

Agenda

www.oxford.gov.uk



Council

Date: **Monday 21 February 2011**

Time: **5.00 pm**

Place: **The Council Chamber, Oxford Town Hall**

For any further information please contact:

Mathew Metcalfe, Democratic Services Officer

Tel: (01865) 252214

Email: mmetcalfe@oxford.gov.uk

If you would like help to understand this document please call Mathew Metcalfe, Democratic Services Officer on 01865 252214 or e-mail mmetcalfe@oxford.gov.uk in advance of the meeting.

Council

Membership

Lord Mayor
Deputy Lord Mayor
Sheriff

Councillor John Goddard
Councillor Dee Sinclair
Councillor Colin Cook

Councillor Mohammed Niaz Abbasi
Councillor Mohammed Altaf-Khan
Councillor Alan Armitage
Councillor Antonia Bance
Councillor Laurence Baxter
Councillor Elise Benjamin
Councillor Tony Brett
Councillor Stephen Brown
Councillor Clark Brundin
Councillor Jim Campbell
Councillor Mary Clarkson
Councillor Van Coulter
Councillor Stuart Craft
Councillor Roy Darke
Councillor Jean Fooks
Councillor Mike Gotch
Councillor Beverley Hazell
Councillor Rae Humberstone
Councillor Graham Jones
Councillor Bryan Keen
Councillor Shah Jahan Khan
Councillor Ben Lloyd-Shogbesan

Councillor Mark Lygo
Councillor Stuart McCready
Councillor Joe McManners
Councillor Sajjad Malik
Councillor Mark Mills
Councillor Matt Morton
Councillor Susanna Pressel
Councillor Bob Price
Councillor Nathan Pyle
Councillor Mike Rowley
Councillor Gwynneth Royce
Councillor David Rundle
Councillor Gill Sanders
Councillor Scott Seamons
Councillor Val Smith
Councillor John Tanner
Councillor Bob Timbs
Councillor Ed Turner
Councillor Oscar Van Nooijen
Councillor Ruth Wilkinson
Councillor David Williams
Councillor Dick Wolff
Councillor Nuala Young

HOW TO OBTAIN AGENDA

In order to reduce the use of resources, our carbon footprint and our costs we do not produce paper copies of agenda over and above our minimum internal and Council member requirement. Paper copies may be looked at in our Town Hall and Ramsay House (St. Ebbe's Street) reception areas and at public libraries.

A copy of the agenda may be:-

- Viewed on our website - www.oxford.gov.uk/councilmeetings
- Downloaded from our website
- Subscribed to electronically by registering online at www.oxford.gov.uk/ebulletins
- Sent to you in hard copy form upon payment of an annual subscription.

Subscription charges can be found online at www.oxford.gov.uk/agendacharges

SUMMONS

A meeting of the City Council will be held in the Council Chamber, the Town Hall, Oxford, on Monday 21 February 2011 at 5.00 pm to transact the business set out below.

Peter Stoman

Proper Officer

OXFORD CITY COUNCIL

11 FEBRUARY 2011

AGENDA

	Pages
1. MINUTES	
Ordinary meeting held on 24 January 2011	1-36
2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
Councillors are asked to declare any personal or personal prejudicial interests they may have in any of the following agenda items. Guidance is attached at the end of these agenda pages.	
3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	
4. APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES	
5. LORD MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS	
6. SHERIFF'S ANNOUNCEMENTS	
7. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE LEADER	
8. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE, THE CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER AND THE MONITORING OFFICER	

9. ADDRESSES BY THE PUBLIC

To hear addresses from members of the public in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.8 for which the required notice (1.00pm on Thursday 17 February 2011) has been given to the Head of Law and Governance.

10. QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC

To hear questions from members of the public in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.9 to the Leader, a member of the City Executive Board or the Chair of an Area Committee for which the required notice (1.00pm on Thursday 17 February 2011) has been given to the Head of Law and Governance, and to hear responses from those members.

11. REPORT OF THE COUNCIL'S SECTION 151 OFFICER

37-43

The Director of Finance and Efficiency has submitted a report under Section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003 to report on the robustness of the estimates made for the purposes of the budget calculations and the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves.

Council is asked to note the report.

CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

12. BUDGET FOR 2011/12

44-127

Report and minute extract from the City Executive Board held on 9 February 2011.

13. TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY 2011/12

128-155

Report and minute extract from the City Executive Board held on 9 February 2011.

14. CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD DECISIONS (MINUTES)

(a) 9 February 2011

156-162

15. COUNCIL TAX 2011/12

163-174

The Head of Finance has submitted a report which details the calculations to allow the Council Tax for Oxford City for 2011/12 to be set by Council in accordance with the Local Government Finance Acts, 1988 and 1992.

16. RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS FROM SCRUTINY COMMITTEES

No report or recommendations submitted.

17. QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

Questions on notice under Council Procedure Rule 11.10(b) may be asked of the Lord Mayor, a member of the Executive Board or the Chair of a Committee.

Questions on notice must, by the Constitution, be notified to the Head of Law and Governance by no later than 9.30am on Friday 18 February 2011.

Full details of any questions for which the required notice has been given will be circulated to Members of Council before the meeting.

18. STATEMENTS ON NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

Statements on Notice under Council Procedure Rule 11.10(b) may be asked. Statements do not need to be directed to a specific Councillor.

Statements on notice must, by the Constitution, be notified to the Head of Law and Governance by no later than 9.30am on Friday 18 February 2011.

Full details of any statements for which the required notice has been given will be circulated to Members of Council before the meeting.

19. CONSIDERATION OF PETITIONS

The Council's Petitions Scheme requires that any petitions containing at least 1,500 signatures be debated at Full Council.

20. MOTIONS ON NOTICE

175-177

Council Procedure Rule 11.13(a) refers. The following Motions have been notified to the Proper Officer by 1.00pm on Wednesday 9 February 2011:-

- (a) Empty Home Management Orders (Proposer – Councillor Joe McManners)
- (b) Electoral Review for Oxford City Council and number of Councillors – (Proposer – Councillor Mark Mills)
- (c) Charity funding – (Proposer – Councillor John Tanner)
- (d) Budget cuts – (Proposer - Councillor Ed Turner)
- (e) Bee Colony Collapse Disorder – (Proposer - Councillor David Williams)
- (f) Oxford Chinese Community and Advice Centre funding – (Proposer – Councillor Nuala Young)

21. REPORTS AND QUESTIONS ABOUT ORGANISATIONS THE COUNCIL IS REPRESENTED ON

22. STATEMENT OF LICENSING POLICY - REVIEW

178-246

The Head of Environmental Development has submitted a report which was considered by a special meeting of the Licensing and Gambling Acts Committee on 1 February 2011.

Council is asked to adopt the Revised Statement of Licensing Policy.

23. REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL ON MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES

247-259

The Independent Remuneration Panel on Members' Allowances has submitted a report following a review by the Panel into the current Members' Allowances Scheme which runs until the end of the 2010/11 financial year.

24. MATTERS EXEMPT FROM PUBLICATION

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

(The Access to Information Procedure Rules – Section 16 of the Council’s Constitution – sets out the conditions under which the public can be excluded from meetings of the Council).

GUIDANCE ON DECLARING INTERESTS AT MEETINGS

What is a personal interest?

You have a personal interest in a matter if that matter affects the well-being or financial position of you, your relatives or people with whom you have a close personal association more than it would affect the majority of other people in the ward(s) to which the matter relates.

A personal interest can affect you, your relatives or people with whom you have a close personal association positively or negatively. If you or they would stand to lose by the decision, you should also declare it.

You also have a personal interest in a matter if it relates to any interests, which you must register.

What do I need to do if I have a personal interest?

You must declare it when you get to the item on the agenda headed "Declarations of Interest" or as soon as it becomes apparent to you. You may still speak and vote unless it is a prejudicial interest.

If a matter affects a body to which you have been appointed by the authority, or a body exercising functions of a public nature, you only need declare the interest if you are going to speak on the matter.

What is a prejudicial interest?

You have a prejudicial interest in a matter if;

- a) a member of the public, who knows the relevant facts, would reasonably think your personal interest is so significant that it is likely to prejudice your judgment of the public interest; and
- b) the matter affects your financial interests or relates to a licensing or regulatory matter; and
- c) the interest does not fall within one of the exempt categories at paragraph 10(2)(c) of the Code of Conduct.

What do I need to do if I have a prejudicial interest?

If you have a prejudicial interest you must withdraw from the meeting. However, under paragraph 12(2) of the Code of Conduct, if members of the public are allowed to make representations, give evidence or answer questions about that matter, you may also make representations as if you were a member of the public. However, you must withdraw from the meeting once you have made your representations and before any debate starts.

MINUTES OF FULL COUNCIL

Monday 21 February 2011

COUNCILLORS PRESENT: The Lord Mayor (Councillor John Goddard), the Sheriff (Councillor Colin Cook), Councillors Mohammed Niaz Abbasi, Alan Armitage, Antonia Bance, Laurence Baxter, Elise Benjamin, Tony Brett, Stephen Brown, Jim Campbell, Mary Clarkson, Van Coulter, Jean Fooks, Michael Gotch, Beverley Hazell, Rae Humberstone, Graham Jones, Bryan Keen, Shah Jahan Khan, Ben Lloyd-Shogbesan, Mark Lygo, Sajjad Malik, Stuart McCready, Joe McManners, Mark Mills, Matthew Morton, Susanna Pressel, Bob Price, Nathan Pyle, Mike Rowley, Gwynneth Royce, Gill Sanders, Scott Seamons, Val Smith, John Tanner, Bob Timbs, Ed Turner, Oscar Van Nooijen, Ruth Wilkinson, David Williams, Richard Wolff and Nuala Young.

94. MINUTES

Council resolved to approve the minutes of the ordinary meeting held on 24 January 2011 subject to the following amendment:

- (a) In minute 89(b)(26) – (Questions on Notice from Members of Council) – delete the word “people” in the third line of the second paragraph, and insert the words “Co-Housing Groups and Co-operatives”.

95. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors declared interests as follows:-

- (a) Councillor Antonia Bance declared a personal interest in agenda item 12 (City Executive Board Recommendations – Budget for 2011/12 – Table 2 re-instatement of independent housing advice) as she had recently accepted a position with Shelter (Minute 105 refers).
- (b) Councillor Sajjad Malik declared a personal interest in agenda item 12 (City Executive Board Recommendations – Budget for 2011/12 – 33/35 George Street which appeared as a line in the capital programme). (Minute 105 refers).

96. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from the Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Dee Sinclair), Councillors Clark Brundin, Stuart Craft, Roy Darke, Mohammed Altaf-Khan and David Rundle.

97. APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES

No appointments were made.

98. LORD MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

No announcements were made.

99. SHERIFF'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

No announcements were made.

100. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE LEADER

The Leader made the following announcements:-

- (1) The Mayor of Leon would be visiting the City from 4-7 March 2011 to celebrate the 25th Anniversary of the twinning between Oxford and Leon. He would also be visiting Salzburg in Austria which was also twinned with Leon.
- (2) Letters had been sent to the United Nations General-Secretary and the British Prime Minister following the address made to Full Council on 24th January 2011, raising the plight of refugees in Camp Ashraf on the Iraq/Iran border.
- (3) To express thanks to the Stewards of Unison and Unite who negotiated with the City Council on the Collective Agreement on staff terms and conditions. This reflected the partnership approach of the Council and would help to protect jobs and services.

101. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE, THE CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER AND THE MONITORING OFFICER

Peter Sloman, Chief Executive, announced that this would be Melbourne Barrett's last ordinary meeting of Full Council before he left to take up the position of Director of Housing and Regeneration at the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham. He thanked him for the work that he had undertaken to change the reputation of the Council with regard to regeneration and in particular he highlighted the Core Strategy which had been agreed, a new asset plan for the Council and the wider national recognition on housing provision. He and the Council wished him well in his future role.

102. ADDRESSES BY THE PUBLIC

Council received seven addresses as follow:-

- (1) Raymond Wang, Chair of the Oxfordshire Chinese Community and Advice Centre addressed Council and thanked the Council for its assistance over the previous 19 years. However he was concerned about the 64% cut in the grant from the Council which would mean that the Centre would have to close and at the lack of consultation on this cut. He said that the Chinese community had grown over the past 19 years and that the Centre with the help of the Council had provided advice to 4000 families. Many in the Chinese community were elderly and through lack of education in their early life were also illiterate. The Centre was the only facility of its kind in the Thames Valley and if it closed, those that had

previously obtained advice there would have to travel to Birmingham or London. He added that the Centre's staff worked with Council Officers providing translations. He concluded by handing the Lord Mayor a petition containing in excess of 6000 signatures, supporting the Centre and calling for it to remain open.

- (2) Vim Rodrigo, a resident of Rose Hill addressed Council and said that he had raised the issue of the Unparished areas tax many times at Area meetings and in letters to the City Council, but as yet had not received a satisfactory answer. He said that the tax was unfair and discriminatory as it had banded impoverished areas with affluent areas. He said that there were other reasons for concern:
 - (i) Unlike Parished areas, where Parish Councillors could decide the expenditure of the revenue collected, Unparished areas did not have an elected body and had no say as to how their money was spent;
 - (ii) Residents had no idea of the amount collected in revenue from Rose Hill or where the monies were spent as the accounts were not kept separate from the Citywide Council Tax;
 - (iii) The only information received from the City Council was that Unparished areas revenue had funded:
 - (a) Community recreation
 - (b) Parks management
 - (c) Grounds
 - (d) Allotments
 - (e) Ditches and streams
 - (f) Cemeteries
 - (g) Street furniture

He said that all of the above items should be included in the general Citywide tax as all areas including Parishes benefitted from them. He alleged that the City Council had introduced the Unparished areas tax as a means of keeping the Citywide tax low. He had been told that the City collected approximately 96% of the Council Tax revenue, yet the County, Thames Valley Police and the Parishes got their full 100% quota. Why were they not receiving 96% of the monies due to them? As the Citywide tax and the Unparished areas tax was held in one account, we were indirectly responsible for making up the shortfalls. He concluded by saying that the Unparished areas tax was unfair and should be abolished.

- (3) Rubia Braun from Metro Brava, a film and distribution company based in Bangalore, India, addressed Council and said that her company had teamed up with a local company to make a film called "No Balls" about a women's rugby team. She said that as a company they worked with community groups and residents so that everyone benefited from the project. She said that she and her company would be happy to facilitate a link between Oxford and Bangalore.
- (4) Nigel Gibson addressed Council and raised issues concerning the increases in leisure charges and in particular the VAT elements of these increases. He felt that the percentage rises did not make sense. He said

he had raised the issue at the Cowley Area Committee and had been assured by Councillor Timbs that he would receive a response. He further added that he had also asked Councillor Price who arranged for Tim Sadler, Executive Director, City Services to respond which he did.

Nigel Gibson expressed the opinion that it was wrong to provide misleading information to the City Executive Board and wondered if this had been the case with other issues.

- (5) Jane Alexander addressed Council and said that in January 2011 at the City Executive Board meeting, it had been said that there was a lot of support for the new pool in Blackbird Leys. With regard to consultation, she said that a meeting had been held. However, officers had spoken for 40 minutes of the hour available for the meeting. She said that Save Temple Cowley Pool (TCP) Campaign was the only body to consult with current users and, of these, 58% said that they could not use a new pool at Blackbird Leys. She said that she had been told that Councillors had conducted a door-knock consultation and that 30 properties had supported the new pool. However, when the TCP Campaign door-knocked 11 properties, 9 said they did not want the new pool. She said that the new pool would not be Olympic size, but instead 25m, would not have slides and would not have single sex showers. She concluded that a new petition to save the Temple Cowley Pools had shown extensive support for the current facility remaining open.
- (6) David Jackson addressed Council and said that difficult would be faced with difficult decisions and choices as part of setting the budget for the next year, as well as some dissenting voices. He said that he had recently attended Area Committee, City Executive Board and Council meetings and had observed how Officers and consultants had briefed Councillors. He wished to remind Councillors of three points:
 - (1) Do not under estimate the people of Oxford. The voters of Oxford know and understand that Councillors were not, experts, but that Councillors had been elected to be the electors voice, and question and scrutinise the City Executive.
 - (2) Make your decisions transparent. Stand up and be proud of the decisions that are made and if services are to be cut, ensure that they are based on verifiable facts and would stand up to scrutiny.
 - (3) Listen to the people of Oxford. The decisions that are taken affect everyone in the City.

He said that the people of Oxford may not like some of the budget decisions that would be taken, but if it could be shown that they had been fully scrutinised and reviewed, based on verifiable facts and that the people were listened to, confidence would be built into the decisions that the Councillors would make.

- (7) Emma Macbeth from Unison addressed Council and said that Unison had accepted that through no fault of the Administration, the Council was facing previously unimaginable cuts to its funding thanks to the government's ideologically-driven war on public services. As a result the

107. CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD DECISIONS (MINUTES)

Council had before it Minutes (previously circulated, now appended) for the City Executive Board held on 9th February 2011.

Minute 139 – Democratic Changes – Proposed Arrangements

Councillor Wilkinson asked if the Leader of the Council could give an assurance to the residents of Barton, Sandhills, Headington Hill, Headington Quarry and Risinghurst that the area forums would not be cancelled at short notice by Labour Councillors when failed ex-Prime Ministers attend constituency dinners?

In response Councillor Price said that it was a matter for individual members.

Council resolved to note the decisions of the City Executive Board held on 9th February 2011.

108. COUNCIL TAX 2011/12

The Head of Finance submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended) which detailed the calculations to allow the Council Tax for Oxford City for 2011/12 to be set by Council in accordance with the Local Government Finance Acts, 1988 and 1992.

Council resolved:

- (1) That the City Council's precept and requirement from Council Tax was £12,527,988 (inclusive of the Parish Precepts). (Net of the Parish Precepts, the figure is £12,354,988);
- (2) That the average Band D Council Tax figure (excluding Parishes) be set at £262.96;
- (3) That the amount of £559,866 be treated as the Special Expenses of the Unparished Area;
- (4) To approve the Band D Council Taxes for the various areas of the City (excluding the Police and County Council additions) as follows:-

Littlemore	£277.56
Old Marston	£290.34
Risinghurst and Sandhills	£277.92
Blackbird Leys	£259.16
Unparished Areas	£265.58

(These figures included the Parish Precepts (or Unparished Area Addition) on top of the Citywide Council Tax of £251.05, the same figure as in 2010/11)

- (5) To approve appendixes 1, 2 and 3 attached to the report;
- (6) To note the County Council's precept of £54,581,550 and a Band D Council Tax of £1,161.71;

- (7) To note the Thames Valley Police Authority's precept of £7,249,631 and a Band D Council Tax of £154.30;
- (8) To note that the overall average Band D equivalent Council Tax was £1,582.65

109. RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS FROM SCRUTINY COMMITTEES

None submitted.

110. QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

(a) Questions notified in time for replies to be provided in writing for Council

* 1. **Question to the Board Member, City Development (Councillor Colin Cook) from Councillor Nuala Young**

"Some years ago our Information Centre was running so impressively that it won awards. The cost/loss to the city of running the service has been said to be between £80,000 to £100,000 a year, did that figure include the nominal cost of the loss of rental of the building as well as the staffing?"

Answer: The TIC continues to run impressively and to win awards.

This year the TIC will bring in a gross income in the region of £700,000, this includes income from sub-letting parts of the Broad Street premises (£37k)

The net cost to the Council in 2010/11 of running a tourism service that includes the TIC and its other tourism activities, such as the web site and marketing is £160,000. This includes the recharge costs to be borne by the Service, (as other Council front line services), of support from finance, legal, HR, IT and corporate services (Democracy, Chief Exec, Communications).

In a supplementary question Councillor Young asked if Councillor Cook would agree that the service provided to guides and guesthouses had reduced due to the reduced numbers of staff at the Tourist Information Centre.

In response, Councillor Cook, said no, he did not agree with Councillor Young.

* 2. **Question to the Board Member, City Development
(Councillor Colin Cook) from Councillor Nuala Young**

“What is the estimated cost of the Information Centre in loss of rent and staffing?”

Answer: There is no estimate in the Budget for loss of rent. TIC staff costs are in the region of £333,000

Councillor Young in a supplementary question asked if Councillor Cook could supply the number of staff employed in the TIC. In response Councillor Cook said that he believed it was 12.

* 3. **Question to the Board Member, City Development
Councillor Colin Cook) from Councillor Nuala Young**

“In the last five years Oxford has attracted more visitors than ever, with people often choosing to come to Oxford rather than London. Most visitors expect to visit a college but the colleges are now saying that they cannot take more visitors and need to limit visitors to the present numbers. There is no room for growth. Given these two factors how can it make sense for us in this year of financial difficulty to contribute £100,000 to Destination Management Oxford as well as our Information Centre building and staff, since it can only really benefit the County, which has room for growth in tourism, but is only contributing £40,000 and using our building and staff as well?”

Answer: I can find no evidence to support the assertion that “colleges are now saying that they cannot take more visitors” nor that they need “to limit visitors to the present numbers”. I would be grateful if the questioner could let me have the evidence to support such assertions.

Anecdotally I am informed that some colleges are introducing or increasing the charges they make for tourists and guided tours, and that some colleges are reducing the numbers permitted on any single guided tour. However this clearly does not represent an overall limit on the numbers visiting a particular college given that far more people will visit as individuals or as a family rather than as an organised tour group.

I disagree with the questioner’s assertion that there is “no room for growth”.

In partnership with private businesses, through Visit Oxfordshire, one of our objectives is to increase the length of stay of the tourists who do come to Oxford, and to encourage them to spend more money whilst they are here. This can but strengthen the local visitor economy.

Visit Oxfordshire is estimated to have a turnover next year in the region of £1 million, with private tourist businesses making a similar scale of contribution through membership as the City Council.

The visitor economy of the City has much more to offer than a visit to the Colleges, and this County-wide partnership will bring benefits to:

- the TIC itself with increases business and sales, such as the walking tours,
- our hotels and guest houses which will benefit from guests staying in Oxford but trekking out into the county each day
- our restaurants, pubs and other eating places and
- the wealth of cultural and other attractions in the City including the Museums.

Councillor Young in a supplementary question asked which businesses had contributed towards the £100k. In response Councillor Cook said that over 26 businesses had expressed an interest in joining Destination Management for Oxfordshire. The Administration would welcome involvement in a sector that was worth £770m and created 12% of the jobs in the County.

4. Question to the Board Member, Cleaner, Greener, Oxford (Councillor John Tanner) from Councillor Jean Fooks

“At the last Council you said that officers had contacted the Department of Communities and Local Government about the powers to require businesses to make saving measures. The Department had, in response to a Sustainable Communities Act request, said that the Council already had these powers. Could you tell Council what response has been received and what specific measures you will be requesting businesses to make?”

Answer: Sadly, the City Council has no powers to enforce against energy wasteful businesses nor to require businesses to be more energy efficient.

However, as the questioner will be aware, we are working closely with local businesses through Low Carbon Oxford to try to reduce our city's overall carbon footprint.'

Councillor Fooks in a supplementary question asked if Officers had contacted the Department of Communities and Local Government and what was the response. In response Councillor Tanner said that officers had contacted the relevant Department but rather than Council Officers being confused, it was the civil servants.

(b) **Questions notified by the deadline in the Constitution**
(replies to be given orally at Council)

5. **Question to the Board Member, Sport, Play and Schools Liaison (Councillor Mark Lygo) from Councillor Tony Brett**

“Given the large number of dog owners in the area do you support the creation of a signed and segregated dog training and exercise area in Cowley Marsh Park?”

Answer: Oxford City Council does not provide separate provision for dogs to exercise or be trained. Dog walking may be accommodated on the footpath network, the boundaries of playing fields and the two nature areas.

6. **Question to the Board Member, Sport, Play and Schools Liaison (Councillor Mark Lygo) from Councillor Tony Brett**

“Following on from the discussion on the Cowley Neighbourhood Forum last week, passed to you by Councillor Timbs, will you tell me that progress is being made, or is planned, on providing a properly signed and segregated dog exercise/training area in Cowley Marsh Park, possibly using some of the currently disused tennis courts?”

Answer: The tennis courts are regularly used informally for football and other games that would conflict with the use for dog walking. Sports and Leisure are seeking to improve the facilities for tennis by providing steel fence ‘nets’. There are no plans/funds for the provision of a segregated dog area.

7. **Question to the Board Member, Sport, Play and Schools Liaison (Councillor Mark Lygo) from Councillor Tony Brett**

“Will you also say what support the Council might be able to offer to the two dog owners, and others, who started the discussion in the forum by way of setting up a group to help promote the interests of dog owners and walkers in Oxford?”

Answer: Considerate dog owners are welcome to use the parks and open spaces. However, the formation of a dog walking group is not part of the remit of Parks and Open Spaces. Sports and Leisure support walking schemes as Health Walks.

8. **Question to the Board Member, Sport, Play and Schools Liaison (Councillor Mark Lygo) from Councillor Graham Jones**

“What efforts are being made to secure the future of Shotover Country Park?”

Answer: Shotover Park is owned and managed by Oxford City Council. A portion of the land is leased from Oxford University.

The current annual maintenance costs are in the region of £35k. Parks and Open Spaces are forming a User Forum to consult about the future of the Park and attract additional third party funding. We are seeking to engage the whole community and will seek help from volunteers to carry out species surveys, and practical conservation work and will consider forming a Park Watch Group to help police the Park. A public meeting is due to be held on 17th March 2011. For further information and minutes of the public meeting held in January 2011 contact Parks Officers.

Councillor Jones in a supplementary question asked if Councillor Lygo would agree that while it was important for officers input in putting together a management plan, it was crucial to have political leadership in getting the support of the various user groups. Councillor Lygo in response agreed.

9. Question to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Bob Price) from Councillor Graham Jones

“Will the Administration report to Council on the progress of Wireless Oxford?”

Answer: It was important to have wireless access developed within the city. A meeting was held in January 2011 involving the Universities which looked carefully at the possibility of developments around what the Universities currently offered. One of the problems concerned the private system used by the Universities which could not be extended beyond the boundaries of the Universities system. However the two Universities and the City Council with limited support from the County Council have agreed to take it forward and look into ways, legally and financially of how one of the two options available could be used. A third option is BT Open Zone which has a good coverage around the City and was being explored. Further updates will be given as and when information becomes available.

Councillor Jones in a supplementary question asked Councillor Price to bring this exciting development to the public’s attention as well as to other users and organisations who could register their interest and offer practical help

10. Question to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Bob Price) from Councillor Graham Jones

“What is the Administration doing to help get Oxford’s Quality Bus Partnership into operation?”

Answer: I hold a regular transport liaison meeting with my counterpart at Oxfordshire County Council. I last met County Councillor Ian Hudspeth on 15th December 2010, and asked him at that meeting what progress was being made with this scheme. It would appear that this is very close to implementation with the three main bus companies fully supportive. However as this is

breaking new ground there are some technical issues that need to be resolved before it can go live. In particular, getting the ticket machines to recognise other companies' tickets, which is necessary for joint ticketing to work and for each company to be reimbursed correctly was an issue.

In a supplementary question Councillor Jones said that the update was encouraging, but asked if Councillor Price agreed that the public's patience was wearing thin over delays with the target date missed by six months.

Councillor Price in response said that he would be happy to convey this to his counterpart at the County Council.

11. Question to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Bob Price) from Councillor Graham Jones

"Will the Administration encourage the University of Oxford to appoint student wardens?"

Answer: Student Wardens was an initiative by Brookes University for students who did not live in Halls of Residence. However, he would raise the issue at a meeting of the Colleges of the University of Oxford.

In a supplementary question, Councillor Wolff was grateful to Councillor Price and invited him to take Councillors Tanner and Malik, as the relevant Board Members to any meeting with the Colleges.

12. Question to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Bob Price) from Councillor Jean Fooks

"You have been quoted in the press as saying that the City Council will be looking to build its own waste collection centre if Redbridge is not available to householders. Where would you suggest building this facility?"

Answer: It would be ludicrous to leave the City without a recycling centre with Redbridge due to close at or after April 2012. The Council wanted to avoid an increase in incidents of fly-tipping and Officers were looking at options as the Redbridge site was owned by the City Council and leased to the County, such as allowing the site to be used for recycling at weekends. If these options were not viable then, Officers would look at the possibility of using other sites.

111. STATEMENTS ON NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

No statements were made.

112. CONSIDERATION OF PETITIONS

No petitions were submitted for formal Council debate at this meeting.

120. MOTIONS ON NOTICE

The Lord Mayor with the consent of Council suspended procedures rules 11.16(a) and (c) under rules of debate in respect of the requirement for Motions to be seconded, for a seconder to speak later in the debate.

Council had before it six Motions on Notice (Motion (e) Bee Colony Collapse Disorder was withdrawn) and reached decisions as follows:

(a) **Empty Home Management Orders (Proposer – Councillor Joe McManners)**

Empty home management orders allow Local Authorities to bring an empty property back into use after 6 months of being empty.

In an environment of housing shortage, increasing the amount of properties available for rent is vital.

The Conservative and Lib Dem Secretary of State, Eric Pickles has changed this period to 2 years saying they are 'heavy handed'.

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-12127328>

This is despite Lib Dem promises, and Grant Shapps signing petitions, to strengthen the schemes.

<http://www.insidehousing.co.uk/ihstory.aspx?storycode=6503152>

Council condemns this move as a step in the wrong direction and asks the Leader of the Council to write to Housing Ministers of both parties asking them to keep pre-election promises to improve rather than damage the orders.

Council also asks that in the spirit of localism, local authorities are allowed to decide for themselves the period of time that is set.

Following a debate Council voted and the Motion was adopted by general assent.

(b) **Electoral Review for Oxford City Council and number of Councillors (Proposer – Councillor Mark Mills)**

Council notes:

- That the Local Government Boundary Commission has reviewed the electoral arrangements for Oxfordshire County Council and the outcome of this will be a reduction in the number of County Councillors and changes to division boundaries.
- That the Commission's guidance identifies coterminosity of district Ward and County Division boundaries as being a desirable feature of electoral arrangements.
- That Oxford City Council's response to the Commission backed the principle of coterminosity

Council believes that:

- Without changing the city ward boundaries coterminosity cannot be maintained.
- An electoral review of Oxford City Council should be initiated
Such a review could also afford the opportunity for the number of district councillors to be reduced
- Such a reduction would reflect the likely reductions in the staffing and functions of Oxford City Council in the next few years and that it would produce a much welcome saving for the authority.

Council, therefore, requests that the Chief Executive write to the Chair of the Local Government Boundary Commission and ask them to consider holding an electoral review for Oxford City.

Following a debate, Council voted but the Motion fell was not adopted.

(c) Charity funding – (Proposer – Councillor John Tanner)

In this time of financial uncertainty, with many people requiring more, rather than less help and advice, our voluntary services are becoming essential lifelines to those in need, but unfortunately, they too are struggling for funding.

This Council believes that funding could be raised to support these services through the private sector and, to this end, will write to the MPs and to the relevant Government department suggesting that a compulsory annual charge be made to all financial institutions to fund the voluntary debt service to ensure that citizens are able to obtain free financial advice when in need. Such funding would allow this sector to pursue its vital role without constant concern over its funding.

Following a debate Council voted and the Motion was adopted by general assent.

(d) Budget cuts – (Proposer – Councillor Ed Turner)

Council deeply regrets that its budget will contain some reductions in services, increases in charges to the public, and some job losses. Council appreciates the constructive role that trade unions have played in trying to minimise the impact upon their members and the council's workforce as a whole, but nonetheless believes that any budget with this level of cuts represents a bitter pill for council staff to swallow.

Council believes that funding cuts on the scale put forward by this government are unnecessary and wrong. Council requests its officers to join with all councillors willing to lobby government against the unjust and unfair budget settlement and to press hard for a fairer settlement in future years.

Councillor Tony Brett moved an amendment:- to delete the final paragraph of the Motion.

Councillor Elise Benjamin moved an amendment:- to delete the final paragraph and replace with the following:

Council notes previous Local Government funding cuts that led to so-called efficiency savings in recent years, resulting in a reduction in both staff numbers and service provision.

Council also notes and regrets that these previous years of cuts have left the Council in the position where it will be difficult to make further cuts without yet more staff and service reductions.

Council asks the Chief Executive to write to the Prime Minister highlighting the pattern of cuts over previous years and asking that the government take this into consideration when working out Local Government settlements and other grants.

The mover of the substantive Motion (Councillor Turner) did not accept the amendments.

Following a debate Council voted as follows:

- (1) The amendments in the names of Councillor Brett and Benjamin were not carried;
- (2) Motion adopted un-amended.

(e) **Bee Colony Collapse Disorder** – (Proposer – Councillor David Williams)

Motion withdrawn by Proposer.

(f) **Oxford Chinese Community and Advice Centre Funding** – (Proposer – Councillor Nuala Young)

This Council believes that the Oxford Chinese Community and Advice Centre situated on Princes Street provides an essential service in meeting the complex and differing social and linguistic needs of those members of our Chinese Community who are often at a great disadvantage and therefore the current level of support for the organisation should be continued and not cut over the coming year.

Following a debate, Council voted but the Motion was not adopted.

121. REPORTS AND QUESTIONS ABOUT ORGANISATIONS THE COUNCIL IS REPRESENTED ON

No questions were asked.

Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee

Membership

Chair	Councillor Stephen Brown	Carfax Ward
Vice Chair	Councillor Van Coulter	Barton & Sandhills Ward
	Councillor Mohammed Abbasi	Cowley Marsh Ward
	Councillor Alan Armitage	North Ward
	Councillor Laurence Baxter	Quarry & Risinghurst Ward
	Councillor Roy Darke	Headington Hill & Northway Ward
	Councillor Mike Gotch	Wolvercote Ward
	Councillor Bryan Keen	Cowley Ward
	Councillor Shah Jahan Khan	Cowley Ward
	Councillor Stuart McCready	Summertown Ward
	Councillor Scott Seamons	Northfield Brook Ward
	Councillor Dick Wolff	St. Mary's Ward
	Anita Fisher	Co-optee – Tenants Improvement and Monitoring Panel
	Barrie Finch	Co-optee – Tenants Improvement and Monitoring Panel

HOW TO OBTAIN 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 internal and Council member requirement. Paper copies may be looked at in our Town Hall and Ramsay House (St. Ebbe's Street) reception areas and at public libraries.

A copy of the agenda may be:-

- Viewed on our website - www.oxford.gov.uk/councilmeetings
- Downloaded from our website
- Subscribed to electronically by registering online at www.oxford.gov.uk/ebulletins
- Sent to you in hard copy form upon payment of an annual subscription.

Subscription charges can be found online at www.oxford.gov.uk/agendacharges

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

2. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

3. **STANDING ITEM: WORK PROGRAMME**

Page 1-31

Pat Jones, Principal Scrutiny Officer, Tel: (01865) 252191,
Email phjones@oxford.gov.uk;
Alec Dubberley, Democratic Services Officer, Tel: (01865) 252402,
Email: adubberley@oxford.gov.uk

Background Information	The work programme needs to reflect the wishes and interests of the Committee. It is presented here and at every meeting to allow members to lead and shape their work.
Why has this item been included on the agenda?	To agree the lines of inquiry for forthcoming meetings and to take an overview of progress.
Who has been invited to comment	The Principal Scrutiny Officer, will present the work programme and answer questions from the Committee.
What will happen after the meeting	The Chair and Vice-Chair will continue to monitor the Committee's work programme and report to future meetings.

4. **STANDING ITEM: REPORT BACK
ON THE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS
TO THE CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD
AND ON MATTERS OF INTEREST TO THE COMMITTEE**

Page 33 - 39

Contact Officer: Alec Dubberley, Democratic Services Officer
Tel: (01865) 252402, email: adubberley@oxford.gov.uk

Background Information	Committee makes a number of recommendations to City Executive Board and officers. This item reports on the outcomes from these.
Why has this item been included on the agenda?	The Committee made recommendations to the December, January and February meetings.
Who has been invited to comment	The Democratic Services Officer will go through the outcomes and answer questions.
What will happen after the meeting	Any further follow up will be pursued within the work programme.

5. VISIT OXFORDSHIRE DESTINATION MANAGEMENT

Pages 41 – 47

Confidential Appendix Pages 98 - 99

Contact Officer: Michael Crofton-Briggs, Head of City Development
Tel: (01865) 252360, email mcrofton-briggs@oxford.gov.uk

Background Information	Oxfordshire Local Authorities have, for the past year, been pooling resources to promote Oxfordshire as a tourist destination.
Why has this item been included on the agenda?	The DMO project has now been running for one year and the Committee, through its work programme, have asked to be updated on progress.
Who has been invited to comment?	Michael Crofton-Briggs and the Lead Board Member, Councillor Price, have been invited to attend.
What will happen after the meeting?	Any requests will be made to officers for further action. Recommendations to City Executive Board will be considered at the March meeting

6. REVIEW OF BENEFITS SERVICE

Contact Officer: Helen Bishop, Head of Customer Services
Tel: (01865) 252233, email hbishop@oxford.gov.uk

Background Information	The Council's Benefits Service has been the subject of an Audit Commission inspection
Why has this item been included on the agenda?	To consider the main issues for concern, challenge and improvement and proposals to tackle these
Who has been invited to comment?	Helen Bishop and the Lead Board Member, Councillor Smith, have been invited to attend.
What will happen after the meeting?	Any requests will be made to officers for further action. Recommendations to City Executive Board will be considered at the March meeting

7. NOISE NUISANCE

Pages 49 - 54

Contact Officer: Tony Payne, Licensing and Development Manager,
Tel: (01865) 252062, email tpayne@oxford.gov.uk

Background Information	A motion concerning the performance of the Council's out of hours noise nuisance phone line was presented to the July Council meeting.
Why has this item been included on the agenda?	The Committee wish to see information on how the service performs, what the implications of government spending cuts to the service might be

	and what progress has been made in responding to the Council motion.
Who has been invited to comment	John Copley and the Lead Board Member, Councillor Tanner, have been invited to attend.
What will happen after the meeting	Any requests will be made to officers for further action. Recommendations to City Executive Board will be considered at the March meeting

8. CORPORATE PLAN AND TARGETS – CONSULTATION **Pages 55 - 87**

Contact Officer: Peter McQuitty, Head of Policy, Culture and Communications
Tel: (01865) 252233, email pmcquitty@oxford.gov.uk

Background Information	The Council's periodically updates its Corporate Plan and targets
Why has this item been included on the agenda?	The Plan for next year is currently out for consultation. As part of this, the Committee's views are being sought.
Who has been invited to comment?	Peter McQuitty and the Lead Board Member, Councillor Price, have been invited to attend.
What will happen after the meeting?	Any requests will be made to officers for further action. Recommendations to City Executive Board will be considered at the March meeting

9. MINUTES **Pages 89 - 97**

Minutes of the meeting held on 18 November 2010 and the special meeting of the 10 January 2011.

10. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

5 April 2011

11. CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS

EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS

In the opinion of the Proper Officer, the following item will not be, or is likely not to be, open to the public and press at the time it is considered.

RECOMMENDATION: that under section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Schedule 12(A) of the Act, as indicated below

C1. VISIT OXFORDSHIRE DESTINATION MANAGEMENT Page 98-99

A confidential appendix relating to agenda item 5.

(This item discloses information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information))

(The Access to Information Procedure Rules in Section 16 of the Council's Constitution set out the conditions under which the public can be excluded from the meeting).

DECLARING INTERESTS AT MEETINGS

What Interests do I need to declare in a meeting?

As a first step you need to declare any **personal interests** you have in a matter. You will then need to decide if you have a **prejudicial interest** in a matter.

What is a personal interest?

You have a personal interest in a matter if that matter affects the well-being or financial position of you, your relatives or your friends more than it would affect other people in the Council's area. A personal interest can affect you, your relatives or your friends positively or negatively. If you or they would stand to lose by the decision, you should also declare it.

You also have a personal interest in a matter if it relates to any interests that you must register.

What do I need to do if I have a personal interest in a matter?

You must declare it when you get to the item headed "Declaration of Interest" on the agenda or as soon as it becomes apparent to you.

Can I stay in a meeting if I have a personal interest?

You can still take part in the meeting and vote on the matter unless your personal interest is also a prejudicial interest.

What is a prejudicial interest?

A prejudicial interest is one that a member of the public who knows the relevant facts would reasonably think is so significant that it is likely to affect your judgement of the public interest.

What is not a prejudicial interest?

The Code of Conduct sets out a small number of exceptions. Check with the Monitoring Officer if you are in any doubt.

What do I need to do if I have a prejudicial interest?

If you have a prejudicial interest in a matter being discussed at a meeting, you must leave the room. You cannot take part in discussions on that matter or try to improperly influence anyone's decision on the matter.

To: Value and Performance Scrutiny Committee

Date: 22 February 2011 **Item No:** 5

Report of: Head of City Development

Title of Report: Visit Oxfordshire Destination Management

Summary and Recommendations

Purpose of report: This report recognises the establishment of Visit Oxfordshire as a stand alone organisation and suggests the related actions necessary to confirm the nature of the relationship between the Council and the new company.

Key decision? No

Executive lead member: Councillors Colin Cook and Bob Price

Policy Framework: Improve the Local Environment, Economy and Quality of Life

Recommendation(s): That the City Executive Board:

Agrees to:

1. Enter into a co-operation agreement for 3 years with the new not for profit company formed to promote tourism and cultural business across Oxfordshire.
2. Lease its premises at 15 – 16 Broad Street to the new company
3. Retain the current staff as City Council employees but second them to the new company
4. Provide a grant of to the new company in 11/12 at a level that retains the City Council's net budget commitment at £160,000 reducing by 10% in subsequent years.
5. Grants delegated authority to the Executive Director of City Regeneration and the Corporate Director of Finance and Efficiency to complete negotiations.

Part Two of the City Executive Board Agenda, Not for Publication: Current and proposed budget information.

Appendix 1 Risk assessment

Introduction

1. At the City Executive Board meeting on 31st March 2010, the Board resolved to :
 1. Establish the Oxford and Oxfordshire Destination Management Organisation as a public/private partnership
 2. Host the DMO for the first year with Oxford City Council acting as the Accountable Body.
 3. Agree that the Executive Board Member for City Development and Tourism should represent the City Council on the Board
 4. Explore the option of joint working between blending the emerging DMO with Oxford Inspires (OI), with a further report to CEB if appropriate.
2. This report considers the next steps for the City Council in supporting a new Oxfordshire tourism and culture company. In doing so it seeks to build on earlier decisions.

Background

3. Members will recall that the Destination Management Organisation (DMO) is to be a public-private partnership agency responsible for the development and delivery of the visitor offer across the County. It would provide strategic leadership for the sector, backed up with marketing expertise and resources to support and promote a sustainable visitor economy. Its scope is to include not only UK domestic and international visitors, but also residents who spend and travel within the county and indulge in retail spend.
4. The Destination Management Organisation is to play a leading role in tourism delivery and promotion, working closely with a wide range of partners and stakeholders. It is to champion the sector and seek to influence all aspects of the visitor experience in order to nurture a thriving tourism industry; and it will set measures (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time bound)so that it can communicate its intended improvements to the value of the County's visitor economy.

Progress since March 2010

- New name for the DMO is Visit Oxfordshire (VO)
- Shadow Board established under the chairmanship of John Hoy, Chief Executive of Blenheim Estates.
- Cllr Colin Cook represents the City Council on the Board
- Susi Golding is the Project Manager, in post until 31st Dec 2011
- Income (£20k) has been received from the sale of subscriptions to private business Members and further income is expected as further members are signed up.
- Membership is at 270 plus, as Tourism South East members have been rolled into membership of Visit Oxfordshire
- Active marketing of Visit Oxfordshire through a new Website which now receives an average of 110k visits per month.
- Worked with tourism South East on an initial marketing campaign with coverage in the Independent (Sept), Guardian (Feb) and Telegraph (Mar)
- Taken space in a Visit Britain guide with distribution of 250k copies to inbound visitors

- Worked with InOxford on co-branding publications such as The restaurant Guide and monthly What's On Guide,
- Producing a 32 page guide for 2011 both for UK and overseas distribution and downloadable from the web

Way Forward

5. The Oxford Inspires Board (OI) and Visit Oxfordshire (VO) Shadow Board have both agreed to join together under a common leadership. Governance work is underway to create a new not-for-profit organisation, likely to be called Experience Oxfordshire. This will have a charity arm as the top company (for cultural activities) and a subsidiary trading company (for tourism activities). The current trading names or brands of Oxford Inspires and Visit Oxfordshire are to be retained because these are well known by existing customers and work well as web search names. The City Council's relationship will be with the new trading company (new company)
6. The Visit Oxfordshire Shadow Board includes very senior individuals from some of the top tourism businesses in the County and has a growing membership of private sector tourism businesses. It now wishes to take the lead responsibility for tourism in Oxfordshire and meet the aspirations of its membership. As it delivers tangible benefits for these members, in return for the membership fee, it will see its membership grow and it will be able to build a sustainable future. However, without a growing membership amongst private businesses it will not succeed.
7. The City Council needs to confirm its relationship with the new company, including financial and contractual matters.

Reminder: key objectives for the Council.

- City Council to facilitate the private sector to take a more strategic tourism management role
- Give full support to private sector tourism businesses and set up a Destination Management Company as a private/public partnership
- Targets for the new organisation are to increase the length of stay of tourists and the spend per head of each in order to grow the tourism economy.
- Agree that the scope of the new organisation should be County wide and include culture
- Need to ensure the best outcome for current tourism staff
- Need to understand the risks to Council if the new organisation does not succeed.

Options for the City Council's tourism function

8. There are three options to consider as the next stage of the process.
9. **Transfer** of the Council's Tourism Service, as a going concern, to a third party This would involve a transfer of all the Council staff and likely transfer of the assets of the Service – a lease to the Broad Street Tourism Information Centre, the customer and supplier data, certain equipment, etc. As with any service outsourcing, the Council would have to be able to demonstrate that it had achieved best value. Because the Council would be procuring a purchaser (even if at negative value) for the Service, it would need to demonstrate that it had

undertaken a competitive selection process which was compliant with our Contract Rules, and even, perhaps, European procurement regulations.

10. **Partnership working.** A partnership between two legal providers of the combined service, the Council and a third party. The Council could provide grant funding to the third party for the promotion of the combined service. The Council would not strictly have "procured" anything but could be said to have simply taken the opportunity to work in association with an appropriate third party. There is benefit in seconding all the Service staff to the third party company, so that there would be one single manager of the combined operation. If on termination of the Co-operation Agreement the combined operation had been successful, the Council could then consider a full transfer of what remains of the Service at that time (probably involving a significantly reduced number of transferring employees). In such circumstances, and at such time, it is suggested that any transfer involved is likely to be easier to facilitate.
11. There is a third option, a transfer of the undertaking, as set out in the first approach above, but to a **wholly-owned Council company**. One advantage of this is that again there should be no deemed "procurement" of anything. It would simply be the Council continuing to provide the Service, but in a different way.

Proposal

12. The City Council has been working towards enabling the private tourism sector to get more involved strategically in tourism promotion. It was originally intended that the City Council would coordinate the creation of a joint public-private partnership with the intention that the private sector would take an increasing role and the City Council would step away from direct involvement. This last year the City Council has hosted the Visit Oxfordshire partnership with the intention for a new partnership company to take on the lead from April 2011.
13. If the City Council had intended to transfer its tourism service to another organisation a different approach should have been adopted along the lines of the Leisure centres contact.
14. Therefore, the partnership option outlined above continues the journey the City Council embarked upon two years ago. It is simpler and meets expectations expressed by leading Members and the private businesses. It gives a good outcome for current staff who remain Council employees, yet through secondment gives the new company management control over the staff. This approach provides flexibility, and the ability for the City Council to step in if the new company fails to grow its membership or achieve the agreed objectives going forward.

Key elements of a new co-operation relationship

15. The proposal is that the City Council enters into a Co-operation Agreement with Visit Oxfordshire from 1st April 2011 for 3 years. The draft Heads of Terms, already prepared, set out the nature of the relationship between the City Council and the new company and the basis of the co-operation. They describe the new County-wide tourism service in general terms and the role of the new company in operating that service. However it is proposed that this agreement should have a break clause and would need to be monitored annually. The City Council would

Appendix 1 Risk Assessment

Risk ID	Risk	Opportunity/Threat	Risk Description	Risk Cause	Consequence	Date raised	Corporate Objective	Gross Risk	Residual Risk	Current Risk	Owner	Date Risk Reviewed	Proximity of Risk (Projects/Contracts Only)
Category-000-Service Area Code	Risk Title	Opportunity/Threat	Risk Description	Risk Cause	Consequence	Date raised	1 to 6	I P	I P	I P			
CEB-012-CD	New company fails	T	Visit Oxfordshire as the trading arm of the new organisation does not succeed as a company and its Board decides to fold the company	New trading company fails to deliver on outcomes, and or to generate level of income necessary to meet obligations	City Council has to take back direct responsibility for tourism	9 Mar 11	2	3 2	3 2	3 2	Michael Crofton-Briggs		
CEB -- 013 - CD	Only part of Broad St	T	Lease taken of basement, ground and part of upper floors to run just the TIC, not whole building for the whole organisation	Unable to reach agreement over lease terms for whole building and company follows other options	City Council has to find tenant for upper floors City Council will need to use change management policy to find alternative roles or make staff redundant	9 Mar 11	2	2 3	2 2	2 3	Michael Crofton-Briggs		
CEB --14 - CD	Staff secondment	T	Not all the current tourism staff are seconded to the new company.	Some staff express wish not to be seconded		9 Mar 11	2	2 2	2 1	2 2	Michael Crofton-Briggs		

VALUE AND PERFORMANCE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Tuesday 22 February 2011

COUNCILLORS PRESENT: Councillor Brown (Chair), Councillors Abbasi, Baxter, Gotch, Keen, Jahan Khan, McCready, Rowley, Seamons and Young. Barrie Finch (Co-opted member)

COUNCILLORS IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor Price (Leader of the Council) and Councillor Smith (Board Member for Customer Services)

OFFICERS PRESENT: Tim Sadler (Executive Director, City Services), Peter McQuitty (Head of Policy, Culture and Communications); Michael Crofton-Briggs (Head of City Development); Karen Seal (Environmental Development) Helen Bishop (Head of Customer Services) Pat Jones and Alec Dubberley (Law and Governance).

46 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Apologies were received from Councillors Armitage, Coulter, Darke, Wolff and Anita Fisher. Councillors Rowley, Van Nooijen and Young attended as substitutes.

47 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Young declared a personal interest in minute 50 (Visit Oxfordshire Destination Management Organisation) as she was employed as a freelance tour guide in the City.

48 WORK PROGRAMME

The Head of Law and Governance submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended) updating the Committee on the work programme for the current year.

The Principal Scrutiny Officer said that the work programme was on target for completion by the end of the year and highlighted the following:

- It was unlikely that any scrutiny of the Allotments Service would take place due to a lack of time
- Work on supporting people would be started in the new Council year
- The Customer First Panel has met and work in this area was ongoing

- The Asset Panel had met to further scrutinise the Offices for the Future project. The Leader said that an update to all Members would be given at the end of March.
- The Audit Commission review of the Benefits Service was likely to be reported to the January meeting.

49 SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS – REPORT BACK

The Committee noted the recommendations made to the Executive Board and the response received.

50 VISIT OXFORDSHIRE DESTINATION MANAGEMENT

The Head of City Development submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended) concerning the next steps required in order to confirm the relationship between Oxford City Council and Visit Oxfordshire.

During the debate the Committee received reassurance that should the venture fail or under perform there would be opportunity for the City Council to leave the organisation without financial penalty. The Broad Street Tourist Information Centre was due to be leased to the new company from 1 April and all Centre staff would be seconded to the new company.

Resolved to:-

- (1) Note the report; and
- (2) Request that the full business plan for the Destination Management Organisation is submitted to a future meeting of the Committee.

51 CORPORATE PLAN AND TARGETS - CONSULTATION

The Head of Policy, Culture and Communications submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended) detailing the draft corporate plan (CP) for the next Council year.

The Committee broadly welcomed the report noting the Council's pleasing record of achievement in a number of areas. Specific comments on the wording of some sections of the draft plan were discussed and summarised below as follows:-

General Comments

1. The CP lacks a concise view of how it fits within the strategic drive of the Council i.e. the "golden thread" or line of sight through frameworks, strategies, service plans and performance appraisals. The expectation is not

of a long laboured description but a concise outline to the reader of its place, status and delivery

2. The CP year coming to an end outlined a number of delivery targets and promised (“we will”) actions by 2013. Whilst accepting that this CP is about the future there should be either under each object or as a separate section:

- Outcomes against each target for 10/11 with a link to a target for 11/12 if that is appropriate
- A look at forward promises made for March 2013 either linking these to a target in 11/12 or an explanation for the removal or changing of the target if this is the case

A vibrant, sustainable economy

3. In the introductory comments made to this section there is no mention of the significant difficulties in deprived communities around education and skills. These difficulties mean that residents in our deprived wards are economically excluded and as growth becomes more high tech and high brow this exclusion becomes deeper. This is recognised in the Regeneration Framework. In essence the economic drive missing here is for the City Council to use its influence and partnership working to lever support for up skilling and “work readiness” amongst pupils, from those high tech high brow companies wishing to make Oxford or Oxfordshire their base

4. The measure reflecting visitor numbers does not reflect our corporate ambition. This is to improve the quality of the “tourism offer” and keep as many of the economic benefits of that within the City. This needs recasting

5. The final measure needs to reflect in a more focused way our aim to support people from deprived communities. For example rather than apprenticeships and capital investment project generally we should be looking at positive action to support youngsters from deprived communities into apprenticeships and measuring how we achieve against this.

Meeting Housing Need

6. Whilst the Core Strategy is mentioned the Housing Strategy and the changes in Housing Finance aren't. Both of these will be a focus for the coming year and beyond with the new Housing Strategy providing our policy response to change and housing finance changes having significant effect within our budgets and delivery potential. Some of these significant strategy responses need to be converted to performance measures

7. It is not clear why the number of affordable homes target has been dropped as a corporate drive

Strong Active Communities

51 NOISE NUISANCE

The Head of Environmental Development submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended) providing the Committee with a brief overview of the Council's out of hours noise nuisance service as well as an update on action taken as a result of a motion, on the same subject, put to a meeting of Council last year on the same subject.

The Committee welcomed Karen Seal (Environmental Development) to answer any questions from the Committee. The following points were clarified:-

- The notion that two complaints of noise nuisance had to be made before Council Officers would investigate was false.
- The out of hours call centre had been transferred to an external company outside of Oxford. This service would be reviewed during the next financial year.
- There was a proposal in the draft budget to reduce the out of hours service so that it would be staffed between 11pm and 4am and deal exclusively with excess noise complaints.

Resolved to:-

- (1) Note the report
- (2) Request that officers look at the viability of conducting a scrutiny review into the noise nuisance service for inclusion in the work programme for the next Council year.

52 REVIEW OF BENEFITS SERVICE

The Head of Customer Services submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended) providing an update on the ongoing review of the Council's benefits service.

The Committee was informed that the recently held inspection by the Audit Commission was nearing the reporting stage. It was hoped that the report could be presented to a future meeting of the Committee.

During consideration of the report the following points were covered-

- The report provided a summary of the proposed methodology for conducting the fundamental service review of the service. This was a planned activity and separate to the work done with the Audit Commission.

- Councillor Smith hoped that the review process would engage members so that they gained a better understanding of the work the service does.
- The national changes to the calculation and payment of benefits were still unclear and it would almost certainly have an effect on the service in the future.
- It was hoped that at the end of the fundamental service review a more defined role for the Committee could be carved out. This would give the scrutiny of the service more focus.
- Value for money and efficiency were highlighted as particular areas the committee wished to see a greater focus on.

Resolved to:-

- (1) To request that the Audit Commission report is presented to the next Committee meeting; and
- (2) To ask for a further report to the Committee once the shape of the re-designed service had become clear.

52 MINUTES

Resolved to approve the minutes of the meeting held on held on 18 November 2010 and the special meeting held on 10 January 2011.

53 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The following date was noted:-

5 April 2011

The meeting began at 5.00 pm and ended at 7.28 pm.

This page is intentionally left blank