

Scrutiny Committee reports for City Executive Board - Thursday 6 April 2017

a) **Scrutiny Response: Health Inequalities** (Pages 3 - 10)

Board Member response included.

b) **Scrutiny Response: University Housing Needs** (Pages 11 - 12)

Board Member response included.

c) **Scrutiny Response: Air Quality** (Pages 13 - 14)

Board Member response included.

d) **Scrutiny Response: Workplace Parking Levies** (Pages 15 - 16)

Board Member response included - this replaces the response included in the main agenda pack.

f) **Scrutiny Response: Public Safety on Oxford's Waterways** (Pages 17 - 22)

Scrutiny Committee report and Board Member response included.

This page is intentionally left blank

Suggested City Executive Board response to the recommendation of the Scrutiny Committee on Health Inequalities

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

Before tabling specific responses, I wanted to preface this commentary with a note of great sadness that these recommendations were amongst the last projects of Cllr Van Coulter before his sad passing. Van was a great colleague, with a huge passion in this area and a real eye for detail, but also detail which would make a concrete difference to people's lives. It is tragic that Van will not be able to scrutinise our council's progress in this area – I know he would have been a thoughtful, challenging, critical friend to work in this area.

3

Recommendation	Agreed?	Comment
1. That the recommendations of the Health Inequalities Panel that have been identified as being most relevant to district councils (see appendix) are supported as far as possible by the Council within existing resources.	Yes	See separate comments in paper attached “OCCG Inequalities Commission Recommendations Relevant to Oxford City Council”
2. That the Council supports reducing health inequalities and will adopt the 'Health in All Policies' approach, which is supported by government and the World Health Organisation.	Yes	The policy review process, which new and renewed policies go through, requires a consideration of impacts and equalities. We will investigate how we can widen this consideration to incorporate health more explicitly and make a recommendation to the programme boards who manage this process.
3. That the Council looks at how it can improve monitoring the health and wellbeing impacts of key services that impact on health and wellbeing.	Yes	As part of the Leisure and Wellbeing Strategy a range of indicators are being developed such as: Leisure Centre Usage by Target Groups (p 22) The policy review process has been revised and will now include a section on monitoring and evaluation that considers the impact of the policy over a set period. We will further encourage service areas to include health measures in their policy evaluation via the policy development toolkit.
4. That consideration is given to whether more could be done within existing resources to tackle loneliness and isolation among the city's growing elderly population	Yes	Through the community grants programme we have and will continue to fund community and voluntary organisations whose work contributes towards alleviating

<p>through community services, with reference to the work of the Jo Cox Foundation's Loneliness Commission.</p>		<p>isolation and loneliness for many people in Oxford.</p> <p>This includes funding The Clockhouse project based in Greater Leys who provides activities for older people, the Parasol Project in Northway that provides inclusive leisure and play activities for disabled children and young people and Open Door that works from East Oxford community centre which is a drop in service for refugees and asylum seekers.</p> <p>Of the community associations leasing community centres at peppercorn rent many provide lunch clubs that target older people in their local community and put on family activities all helping towards reducing isolation and loneliness.</p> <p>The OSP of which the council is a partner, is looking to add value to work that reduces loneliness and isolation. For example the council, via the OSP has contributed funding to an AGE UK event in May, linked to the Jo Cox loneliness commission, bringing together organisations to look at what more can be done in Oxfordshire around loneliness. The OSP will also be looking at ways to influence partners to encourage more staff to volunteer their time via organisations such as Ami https://www.withami.co.uk/ that works to reduce loneliness and isolation. As a member of the OSP the council can look at what more can be done to encourage our own staff to volunteer via organisations such as Ami.</p> <p>We will consider whether this area can be further supported when commissioned grants are next reviewed.</p>
<p>5. That the Council continues to support and encourage advice agencies in helping people to claim the benefits they</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Ensuring that people suffering from poor health and disabilities have access to the right benefits plays a key</p>

<p>are entitled to.</p>		<p>role in reducing health inequalities. The council funds four advice agencies that provide a range of support to some of our most vulnerable residents. Recent work has supported people moving from Disability Living Allowance to Personal Independence Payment around understanding the changes and in some circumstances challenging decisions. The Council gathers monitoring information on the client group of advice agencies including those who are disabled, and will be reviewing the service in advance of new contracts in 2018. There is no intention to reduce funding but the review will ensure the Council commissions the right service to ensure the needs of our most vulnerable residents continue to be met.</p> <p>We will be interested in discussing collaboration with the CCG in this area as well, and assessing the outcomes of the <i>Benefits in Practice</i> pilot.</p>
<p>6. That consideration is given to how the 1001 Critical Days Manifesto, which focuses on the importance of the conception to age 2 period, is relevant to the work of the Council, including support provided to children's centres in the city.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The vision of the 1001 Critical Days Manifesto is here http://www.1001criticaldays.co.uk/sites/default/files/1001%20days_oct16_1st.pdf . While the council is not directly responsible for services for 0-2 year olds, we support them in other ways for example; funding and supporting community centres that host a range of pre and post natal activities for parents and babies; improving air quality in the city which has a direct impact on children's' health; ensuring we have appropriate safeguarding processes in place to identify risk to children; continuing to fund grants to the voluntary sector who provide a range of services that support young children and their families. This year's budget also included some support for "stay and play" provision, which is sadly being withdrawn by the Oxfordshire County Council in almost its entirety.</p>

		Oxfordshire County Council will be presenting on children's services at the next OSP meeting in May. At this meeting the OSP will identify ways in which partners, can add value to their work. Through this process we will be able to highlight if the council can add any further value to this area of work.
7. That the Council looks again at whether it could provide funding for struggling city schools with poor levels of attainment, perhaps focused on sports provision or other activities that can reduce health inequalities.	Yes	<p>The City Council has been involved with the strategic school partnership and is attending their meetings to gain a better understanding of the position of schools and to work with partners to identify appropriate support and actions. The City Council is represented on the vulnerable learners group which is developing a strategy to support vulnerable learners. We are also engaged in a number of projects to promote attainment such as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - supporting the legacy project to enable teachers to learn from best practise, following on from the learning and leadership programme - support to pupils on the pupil premium to access cultural opportunities (May evaluation forthcoming) - a range of youth ambition projects that promote and support improved educational attainment. <p>A key concern is around recruitment and retention of key staff, and we are part of an open dialogue with schools about housing projects, and have kept funding in our capital programme to support loans for senior teachers to help with purchasing a property.</p> <p>We share the panel's frustration at areas of poor attainment, and will keep the role we can play under close review.</p>
8. That the Council redoubles efforts to publicise, promote	Yes	1. Because of the high costs of living in Oxford, we have

and enhance the visibility of the Oxford Living Wage scheme (as well as other good employment practices), given that the new Westgate Shopping Centre will reopen in autumn 2017.

- set a separate Oxford Living Wage based on the Living Wage. We pay this to all our staff and agency workers working for us and it is above the Living wage
2. We also require all contractors with contracts over £100,000 to pay the Oxford Living Wage to their staff and subcontractors.
 3. We believe this benefits staff, employers and the wider Oxford economy.
 4. The Oxford Living Wage is currently **£9.26** an hour. For someone working a 38 hour week, this would mean annual pay of **£18,303**.

Currently more than 2,000 employers are signed up to the Living Wage scheme, which offers a number of business benefits to employers:

- 80% of employers believe that the Living Wage has improved their staff's quality of work
- Better loyalty and customer service, and fewer complaints
- Absenteeism down by a quarter
- Better retention of staff and lower HR costs
- 70% of employers think that the Living Wage has increased consumer awareness of their commitment to be an ethical employer
- Living Wage accreditation is confirmed by a license signed between the Living Wage Foundation and an employer.

As a Council we advertise the OLW within all our recruitment activities and also apply 1 above. In addition there is the requirement at 2 above however the council could consider reducing this figure (for example down to £50,000). There is also potential to advertise it further within Oxford and have our own 'Council Accreditation'

		<p>scheme although the legalities of this would need to be explored. As we have a high employment rate there may be some attraction to businesses locally</p> <p>We will continue to seek out new avenues to promote the OLW and are very open to suggestions.</p>
9. That the Council uses procurement as a tool for tackling poverty and to extracting measurable social value, drawing on good practice from Manchester City Council, and reinforces rules for contractors to pay Oxford Living Wage	Yes	<p>The City Council aims to seek social value where it practically can through procurement. Where services or works are delivered within Oxfordshire we already encourage suppliers to pay their staff at least the Oxford Living Wage. Social value considerations are included where relevant and are subject to evaluation. An example of social value being delivered under a construction contract is for the Oxford Tower Refurbishment project with circa £900k of social value being committed by the contractor; there are lots of examples of the different types of social value being offered including apprenticeships, training and educational opportunities, supporting local community projects etc. The Procurement Team are working with the LEP to review our Ethical & Sustainability guide which forms part of our Corporate Procurement Strategy to include more guidance around social value. Over the next financial year the importance and benefits of social value will be promoted to officers through the Procurement Champions network.</p>
10. That the Council continues to engage constructively with partners, including through discussions about the emerging local NHS Sustainability and Transformation Plan, about delivering more health services in community facilities and improving access to health and other services in estates.	Yes	<p>Oxford City Council is actively engaged in the Health & Wellbeing Board, the Health Improvement Board and the Children's Trust and a number of working groups. Through this process the council works closely with other agencies to deliver health services in the community. For example; supporting the homelessness pathway; strategies to reduce obesity; promotion of health</p>

		<p>initiatives, and fuel poverty. On each of our estates we have a health partnership that supports the health needs of the neighbourhoods and is underpinned by an action plan.</p> <p>In addition to the day to day work the council undertakes to support the health of the population, we are working closely with Barton Health Town to pilot innovative approaches to health. The council is also supporting the food poverty programme which may lead to a food project being delivered on one of our estates. The council are responding to the OCCG consultation on their transformation plans.</p> <p>Our community centres are a tremendous resource for healthcare facilities and we hope that at Barton and Rose Hill, there will be a significant and ongoing offering of health facilities. We are extremely open to including health partners in discussions about community buildings to ensure they can offer services in them.</p>
--	--	---

This page is intentionally left blank

Suggested City Executive Board response to the recommendation of the Scrutiny Committee on University Housing Needs

Provided by the Board Member for Planning and Regulatory Services

11

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
<p>That options are explored through the new Local Plan 2036 processes relating to student accommodation, and that early discussions are sought with the two universities (and neighbouring authorities where relevant) aimed at building shared concerns and shared efforts to improve the housing situation in the city. Consideration should be given to:</p> <p>a) Encouraging the University of Oxford to present proposals for accommodating postdocs in the city; (para. 4)</p> <p>b) Allocating specific sites for new student accommodation for the two universities; (paras. 8a & 16)</p> <p>c) Limiting the amount of student accommodation allowed within any given geographical area; (para. 17)</p> <p>d) Encouraging the universities to provide accessible accommodation as part of any proposed new developments of student accommodation; para 18)</p> <p>e) Exempting groups such as post-doctoral researchers and nursing and teaching students from the target of no more than 3,000 students from each university living outside of university-provided accommodation in the city, balanced by a reduction in the target figures; (paras. 2a, 8b & 19)</p> <p>f) Extending the targets for students living outside of provided accommodation to other large educational institutions based in the city; (para. 20)</p> <p>g) Limiting the use of new student accommodation to the two universities; (para. 21)</p> <p>h) Whether university students housed in non-university</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>I welcome the constructive and open dialogue with the two Universities about their accommodation needs, which have been held between officers, members and the two institutions over a prolonged period, and will continue to be held.</p> <p>I recognise the positive contribution that the Universities make to the city in terms of economic growth, vitality, and employment, and the City Council wants to continue to support them. This kind of engagement is exactly what this stage of the Local Plan is all about, as we work towards publishing the Preferred Options in June 2017.</p> <p>At present detailed evidence, technical work, consultation responses from last summer, and sustainability appraisal are all being considered, and will inform the direction of policies to be published in the Preferred Options. The evidence given by the Universities to the Scrutiny Committee, and the Scrutiny Committee’s recommendations, will be included in that consideration.</p> <p>While that work is still ongoing it would not be appropriate to respond in detail at this stage to the precise proposals, other than to confirm that they are all being considered alongside all other proposals. That being said, there are a number of very useful and interesting proposals within the report which are being given very careful consideration as to whether they could be included in the Preferred Options</p>

<p>provided student housing should count towards the 3,000 target figure; (para. 22)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i) Encouraging private developers of student accommodation to work closely with the universities; (para. 23)j) Reviewing the local key worker definition to potentially include post-doctoral researchers, nursing and teaching students and lower-paid university support staff; (para. 24)k) Providing some flexibility to substitute some of the social rent planning obligations with key worker housing obligations in order to encourage key worker housing schemes (including accommodation for post-doctoral researchers and lower-paid university support staff); (para. 25)l) Providing additional flexibility in the balance of dwellings policy specifically for key worker housing schemes. (para. 26)		<p>document.</p> <p>Given that it is not possible at this stage to pre-empt the proposals that will be included in the Preferred Options document, but being aware of the detailed work that the Scrutiny Panel have done on this issue, I propose that a full and detailed response to each proposal in the Scrutiny Panel report is sent back to the Panel once the Preferred Options document has been published.</p>
---	--	--

Suggested City Executive Board response to the recommendation of the Scrutiny Committee on Air Quality

Provided by the Board Member for A Clean Green Oxford

<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Agreed?</i>	<i>Comment</i>
1. That as part of the Local Plan review consideration is given to policies to mitigate the negative impacts of development in areas with poor air quality.	Yes	This is already part of the Local Plan development. Environmental Sustainability Officer will continue work to support Planning Officers developing the Local Plan.
2. That consideration is given to implementing differentiated car-parking charges in order to offer cheaper parking for electric vehicles.	Yes	Dialogue will continue within Oxford about the best way to support the uptake of electric vehicle to residents and visitors.
3. That the feasibility and impact of measures contained in the City's Air Quality Annual Status report that have not been progressed to date are reviewed annually.	Yes	We do a review and update of actions as part of the Annual Status Report anyway for DEFRA, so this action will be carried out as part of this exercise.

This page is intentionally left blank

Suggested City Executive Board response to the recommendation of the Scrutiny Committee on Workplace Parking Levies

Provided by the Board Member for Planning and Regulatory Services

15

<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Agreed?</i>	<i>Comment</i>
<p>1. That the City Council supports the County Council’s development of proposals for a workplace parking levy and a congestion charge given that both approaches have the potential to generate significant additional funding for transport improvements in the city and reduce congestion.</p>	<p>In part</p>	<p>At this stage, as the report to the Scrutiny Committee makes clear, the proposed Workplace Parking Levy is at the very earliest stages, and it is not clear how it might work, what the impacts would be broadly or an individual employers, what exemptions might be put in place and to what purposes the funding might be put. The one potential consequence outlined in the report – that the entire city might need to be covered with controlled parking zones for the scheme to work – would mean that every household in the city with a car and no off-street parking space would be required to buy a parking permit. This is a significant financial impact on residents of the city, and would need to be weighed up against the broader benefits of the scheme.</p>
<p>2. That consideration is given to how the City Council could help to mitigate and manage the wider impacts of the future implementation of either a workplace parking levy or a congestion charge on parking in the city, for example through additional controlled parking zones.</p>	<p>In part</p>	<p>At present the City Council supports the work done by the County Council to develop the detail of the scheme further, but reserves judgement until that detail is available for consideration as to whether the benefits of the scheme outweigh its costs.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

To: City Executive Board

Date: 6 April 2017

Report of: Scrutiny Committee

Title of Report: Public safety and addressing anti-social behaviour on Oxford's waterways

Summary and Recommendations

Purpose of report: To present the recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee on public safety and addressing anti-social behaviour on Oxford's waterways

Scrutiny Lead Member: Councillor Andrew Gant, Chair of Scrutiny

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

Recommendation of the Scrutiny Committee to the City Executive Board:

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

Background

1. The Scrutiny Committee scrutinised this report at a meeting on 27 March 2017. The Committee would like to thank Cllr Dee Sinclair, Board Member for Community Safety, and Richard Adams, Community Safety and Resilience Manager, for attending the meeting to present the report and answer questions, and Cllr Liz Wade for addressing the Committee.

Findings and recommendations

2. The Board Member for Community Safety introduced the report. She highlighted the four areas of concern and the range of intervention options that had been identified following the preliminary consultation. She said that the Council had been listening to all concerned and would continue to do so. The Community Safety and Resilience Manager highlighted the proposal to undertake a review of the waterways as a whole. He said that the waterways should be viewed as an asset that presents various opportunities that should be identified and developed.

3. The Committee welcomed the excellent example of engagement that had taken place, the proposed review of the waterways as a whole, the carefully prepared Equalities Impact Assessment and the narrowing of focus since the previous report a year ago, which had proposed a PSPO for the entirety of the Oxford waterways (and was not supported by a majority of the Committee at the time).
4. The Committee considered the feedback provided by different groups in the preliminary consultation. Members heard that land owners had tended to support the original waterways PSPO proposal, boaters had not supported it and businesses had asked for specific issues to be tackled, such as drug use and paraphernalia. The Community Safety and Resilience Manager said that the engagement had been high quality and provided assurance that the level of response had been very good for an engagement exercise of this nature.
5. The Committee raised concerns that a PSPO was listed as an intervention option on the Folly Bridge to Iffley Lock stretch of the River Thames, given that this was a big stretch of river. The Committee also raised concerns about issues such as sewage dumping in this stretch of river, which was popular with rowers and tourists. The Community Safety and Resilience Manager advised that PSPOs could be suitable in particular hotspots. No decisions had been taken yet on which intervention options would be utilised and there would be a process to go through.
6. The Committee questioned what powers the Council had to enter and inspect boats when concerns about sanitation and safety had been identified. The Community Safety and Resilience Manager explained that gaining the right of entry was difficult but that the Private Sector Safety Team had some limited powers that had been used at Castle Mill Stream.
7. The Committee sought assurances that strong partnerships were in place to support potentially vulnerable people living on the Oxford waterways and that clear pathways were in place with clear responsibilities that worked seamlessly in practice. The Community Safety and Resilience Manager advised that pathways were in place but that the crucial issue was one of effective engagement with particular individuals living in squalor on the waterways who had complex needs and chaotic lifestyles. Triage was used in high demand cases and there had been a small number of positive interventions.
8. The Committee considered the extent to which fumes from boats were a problem at Aristotle Lane, adjacent to a playground, and heard opposing views about this and the significance of a resident's complaints. The Community Safety and Resilience Manager said that the impact of smoke can vary in different climatic conditions and that some fumes (e.g. diesel emissions) were more visible than others. The Council had investigated on some 70 occasions whether fumes at Aristotle Lane constituted a statutory nuisance in response to complaints. To date a statutory nuisance had not been identified but that did not mean that fumes were not a real issue at Aristotle Lane at certain points in time. The Council was also supportive of a 'quiet zone' at this location including a limit of two boats being present during winter months (with some specific exceptions allowed).

9. In response to a question about riparian land ownership, the Committee heard that the problem of identifying land owners was a significant and complex problem to resolve. The provision of additional temporary and permanent moorings, which was identified as being integral to addressing safety issues at the areas of concern, would also be challenging to achieve. The Council wanted to achieve a regularised environment with sensible solutions to these issues.
10. The Committee considered a proposal to recommend to the City Executive Board that a PSPO should be a solution of last resort. This proposal was not supported by a majority of the Committee. It was supported by a minority of the Committee.
11. The Committee noted that the timetable for addressing the four areas of concern and conducting a review into the wider use of the waterways is dependent upon identifying resources to take this work forward. The Committee strongly support this work and hope that appropriate resources can be made available at the earliest opportunity.

Recommendation 1 – That resources are made available at the earliest opportunity for addressing the areas of concern and conducting a wider review of the use of the Oxford waterways.

12. The Committee requested a progress report in 12 months time.

Name and contact details of author:-

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

List of background papers: None
Version number: 0.1

This page is intentionally left blank

Suggested City Executive Board response to the recommendation of the Scrutiny Committee on Public safety and addressing anti-social behaviour on Oxford's waterways

Provided by the Board Member for Community Safety

<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Agreed?</i>	<i>Comment</i>
1. That resources are made available at the earliest opportunity for addressing the areas of concern and conducting a wider review of the use of the Oxford waterways.	Y	The 'hotspots' identified will be prioritised and resourced within the existing Community Response and Anti Social Behaviour team. In respect of the longer term issues of regularising the moorings along the Thames, a part time resource has been identified to coordinate a scoping report on options and costs and will be available during the 2017/2018 municipal year.

This page is intentionally left blank