new wards of St. Clement's, Donnington and Bartlemas wards.

Financial implications

7. There are no financial implications.

Legal issues

8. There are no specific legal implications insofar as the Council is concerned as it is a consultee.

Level of risk

A completed Risk Register is attached at Appendix 1.

Report author	Martin John
Job title	Electoral Services Manager
Service area or department	Law and Governance
Telephone	01865 252518
e-mail	mjohn@oxford.gov.uk

Background Papers: None

Appendix 1: Risk Register

					Date Raised	Owner	Gross		Current		Residual		Comments	Controls				
Title	Risk description	Opp/ threat	Cause	Consequence			I	P	I	P	I	P		Control description	Due date	Status	Progress %	Action Owner
City Ward Boundary Review 2018	If the agreed scheme is inaccurately implemented by the Council	Threat	Implementation of the agreed scheme	Reputational damage, possible court action	27/10/17	Martin John	3	1	0	0	3	1		Ensure, when the changes are made in the elections management system, that they are checked by at least two different people	Jan 2020	Ongoing	30%	Anita Bradley

This page is intentionally left blank

To: City Executive Board
Date: 14 August 2018
Report of: Head of Housing Services
Title of Report: Award of contract for Covered Market roof replacement

Summary and recommendations	
Purpose of report:	To seek approval to place a Contract in the sum £1.3m for a rolling four year programme to replace the covered market roof coverings which have reached the end of their life. Work in connection with which includes redecoration at high level and ensuring safe access for maintenance into the future.
Key decision:	Yes
Executive Board Member:	Councillor Ed Turner
Corporate Priority:	Vibrant and sustainable economy Efficient and effective Council
Policy Framework:	None.
Recommendation: That the City Executive Board resolves to:	
1. Approve the placing of the contract to Croft Building and Conservation Ltd following the procurement of repair and refurbishment works to the Covered Market roofs in the sum of £1.3m over a four year period	

Appendices	
1	Tender evaluation and evaluation system

Introduction and background

1. As part of the ongoing maintenance of the Covered Market a programme of repairs is in place with identified and approved funding totalling £2.6m over the next four years.
2. One key piece of work is the replacement of the Covered Market roof covering which has been organised on a phased basis and is planned to take place over the next four years
3. Tenders have been sought in line with the Council's procurement policy and processes and we are now in a position to place the contract for the works.
4. The total cost of the works over the four year period is £1.3m which exceeds delegated authority levels.
5. CEB is being asked to approve the placing of this contract to allow works to proceed.

Works in the context of the Covered Market strategy

6. The future strategy of the Covered Market is currently under consideration. These works are not dependent on the longer term strategy nor do they limit any decisions in this regard.
7. It should be noted that there will be a further paper to CEB which discusses future investment in the covered market against other priorities, including the need to reconfigure a number of larger units, letting vacant units, and further need for repair and maintenance.
8. The roof however is in a poor state of repair and is vulnerable to roof leaks and occasional flooding during heavy rainfall. As a grade 2 listed building any future plans with regard to the market will not affect the structure or covering of the roof.
9. The proposed works are therefore simply those of repair and replacement of the current covering to extend and preserve the life of the building and are considered essential to maintain the integrity of the structure for the future
10. The Covered Market is a listed building and all works are being carried out in accordance with the conservation requirements. The works do not include any alterations to the existing structure apart from ensuring safe access walkways for future maintenance.

Procurement process

11. It should be noted that due to the specialist nature of the work and the fact that we are working on a listed building along with access problems, ensuring trading can continue and meeting health and safety requirements arising from this, obtaining Contractors with both the experience and the interest in this work has traditionally been very difficult.
12. The work is being done over seven phases. Phases one to three have already been successfully completed however because we now have budget for the complete works, and because of the specialist nature of the works and the size of

the project it was agreed that the remaining phased works four to seven should be tendered as one contract.

This has a number of benefits.

- a) Efficiency in the tender process avoiding the need to retender the works each financial year
- b) To achieve continuity in the contractor over the period of the works, ensuring a consistent quality of work and smooth running of the contract
- c) Obtain a more competitive price by tendering the works as one large package

13. Tenders were sought on an open tender basis through South East Business Portal. This was done as a single stage tender inviting interested contractors to complete the pricing schedule and provide case studies of similar works they had carried out along with a proposal as to how they would execute the works and the qualifications of the key staff involved in the project. These factors were used to evaluate the tenders, evaluation was based on a 60/40 split Quality/Price.

14. As a result of this evaluation Croft Building and Conservation Ltd was the highest scoring contractor.

Tender evaluation

15. Tenders were received from three contractors. With prices submitted as follows:-

- a) Contractor A £543,019
- b) Contractor B £862,860
- c) Croft Building and Conservation £1,334,042

16. Following the evaluation process (please see appendix 1) the winning tenderer based on 60% Quality and 40% Costs was Croft Building and Conservation despite the fact that they were significantly more expensive than the other two tenderers.

17. Croft Building and Conservation were the only contractor deemed to have provided sufficient information to provide reassurance that they understood the works and were able to commit the correct resources to successfully complete the project

18. This decision was based on the tender evaluation process of considering quality as well as cost. Both Supplier B & C received very low scores for quality for the reasons outlined below and were not considered capable of dealing with such a sensitive building.

19. Below is more detail on the specific questions and responses from the unsuccessful contractor's submissions.

Background of the Company

20. Supplier B

Mainly gave details of School extensions and new build, no details of historic or more complicated projects

21. Supplier C

Advised roofing specialist and experience of new and refurbishment.

Question 1 – Case studies

Please provide TWO case studies detailing current Contracts (within last 5 years) of a similar nature or previous experience to include: Overview of the Contract – project brief; Value of Contract (£); Duration period of Contract/experience;

22. Supplier B

Responded with two case studies, one a new build extension for a school and one re-trussing a single storey school – both with one paragraph of project brief and nothing that addressed the hi-lighted sections above which was considered as a major concern.

23. Supplier C

Responded with two case studies, one a slate tile renewal to a unlisted basic building, one cladding a new steel trussed school extensions again nothing that addressed the hi-lighted sections above which was considered as a major concern.

Question 2 – Contractors experience and qualifications

Please provide CV's of the Team who will be delivering the services, highlighting specific qualifications/experience applicable to this Contract.

Supplier B

Responded with very basic details of the Managing Director, Commercial Manager, Contracts Supervisor and Works Supervisor - no relevant experience highlighted and nothing to identify the contract lead and why they had been chosen.

24. Supplier C

Responded with one sentence for two contracts managers – again no relevant experience highlighted and nothing to identify the contract lead and why they had been chosen.

Pricing

Croft		Supplier A		Supplier B
£1,334,042.00		£543,019.00		£862,860.00

25. It can be seen from the above table that there is a very big difference in the costs. However the quality scores of contractors A and B were so low that Croft was still the winner based on the value for money score of 60% Quality and 40% Prices

26. From the total inadequacy of the submissions from contractors A and B it was evident to the evaluation panel that they had not understood the brief. In addition the prices submitted by both contractors were much lower than our estimated tender price which was based on procurement of past phases and our experience during

the execution of those works which uncovered a number of additional works and complexities of dealing with an historic structure. The latest specification included the additional works discovered in the past phases, however it was felt by the evaluation panel that neither contractor A or B had sufficiently taken this into account and that they would not be able to satisfactorily complete the works for the price they had stated.

27. It was for these reasons that we did not approach them for further clarification or information. It was further considered that to accept either of these tenders would give rise to unacceptable risks in terms of the ability to complete the work, the quality of the finished product, the safe execution of the works and the need to control variations and price rises during the contract as the contractors discovered the true nature of the works.

Consideration of Croft Building Conservation tender

28. In considering whether or not the Croft Building Conservation tender represented value for money, we looked back the tenders from the previous three phases of the work
29. Below is set out the brief history for each phase. It will be seen that we did receive a competitive quote for phase 2. In all other phases we struggled to get enough tenderers to submit prices.

Phase 1 - 2012

30. Only one tender received, from Croft Building and Conservation £112,602.82
31. The final cost was circa £185,384k. As this was the first phase we discovered a number of hidden problems which only became apparent as the roof was stripped and these problems had to be addressed hence the additional work and costs

Phase 2- 2015

32. Tenders were sought from:
- a) Supplier 1 – tender submitted (£148,182)
 - b) Croft Building and Conservation - tender submitted (£107,732)
 - c) Supplier 2 – declined to tender as they did not consider they would be able to meet our H & S requirements
 - d) Supplier 3 – no response received
33. Because of the poor return we contacted several other suitable contractors:-
- a) Supplier 4 – advised they were in London and not interested
 - b) Supplier 5 – advised they were too busy
 - c) Supplier 6 – advised they were too busy

34. Croft Building and Conservation, as the lowest tenderer, were awarded the contract.
35. Final cost circa £120k after additional works were identified

Phase 3 - 2017

36. Aware of the previous difficulties in getting contractors to quote for these works we approached 7 contractors to enquire if they were interested in the works

- a) Supplier 1 – advised they did not want to waste their time tendering against the contractor who won the works for the previous phase
- b) Croft Building And Conservation – expressed interest
- c) Supplier 3 – expressed interest
- d) Supplier 4 – advised they were too busy
- e) Supplier 5 – advised they were too busy
- f) Supplier 6 – expressed interest
- g) Supplier 7 – expressed interest

37. Four contractors were invited to submit tenders. Only one tender received, from Croft Building and Conservation - £153,870. The tender figure was value engineered and negotiations undertaken. The tender figure was reduced and an order placed. The final cost circa £180k (increase due to unforeseen variations)

38. The works included for decorations and external timber repairs were undertaken to all external timberwork and metalwork

Phases 4 to 7

39. This is the current tender being considered by CEB. As can be seen from the tendering of previous phases, despite approaching a significant number of contractors it was very difficult to get them to submit a tender. This we believe is mainly due to the specialist and complex nature of the work. The latest tender submissions demonstrate this further and apart from Croft Building and Conservation we have not managed to attract any contractors with the necessary experience/ ability to safely execute the work.

40. In addition analysis of the current tender from Croft Building and Conservation with their previous price is broadly comparable to the three previous phases taking into account the more difficult access issues on the current phases.

41. Finally, Croft Building and Conservation have proved that they are able to execute the works effectively, competently and to a high quality

Options

42. Below are set out the options that were considered when deciding to recommend the tender from Croft Building and Conservation

- a) **Option 1** – Accept one of the lower current tenderers.
- b) As discussed above the risks of accepting one of the lower current tenderers are significant, for the reasons stated
- c) **Option 2** – Retender the works in an attempt to attract more suitable contractors

- d) Our previous experience has highlighted the difficulties of finding and attracting suitable contractors. There is a risk that this experience will be repeated we may be no further forward, in addition and the costs may increase due to rising costs in the intervening period between the current tender submission and future submissions.
- e) **Option 3** – Accept the tender submitted by Croft Building and Conservation

43. We know that Croft Building and Conservation have successfully completed previous phases to a high standard and they are able to execute the works efficiently. They also now have considerable experience of working on the building. In addition we do have a price benchmark from the tender of phase 2 in 2015. Our tender estimate was based on our previous experience of costs on this building and this is comparable to Croft Building and Conservation's tender submission.

Other implications

44. Croft Building and Conservation carry out a lot of work in the Oxford area. They are committed to the Oxford Living Wage and have confirmed this in their tender submission.

They also recognise the shortage of traditional roofing skills in the industry and are actively involved in taking on apprentices as part of their strategy to address this. We have discussed this with Croft Building and Conservation and they have confirmed that they would support an apprentice from the Oxford area.

Consultation and communications

45. All relevant stakeholders including market traders will be informed of the impact of the works on the day to day running of the contract. This will take the form of an initial communication and be reinforced on a daily basis via the Covered Market Manager, Project manager for the works, and the builder's site foreman/clerk of works.

Health and safety

46. The works are subject to the Construction Design & Management regulations and all the appropriate responsibilities have been identified along with agreed health and safety plans in accordance with the regulations

Financial implications

47. Capital Funding of £1.6 million has already been approved by CEB as part of the annual budget setting process over the next four years. Depending on the timetable of the project this budget may be re-profiled to provide best value for money. The Head of Financial Services may authorise this under delegated powers

Legal issues

48. The NEC3 contract will be used and checked by legal before signing

Equalities impact

49. The extent of the project is related to the execution of building works only and as such has no impact either immediate or lasting on matters of equality

Conclusion

50. In conclusion it is felt that the tender submitted by Croft Building and Conservation represents value for money in a difficult market and that they have the necessary skills and knowledge to complete the work satisfactorily
51. Funding has already been agreed for these works as part of a larger investment in the long term maintenance and repair of the covered Market. CEB approval is required in order to place the works which have been tendered as a package.
52. Members are asked to consider the exceptional circumstances and difficulties experienced in attracting a viable contractor to undertake the work.
53. The cost of the contract at £1.3m exceeds the delegated authority for officers.
54. The CEB is therefore being asked to approve the issue of the appropriate works contract

Report author	Martin Shaw
Job title	Property Services Manager
Service area or department	Housing and Property
Telephone	01865 252544
e-mail	mshaw2@oxford.gov.uk

Background Papers: None

Appendix 1

Below is the outcome of the scoring process for the submitted tenders. An explanation of the evaluation process is also included

Award Criteria Evaluation Spreadsheet

Criteria	Weight	Croft		Contractor B		Contractor C	
		Score	Score weighting	Score	Score weighting	Score	Score weighting
Case studies	36%	5	36	1	7	1	7
CVs	24%	5	24	1	5	1	5
Total	60%		60		12		12
Cost			1334042		543019		862860
Financial	40%		16		40		25
Total	100%		76		52		37

The evaluation process

The scoring framework shown below is used to evaluate qualitative aspect of tenders. The Tenderers response to each question is scored and the total pro-rated to give a percentage score out of the maximum percentage for that section

0 Unacceptable	Nil response, or Proposal is so incomplete or irrelevant that it is not possible to form a judgement
1 Poor	Almost unacceptable, response is limited or proposal is inadequate or substantially irrelevant.
2 Unsatisfactory	Below expectation, proposal does not fully address the requirement and gives rise to a number of concerns about its potential reliability.
3 Satisfactory	Satisfactory, proposal generally meets requirements, gives minor reservations about meeting some of the requirements.
4 Good	Good, meets expectations, proposal provides detail that is directly relevant, gives confidence as to reliability to meeting all key aspects of the requirements.
5 Excellent	Comprehensive, proposal exceeds expectations, gives high confidence that all key aspects of the proposal may be relied upon without reservation, offers added value and innovation that is relevant to requirement.

The final scores for the qualitative and price elements of the tender are combined to give an overall final score for the submission.

With respect to financial criterion scoring each submission is awarded a weighting based on its relationship with the lowest priced quotation on the basis of the submitted lump sum fee. The Tender with the lowest lump sum fee is awarded the full weighting available. Each of the remaining Tenders is awarded a weighting on a pro-rata basis according to the following calculation:

Lowest quotation price

x **40** % of weighting to be allocated

Tenderer price

To: City Executive Board
Date: 14 August 2018
Report of: Executive Director of Sustainable City
Title of Report: Court Place Farm Parking

Summary and recommendations	
Purpose of report:	To implement a coherent parking policy at the Court Place Farm car park
Key decision:	No
Executive Board Member:	Councillor Hollingsworth, Planning and Regulatory Services
Corporate Priority:	A Vibrant and Sustainable Economy.
Policy Framework:	
Recommendations: That the City Executive Board resolves to:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduce a pay & display parking scheme at Court Place Farm car park; 2. Add Court Place Farm car park to the existing Parks Traffic Order; 3. Agree that the level of penalty charges is kept in accordance with all other City Council operated car parks; and 4. Agree the tariff level at the car park 	

Appendices	
Appendix 1	Current Parks Tariff
Appendix 2	Site Plan
Appendix 3	Car park capacity per area

Introduction and background

1. Parking charges in Park locations were first introduced in September 2011. The objective of the scheme was to manage the limited parking spaces available and ensure that the car parks were not used for commuter parking.
2. The current locations include Walton Well Road, Alexander Court, Hinksey Park and two car parks in Cutteslowe located at Harbord Road and Cutteslowe A40.
3. The parking at Court Place Farm is currently divided into three distinct areas, which include Oxford City Football Club, OXSRAD and the City Council's car park. The areas are defined as shown in Appendix 2
4. The overall capacity of the site can accommodate circa 170 vehicles, with the capacity of each area shown in Appendix 3
5. Oxford City Football Club and OXSRAD have confirmed that the current facility is not able to meet current demand during peak periods.
6. Officer observations suggest that non-park/club users are taking advantage of the fact that the Council currently does not charge for parking at this location. This particular site is within walking distance of the John Radcliffe Hospital, which makes it an attractive option for hospital employees that are unable to park at their place of work.

Current Operation

7. The car park currently operates without any parking controls. Customers are not required to pay to use the facility nor are they restricted to a maximum time period.
8. The lack of parking controls and the proximity of this site to the John Radcliffe Hospital have encouraged some customers to use this area as an alternative parking site.
9. Significant capital investment has been invested in this car park to bring the surface up to an acceptable standard.
10. The absence of parking controls has not encouraged visitors to explore whether car sharing or more sustainable forms of transport could be considered when visiting this facility.

Proposal

11. Considering the challenges associated with parking at these sites, it was initially proposed that a cohesive scheme would be adopted across the entire Court Place complex, encompassing OXSRAD, Oxford City Football Clubs and the Council's parking areas.
12. The Council reached a suitable agreement with OXSRAD and have sought to conclude negotiations with OCFC. However, whilst discussions have remained positive, we have not been able to progress the scheme.
13. As a consequence, the Council has not been able to address the parking issues that are affecting this site. Furthermore, OCC have not been able to recover any of the capital investment as parking charges have not yet been introduced.
14. Whilst officers are optimistic that an agreement can be reached with OCFC, it is now proposed that the Council implement a pay & display scheme in the sections shown as area 1 & 2 on appendix 2.
15. The car park is currently used by a number of various groups, which utilise the facility at different points of the day. Officer observations suggest that the majority of vehicles parked in area 1 during the week, in the daytime period are not using the park facility or OXSRAD's gymnasium. It is therefore assumed that these customers are using this car park for commuter purposes.
16. It is likely that this group consists of employees of the John Radcliffe hospital, as they can easily walk to the hospital within 15-20 minutes.
17. Outside of the daytime period during the week, the site is predominately used by netball and football teams for either matches or training sessions. However, both parties preference for parking is to utilise the OCFC area, as this adjacent to the facility being used.
18. Patronage at weekends mainly consists of spectators and participants of OCFC . However, it is understood that the car park is also used by other sporting groups who may be parking at this site whilst using adjacent facilities.
19. The parking tariff will only operate Monday-Friday . It is expected that the operating period will reduce the amount of commuters that are using this car park, whilst facilitating sporting groups that use the facility at the weekend.

20. Officers have taken into consideration the average length of stay and are proposing that the first tariff band is charged at a level that does not discourage use. However, whilst the charge is modest, it is hoped that the introduction of a parking tariff may persuade some to seek more sustainable mode of transport or consider car sharing where possible. See appendix 1 for tariff information.
21. Implementing a parking scheme at this site will ensure the area is managed and the facility is utilised by those intended. The tariff adopted will further support this objective by discouraging commuter parking,
22. Parking enforcement will be undertaken by the Council's parking contractor Oxford Direct Services (ODSL) and penalty notices will be issued for non-compliance including the use of the disabled bays located near the Oxsrads facility. The current Excess Charge is £100 reduced to £50 if paid within 14 days in accordance with all other public off-street car parks operated by the City Council.

Financial Implications

23. To enable enforcement two parking machines will also be required in addition to a small amount of signage.
24. The financial forecast suggests that this site could generate c£9,000 from parking cars at this facility. The capital investment made in the car park will be gradually recovered once charges are introduced.
25. The car park has been recently resurfaced. For this site to be maintained to an acceptable standard, it is suggested that a £5,000 per annum budget provision is created.

Legal Issues

26. If the recommendation is ratified, the Council will be required to obtain consent from the Highways authority to the proposals contained within this report and then to promote the Order following the same process as adopted for all other off-street Council car parks. The Order must be advertised for 21 days. This provides customers with an opportunity to formally comment on the proposal.

Consultation

27. The Council has met with OCFC and OXSRAD to ensure the scheme achieves the desired outcomes.

28. Whilst we have not been able to conclude an arrangement with OCFC, it is generally acknowledged that there is only a finite parking resource and this needs to be better managed.

29. Licence agreements with OXSRAD have been signed and agreed.

30. Once the CEB has ratified the proposal, the Traffic Order will be advertised in the local press and notices displayed within the affected car park. This notice will invite customers to formally comment on the proposal.

31. If the proposal is agreed and a variation order is advertised, any comments received will be considered in consultation with the relevant Board Member.

Level of Risk

32. The City Council/ODSL has a significant and successful track record in providing off-street parking in the city centre, park & rides, suburban sites and park locations. This experience has helped formulate a successful policy which encourages visitors whilst reducing congestion.

33. Historically when charges are introduced affordability of the tariff is often cited as the main obstacle for customers using the facility. However, as the proposed tariff is £1.00 for up to three hours parking, it is anticipated that this amount will not adversely impact usage.

34. Failure to implement a cohesive parking policy at Court Place Farm will not encourage motorists to change their behaviour. The car park will remain an attractive alternative for employees working at the hospital and capacity will be exceeded during peak periods.

Conclusion

35. Implementing a tariff may encourage commuters to utilise more sustainable methods of transport or car share, consequently reducing congestion in the area. This will help to ensure that there are available parking spaces for bona fide users of the park.

36. The proposed scheme will help manage the available capacity, achieve a turnover of vehicles and to recover costs associated with providing these facilities.

Report author	Jason Munro
Parking Manager	
Service area or department	Oxford Direct Services
Telephone	01865 252489
e-mail	<u>Jason.Munro@oxfordds.co.uk</u>

Background Papers: None

Appendix 1

Current Tariff in Park Locations

Parks		0-1 hour	1-3 hours	3-5 hours	5 - 24 hours
Hinksey Park	42	£0.80	£2.00	£4.00	£15.00
Walton Well Road	28	£0.80	£2.00	£4.00	£15.00
Alexander Court	26	£1.00	£2.00	£4.00	£15.00

		0-1 hour	1-3 hours	3-24 hours
Cotteslowe	45	£0.80	£2.00	£3.00
Cottesllowe - A40	60	£0.80	£2.00	£3.00

Proposed Tariff Monday – Friday

		0-3 hour	3-6 hours	6-24 hours
Court Place Farm	70	£1.00	£2.00	£6.00

This page is intentionally left blank



This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 3

Current Car Park Capacity

Area	Approximate Capacity
Area 1 – Oxford City Council	70 parking spaces
Area 2 – Oxsrade	20 parking spaces
Area 3 – OCFC	80 parking spaces

This page is intentionally left blank

To: City Executive Board
Date: 14 August 2018
Report of: Head of Law and Governance
Title of Report: Appointment of an Oxford City Council representative to the Oxfordshire Association of Local Councils

Summary and recommendations	
Purpose of report:	To include the Oxfordshire Association of Local Councils on the list of Oxford City Council Outside Bodies and to appoint a representative for the 2018/19 Council Year; and to note changes in representation to two other organisations.
Key decision:	No
Executive Board Member:	Councillor Susan Brown, Leader, Member for Economic Development and Partnerships
Corporate Priority:	None
Policy Framework:	None
Recommendations: That the City Executive Board resolves to:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agree to include the Oxfordshire Association of Local Councils on the list of Oxford City Council Outside Bodies; 2. Appoint Councillor Tanner as the Oxford City Council representative to the Oxfordshire Association of Local Councils for the 2018/19 Council Year; 3. Note the appointment of Councillor Howlett as the Oxford City Council representative on the City of Oxford Charity; 4. Note the appointment of Councillor Curran as the Oxford City Council representative on the Donnington Community Centre Association; and 5. Note the appointment of Councillor Garden as the Oxford City Council representative on the Headington Parish Charity. 	

Appendices
None

Introduction

1. The Oxfordshire Association of Local Councils has approached the City Council to appoint a representative to the OALC Executive & Policy Committee.
2. The appointment of representatives to Outside Bodies is a matter for the Leader of the Council, who chooses to seek Executive Board agreement to her nominations.
3. The Leader wishes to include the Oxfordshire Association of Local Councils (OALC) on the list of Oxford City Council Outside Bodies and appoint Councillor John Tanner as the Oxford City Council representative for the 2018/19 Council Year.
4. The Oxfordshire Association of Local Councils is a membership organisation that represents the interests of affiliated parish and town councils and supports parish meetings. The County Council and each of the District Councils are also represented on the OALC Executive & Policy Committee.
5. Representation on the OALC Executive & Policy Committee would provide a greater insight and the opportunity to contribute to discussions and deliberations on the issues facing parish councils. This would complement the role of the City Council's own Parish Council Forum.
6. Representation on the OALC Executive & Policy Committee meets the following categories for Council appointments to outside bodies:
 - B. Appointments to organisations with established historical links to the local community, the city of Oxford or the City Council on which representation is desirable and should be maintained as a matter of local goodwill and for as long as nominations are forthcoming from members
 - C. Appointments which will allow the Council to influence policy at a national or regional level

Change in representation

7. If a change in representation to an organisation is required during the year the appointment is delegated to the Head of Law and Governance in consultation with the Leader of the Council, and where appropriate with other group leaders.
8. The Head of Law and Governance, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, has agreed the following changes in representation:

Outside Body	Stood down	New representative
City of Oxford Charity	Cllr Corais	Cllr Howlett
Donnington Community Centre Association	Cllr Tanner	Cllr Curran
Headington Parish Charity	Cllr Wilkinson	Cllr Garden

Legal and Financial issues

9. Representation on outside organisations presents legal implications for the Council if the roles and responsibilities of those involved are not fully defined.

Council representatives are provided with detailed written guidance on their roles and responsibilities.

10. The appointment proposed in this report has no direct financial implications for the Council.

Level of risk

11. Representation on outside organisations should result in benefit to both the Council and the organisation concerned. There is a risk that such benefit may be lost to either or both parties if representation is withdrawn or inadequately resourced or briefed.

Equalities impact

12. An Equalities Impact Assessment is not necessary for this report.

Report author	Catherine Phythian
Job title	Committee & Member Services Officer
Service area or department	Committee and Member Services
Telephone	01865 252402
e-mail	cphythian@oxford.gov.uk

Background Papers: None

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes of a meeting of the CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD on Wednesday 11 July 2018



Committee members:

Councillor Brown (Chair)

Councillor Chapman

Councillor Rowley

Councillor Upton

Councillor Linda Smith (Deputy Leader)

Councillor Hollingsworth

Councillor Tidball

Officers:

Gordon Mitchell, Chief Executive

Tim Sadler, Executive Director Sustainable City

Ian Brooke, Head of Community Services

Lindsay Cane, Legal Services Manager

Nigel Kennedy, Head of Financial Services

John Mitchell, Committee and Member Services Officer

Also present:

Councillor Andrew Gant

Apologies:

Councillors Turner and Hayes sent apologies.

35. Declarations of Interest

None.

36. Addresses and Questions by Members of the Public

None.

37. Councillor Addresses on any item for decision on the Board's agenda

None.

38. Councillor Addresses on Neighbourhood Issues

Councillor Gant spoke to this item. He had become aware that the Chair had recently accepted the opportunity to be briefed on the Northern Gateway project by the developers. He thought it would have been helpful for that opportunity to have been available to the rest of the Board and those Ward Members affected by the project.

The Chair explained that the invitation had come at very short notice and it had not been practicable to involve others. She noted that this had come prior to a public

consultation which was due to start very soon and which would give all those with an interest the opportunity to contribute.

39. Items raised by Board Members

None.

40. Scrutiny Committee Reports

The Scrutiny Committee met on 03 July. No reports were due to come to this meeting of the City Executive Board as a direct result of that meeting. Cllr Gant, as Chair of Scrutiny Committee, was however able to report on the establishment by Scrutiny Committee of two review groups on “No Local Connection” (in the context of homelessness) and “Tourism Management.”

41. Children and young people's strategy

The Head of Community Services had submitted a report to request that the City Executive Board approve the Children & Young People’s Strategy (2018-2022) which had been updated following consultation.

Cllr Tidball introduced this item, reminding members of the Board that they had seen the previous pre-consultation iteration of the strategy. The consultation had been very effective, elicited over a hundred responses, the majority of which had been from representative organisations, which had, in turn, helped to shape and improve the strategy.

She was pleased to note that the Children’s Trust regarded the strategy as an example of good practice and it would be cited in its revised Children and Young People’s Plan.

The Head of Community Services drew attention to paragraph 14 of the report which summarised common themes flowing from the consultation which included: making the strategy accessible to a wider audience; the need to work effectively in partnership; increased clarity on roles and responsibilities; increased focus on those with disabilities; and an increased focus on mental health.

The Chair thanked all those who had contributed to this important piece of work. She encouraged Board members to take every opportunity to celebrate and promote the wide range of support and activities provided by the City Council for children and young people.

The City Executive Board resolved to:

Adopt the Children & Young People’s Strategy.

42. Minutes

The City Executive Board resolved to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 13 June 2018 as a true and accurate record.

43. Dates of Future Meetings

Meetings are scheduled for the following dates:

14 August 2018
18 September 2018
16 October 2018
14 November 2018
18 December 2018

All meetings start at 5pm.

44. Matters Exempt from Publication

No matters were considered in confidential session.

The meeting started at 5.00 pm and ended at 5.15 pm

Chair

Date: Tuesday 14 August 2018

This page is intentionally left blank