

Suggested CEB responses to Scrutiny Committee reports for City Executive Board Thursday 17 March 2016

6. **Suggested CEB responses to the Scrutiny Committee Reports (Pages 3 - 6)**

This supplement contains the suggested CEB responses to the following Scrutiny Committee reports:

- Waterways Public Space Protection Order: pre-consultation
- A Housing Company for Oxford

This page is intentionally left blank

Suggested City Executive Board response to Scrutiny Committee recommendations on Oxford Waterways Public Spaces Protection Order consultation

Provided by the Board Member for Housing and the Board Member for Crime, Community Safety and Licensing

3

Recommendation	Agreed? (Y / N / In part)	Comments
<p>That the Council should revise the documentation, draft Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) and consultation proposals in collaboration with interested parties before consulting on an improved proposal for an Oxford Waterways PSPO.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Comment from the Board Member and Director</p> <p>This report to the Board is intended to be the first stage in our consideration of the potential scope and effectiveness of a PSPO in respect of anti-social behaviours affecting Oxford’s waterways.</p> <p>The recommendations from Scrutiny are helpful, and reflect the lengthy discussions that have taken place with local residents and other interested parties over the past months. In drafting the report, it was felt to be appropriate to adopt a two-stage approach due to the complexity of the issues involved, and this first stage involves an additional non-statutory consultation on whether a PSPO is the appropriate way of managing the behaviours that have been creating harm and concern, and, if so, the form it might take.</p> <p>This consultation stage effectively corresponds to the wish expressed by the Scrutiny Committee for an early and meaningful engagement with all those who have an interest in the use and management of the city’s waterways.</p> <p>The draft Order provides an outline of the potential scope of the regulations and it will provide a means of obtaining views, guidance and evidence as to their appropriateness and likely effectiveness. In response to the Scrutiny Committee’s recommendation, I am making two proposals to the Board.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the Council’s Public Engagement Board should consider all the points raised by Scrutiny and provide professional advice on the details of the proposed consultation process, and specifically, that it will ensure effective engagement with all interested parties 2. That the Head of Law and Governance, and other relevant officers, should review

		<p>the current drafting of the Order before it is published for consultation and agree an amended form with me before it is used in that process.</p> <p>Comment from the Head of Law and Governance</p> <p>I have reviewed the draft Order proposed for consultation and would recommend that the following changes be made to it –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. That the draft prohibition at (d) be amended to read ‘No person shall create smoke, noise or fumes in such a manner as to give reasonable grounds for annoyance to any person.’2. That the draft prohibition at (e) be amended to read ‘No person shall damage waterways habitats, signage, lifebelts, fencing or other waterways infrastructure.’ <p>I will, of course, review all of the terms of any Order proposed following the consideration of all the consultation responses.</p>
--	--	---

Suggested City Executive Board response to Housing and Finance Panel recommendations on A Housing Company for Oxford

Provided by the Board Member for Housing and the Board Member for Finance, Asset Management and Public Health

5

<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Agreed? (Y / N / In part)</i>	<i>Comment</i>
<p>Recommendation 1 - That the Company articles should be drafted in such a way so as not to preclude entering into any funding arrangements or partnerships that could help to increase the supply of affordable housing, including working with alternative housing providers and models (such as co-housing or a community land trust).</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Recommendation 2 - That consideration should be given to enabling wider member oversight and input into decisions delegated to officers, in particular decisions about the articles of the Company, shareholder agreements, and details of agreements regarding the acquisition of affordable housing at Barton Park.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The recommendation to delegate to officers is for one of expediency to get this very important project moving as quickly as we can and it is considered that given this can only be exercised in consultation with the deputy leader and portfolio holder provides sufficient member oversight. Accountability for Barton Park has not been a problem where we are 50% owners and the housing company will be 100% owned. Briefings can be arranged on matters of interest for other members.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank