

MINUTES OF THE CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD

Thursday 11 June 2015

www.oxford.gov.uk



COUNCILLORS PRESENT: Councillors Price (Leader), Brown, Hollingsworth, Kennedy, Seamons, Simm and Sinclair.

OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT: Councillor Jean Fooks, Councillor Craig Simmons and Councillor David Thomas

OFFICERS PRESENT: Peter Sloman (Chief Executive), David Edwards (Executive Director City Regeneration and Housing), Helen Bishop (Head of Business Improvement), Adrian Chowns (Team Leader HMO Enforcement Team), Stephen Clarke (Head of Housing and Property), Geoff Corps (Cleaner Greener Services Manager), Paul Fleming (Chief Technology Manager), Elaine Philip (Markets Manager), Fiona Piercy, Jane Winfield (Regeneration and Major Projects - Team Manager), Ian Wright (Environmental Development), Nigel Kennedy (Head of Financial Services), Lindsay Cane (Law and Governance), Andrew Brown (Scrutiny Officer) and Catherine Phythian (Committee Services Officer)

10. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Turner, Rowley and Tanner.

11. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

12. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The City Executive Board noted that public questions had been submitted by Mr Nigel Gibson and that the questions with the written officer responses would be published with the minutes of the meeting.

13. SCRUTINY COMMITTEE REPORTS

Councillor Simmons, Chair, Scrutiny Committee presented the following scrutiny reports:

- Support for Businesses in the City Centre, report of the Local Economy Panel
- Covered Market Leasing Strategy

He noted that the scrutiny committee report on the City Centre Public Spaces Protection Order would be deferred until the City Executive Board discussion of the issue. He said that the Scrutiny Committee would welcome the opportunity to work with Board Members and Officers on this issue.

The Scrutiny Officer presented the following scrutiny reports:

- Housing Asset Management Strategy, report of the Housing Panel
- Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) Licensing Scheme, report of the Housing Panel

(a) Support for Businesses in the City Centre

The Scrutiny Officer submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended) which presented the recommendations of the Local Economy Panel which had considered how the City Council could make the city centre even more attractive to the public and to local businesses during a time of major developments which will affect the trading environment.

Cllr Simmons, Chair of Scrutiny Committee presented the report. He thanked the Board for their responses to the recommendations, noting that in some cases the wording was ambiguous. He said that it would assist the Scrutiny Committee in monitoring the implementation of their recommendations if the Board could provide clear Yes or No replies. He said that he would ask members of the Local Economy Panel to discuss the responses with the Board Member and officers to clarify the position.

The City Executive Board resolved to AGREE the following recommendations from the Scrutiny Committee report as set out in their written response:

1. a) That the City Council ensures that information about appealing to the Valuation Office Agency is made available to local businesses. In particular, this information should be communicated to all independent traders who may be affected by the major redevelopments taking place in Oxford.
- b) that the City Council takes any opportunities to join with other local authorities to lobby the new Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government for more council controls over business rates.
2. that the City Council works with the County Council through the Town Team to agree on a single united channel of regular communications to businesses, such as about travel disruptions, supported by a single online source of information.
4. that the City Council works with partners through the Town Team to reinforce the coordinated overall marketing and publicity campaign for Oxford in ways that cover all major potential audiences.
7. that the City Council takes a lead in establishing and facilitating a city centre commercial property landlord forum. This would be intended to bring together the owners of commercial properties, including the City Council, to ensure that there is a coordinated approach towards issues affecting the city centre, such as the minimisation of the time during which premises are empty. The forum could be chaired by the Leader of

the Council, linked to the work of the Town Team and constituted based on the model of the previous Pensions and Language School forums. We also suggest that its membership should include a representative of each political group and that City Councillors should be able to observe meetings of the forum.

8. that the City Council leads on the development of a long term strategy for the city centre as a whole. This should include a commitment to developing and supporting vibrant and distinct city quarters away from prime sites, in locations such as Gloucester Green, Jericho/Observatory Quarter, Market Street, Broad Street and a possible arts quarter around the Ashmolean Museum.

(b) Scrutiny Report_ City Centre Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO)

Consideration of this report from the Scrutiny Committee to be deferred to a future meeting of the City Executive Board.

(c) Scrutiny Report_Covered Market Leasing Strategy

The Scrutiny Officer submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended) which detailed the recommendations from the Scrutiny Committee regarding the Covered Market Leasing Strategy.

Cllr Simmons, Chair of Scrutiny Committee presented the report and highlighted the proposed amendments to the wording of the Covered Market Leasing Strategy.

The City Executive Board resolved to AGREE the recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee as set out in the report.

(d) Scrutiny Report_Housing Asset Management Strategy

The Scrutiny Officer presented a report (previously circulated, now appended) which detailed the conclusions of the Housing Panel, drawing attention to their concerns regarding the number of unused garages and the potential to make better use of these assets.

Cllr Seamons explained that as garages were no longer included in the Housing Revenue Account they did not come under the Housing Asset Management Strategy but he acknowledged the point made by the Housing Panel and said that this was something that officers would consider.

The City Executive Board resolved to NOTE the Housing Panel report and to provide a formal written response to the recommendations.

(e) Scrutiny Report_Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) Licensing Scheme

The Scrutiny Officer presented a report (previously circulated, now appended) which detailed the recommendations from the Housing Panel review of the HMO Licensing Scheme. He said that the Housing Panel was fully supportive of the proposal to renew the HMO Licensing Scheme for another 5 years and advocated the need for the Council to take a flexible approach to enforcement in different sectors.

Cllr Seamons thanked the Housing Panel for their contribution to the review and said that he was supportive of the principle of a flexible approach to enforcement.

The City Executive Board resolved to NOTE the Housing Panel report and to provide a formal written response to the recommendations.

14. COUNCILLOR ADDRESSES ON ANY ITEM FOR DECISION ON THE BOARD'S AGENDA

Cllr Thomas addressed the Board on item 7 – City Centre Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) – which was later deferred (minute item 16).

Cllr Thomas told the Board that he believed that a Community Protection Notice would be a more appropriate tool than a PSPO for dealing with anti-social behaviour; he also questioned the advisability of proceeding with the PSPO in the absence of an enforcement code of conduct for officers or a revision to the existing “Code of Conduct for Busking and Street Entertaining in Oxford.” In conclusion he said that he welcomed the Board’s decision to defer the item and that he hoped that this would be an opportunity for the Board Member and officers to work with all councillors and other interested parties to resolve the matter.

15. COUNCILLOR ADDRESSES ON NEIGHBOURHOOD ISSUES

Cllr Fooks addressed the Board on her concerns regarding overcrowding in a Cutteslowe playground. She said that the popularity of the playground meant that there was often a queue to use the equipment and that this was becoming a safety issue. She asked the City Executive Board to consider whether there were any funding options available to provide more playground equipment.

The City Executive Board AGREED that the Head of Community Services should be asked to consider the matter.

16. CITY CENTRE PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER (PSPO)

The City Executive Board resolved to AGREE to defer this item until a future meeting in order that the Council had sufficient time to consider the submission from the civil liberties and human rights organisation Liberty.

17. COVERED MARKET LEASING STRATEGY

The Regeneration and Major Projects Manager submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended) which detailed the updated Covered Market Leasing Strategy. The Regeneration and Major Projects Manager said that this was an update to the previous strategy and that it had been subject to extensive consultation with the market traders.

Cllr Price presented the report and emphasised that the proposed changes to the strategy were intended to ensure that the covered market remained a “must visit experience” and “focussed on the needs of all Oxford residents”.

The City Executive Board resolved to APPROVE the updated Covered Market Leasing Strategy 2015.

18. RECYCLING REWARD SCHEME BID – BLUE BIN PREMIER LEAGUE

The Head of Direct Services submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended) which detailed the Council’s successful bid for £350,000 funding from the Department of Communities and Local Government for a 3 year recycling incentive scheme.

Cllr Price presented the report and congratulated officers on the successful bid.

The Cleaner Greener Services Manager briefed the Board on the details of the scheme and explained that Ward Councillors would be involved in its implementation. He said that it was planned to launch the scheme during recycling week at the end of June. He said that the idea to submit the bid had originated from discussions at the Recycling Scrutiny Panel.

The City Executive Board resolved to APPROVE the implementation of the proposed recycling incentive scheme outlined in the report.

19. ICT STRATEGY 2015 - 2018

The Head of Business Improvement submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended) which detailed the new ICT Strategy and the arrangements for its implementation.

Cllr Brown, Board Member for Customer and Corporate Services presented the report. She said that this was the first of a number of ICT related reports that would come to the Board from this service area.

In response to questions from Board Members the Chief Technology Manager confirmed that the telephony project and the new ICT partner project were both on target for delivery; and that the lessons learnt from the South Oxfordshire District Council fire would be taken into account in discussions with potential ICT partners.

The City Executive Board resolved to APPROVE the new ICT Strategy 2015 – 2018.

20. HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMO) LICENSING SCHEME

The Executive Director for Community Services submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended) which detailed findings from a review carried out for the HMO Licensing Scheme and sought approval to conduct a statutory consultation to renew the scheme in January 2016.

Cllr Seamons, Executive Board Member for Housing presented the report. He said that the review had identified a number of successes but that there remained a large volume of work to do to regulate the service and improve standards.

The Service Manager Environmental Health and HMO Enforcement Team Manager outlined the arrangements for the consultation which would include an on-line questionnaire, roadshows, focus groups with students and ethnic tenants, and meetings with ward councillors and local resident groups.

Cllr Brown raised concerns about the growing problem of “beds in sheds” and “hot bedding” in parts of the city.

The City Executive Board resolved to:

1. NOTE the Review of Licensing of Houses in Multiple Occupation 2015;
2. NOTE that the Review indicates that a significant proportion of HMOs in the Council's area are being managed ineffectively;
3. INSTRUCT Officers of the Council to proceed with a statutory 10 week consultation on the basis that it is necessary to renew the licensing scheme in its entirety for a further 5 years from the 25 January 2016 (Option 3);
4. REQUEST a future report in October 2015 setting out the results of the statutory consultation and the proposed future of the licensing scheme.

21. HOUSING ASSET MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

The Head of Housing and Property Services submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended) which detailed the proposed Housing Asset Management Strategy and associated action plan for Oxford City Council's housing stock.

Cllr Seamons, Executive Board Member for Housing presented the report, highlighting the proposal to adopt and deliver an Oxford Standard which would be higher than the statutory Decent Homes standard. The Head of Housing and Property Services said that the Council was already commissioning work that would meet this enhanced standard.

In considering this report the City Executive Board discussed the implications of the Government's proposals for housing association tenants to buy their homes at discounted prices. The Chief Executive said that this was potentially a very serious issue for the Council which would challenge all aspects of the Council's housing strategy and management of its housing stock.

The City Executive Board resolved to:

1. RECOMMEND to Council the adoption of the Housing Asset Management Strategy along with the Oxford Standard as part of the Council's policy framework;
2. ENDORSE the action plan;
3. NOTE that an Energy Strategy will be presented to the Board later this year.

22. TOWER BLOCKS REFURBISHMENT PROJECT REPORT

The Head of Housing and Property Services submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended) which detailed proposals to increase the project budget and reconfirm delegated authority to the Executive Director for Regeneration and Housing in consultation with the Heads of Finance and Law and Governance, to be able to appoint and award the contract to the preferred principal contractor.

Cllr Seamons, Executive Board Member for Housing presented the report. He stressed that although it was regrettable that the cost of the project had increased it was important to note that this was a very exciting community project with high levels of resident engagement which would deliver very positive benefits.

Cllr Fooks addressed the Board on this item.

In response to a question around the use of £700,000 Section 106 affordable homes contribution to finance the tower blocks additional expenditure the Head of Finance advised that:

The Council held in excess of £700,000 Section 106 contributions that were required to be used for the financing of affordable homes, which it had not currently allocated to fund capital expenditure. These monies could be used to fund the New Build Programme currently included in the HRA Business Plan and HRA revenue resources currently used to fund the New Build Programme could be switched to fund the tower block expenditure.

The City Executive Board resolved to:

1. RECOMMEND that full Council approve an additional budgetary provision within the HRA Capital Programme of £1.750m, funded as detailed at paragraph 19, so that the revised total project budget envelope for the Tower Block Refurbishment Scheme is £20.108m:
2. RECONFIRM the authority delegated to the Executive Director, previously City Regeneration now Regeneration and Housing in consultation with the s151 Officer and the Monitoring Officer, to appoint and award the contract to the preferred principal contractor in accordance with the competitive tender process undertaken.

23. BLACKBIRD LEYS DISTRICT CENTRE REGENERATION

The Executive Director for Housing and Regeneration submitted a report (previously circulated, now appended) which sought approval to procure a development partner for the regeneration of Blackbird Leys District Centre.

Cllr Seamons, Executive Board Member for Housing presented the report. He said that this was an extensive plan for change that was affordable and deliverable and would lead to significant benefits for Blackbird Leys District Centre.

The Board thanked the Partnership and Regeneration Manager for her hard work and commitment to the success of this important project.

The City Executive Board resolved to:

1. NOTE the contents of the report.
2. COMMISSION officers to undertake an OJEU compliant marketing process to seek a joint venture partner for redevelopment and regeneration.
3. DELEGATE to the Director of Regeneration and Housing the authority to prepare and issue draft Heads of Terms to accompany the Invitation to Tender.
4. GRANT project approval for the Blackbird Leys delivery project as set out in this report, based on Option B.

5. APPROVE expenditure of up to £300,000 to be funded from the HRA capital programme in order to procure and, subject to future CEB approval, make the appointment of the development partner.

24. ITEMS RAISED BY BOARD MEMBERS

No items were raised by Board Members.

25. MINUTES

The Board resolved to APPROVE the minutes of the meetings held on 14 May and 26 May 2015 as a true and accurate record.

26. MATTERS EXEMPT FROM PUBLICATION

The City Executive Board resolved to exclude the press and public from the meeting during consideration of the item in the exempt from publication part of the agenda in accordance with the provisions in Paragraph 21(1)(b) of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (England) Regulations 2000 on the grounds that their presence could involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as described in specific paragraphs of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 and that, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information.

27. NOT FOR PUBLICATION - APPENDICES - TOWER BLOCKS REFURBISHMENT PROJECT

The Board received and noted the contents of the confidential appendices to the report at minute 22.

28. NOT FOR PUBLICATION - APPENDIX 6 - BLACKBIRD LEYS DISTRICT CENTRE REGENERATION

The Board received and noted the contents of the confidential appendix to the report at minute 23.

29. CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES 26/05/15

The Board resolved to APPROVE the confidential minutes of the meetings held on 14 May and 26 May 2015 as a true and accurate record.

The meeting started at 5.00 pm and ended at 6.25 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

Questions submitted by Mr Nigel Gibson – answers supplied in writing shown *in blue italics*.

I would like the following questions answered at the Oxford City Council City Executive Board meeting on Thursday 11th June 2015.

Agenda Item 7, PSPO.

From the accompanying report:

1. Para 10: who are the “designated council officers” who would enforce the PSPO?*Community Response Team Officers.*
2. Para 10: what are the “delegated organisations” whose employees would enforce the PSPO?*The City Centre Ambassadors.*
3. Para 10: how will the council pay the delegated organisations for enforcement?*They are currently contracted to provide services in the city centre.*
4. Para 14: what were the names of the members of the Member Reference Group?*All Ward councillors within the PSPO area, the Board Member for Crime and Community Safety.*
5. Para 18: the map website reference is incorrect – can you please provide the correct one, that shows the precise map being shown in the document, including the marked boundary?*This is contained in the CEB report.*
6. Para 18: Alternatively, can you provide it as a downloadable document as part of the minutes of this meeting?
Yes
7. Para 20: What are you trying to imply by drawing out the difference in comments received up to and after an online petition gained publicity?
26 March 2015 was the Member Reference Group meeting where the results were presented, the 31 March 2015 was the closing date for consultation.
8. Para 20 and Appendix Two: Only 2% of the overall respondents to the eConsult survey were from outside Oxford, despite the widespread national publicity. Why have you not referenced the topography specifically in your report, preferring instead to highlight the timing of responses?
This is explained in the report.
9. Para 20: Can you please summarise which recommendations for inclusion in the PSPO were reversed as a result of consultation up to 26th March, and which were reversed as a result of the responses up to 31st March?
As explained in the report, Members came to the view during the period of the consultation up to March 26th that there were more effective ways of dealing with the pigeon problem; discussions on the application of the proposed Order in respect of the group of people who continue to sleep on the street despite having appropriate accommodation continued for a long time after the end of the consultation period.
10. Para 40: What do you anticipate the cost of each element of the order (1 a-l, Draft PSPO) to be by financial year, assuming the PSPO is approved at this CEB and enforced for 3 years?*Signage – less than £1k; cost of enforcement will be small due to an expected high compliance rate.*
11. Appendix One, Para 1 d: Can you please correct the typo in this paragraph?
Yes, the full Order will remove the second “shall”.
12. Appendix Six: What was the response rate to each of the Consultation methods?
The consultation was the on-line survey, with the communication methods listed used to increase responses. Some letters, emails and twitter responses were submitted.

13. Appendix Six: What was the cost of each of the Consultation methods?
Approx. £1k.
14. Appendix Six: What were your measures of success for each of the Consultation Methods?*As detailed in the report.*

Agenda Item 8, Covered Market Leasing Strategy

15. Para 2: how were The Retail Group appointed?
The Retail Group were appointed in January 2013, following a tender process for the work which was in accordance with the procurement procedures at that time.
16. What is the total value of fees paid to The Retail Group?
Total to date £118,117.

Agenda Item 9, Blue Bin Premier League

17. There is an implicit assumption that increasing recycling is a key performance indicator. Surely the KPIs should be
 - a. increase in recycling AND corresponding reduction in household waste?
 - b. decrease in total waste per household?*Oxford City Council report to national indicator NI191. The amount of residual waste per household and NI192 the percentage of household waste that is sent for reuse, recycling or composting.*
18. How is the Council supporting and incentivising overall waste reduction, rather than simply increasing recycling?
This is part of on-going campaigns such as Love Food Hate Waste.
19. What are the areas covered by the Scheme?
The scheme covers all domestic properties across the city.
20. How do you measure recycling rates?
Weight data is gathered from all residual and recycling collection rounds. From this data we are able to determine recycling rates using a nationally recognised formula.
21. How will you reward households that rarely if ever put out general household waste?
Residents in each winning area are required to 'opt in' to the scheme and, will be rewarded if their name is drawn. We are unable to identify specific properties that have little general household waste.
22. How will you award the individual prizes?
There will be a monthly community prize of £400 to be awarded to the charity/scheme that has the most nominations. Prizes of £30 in vouchers for local businesses will be awarded to two residents who have 'opted in' and whose names have been drawn. We will publicise winners each month.
23. Will all the promotional items be easily recyclable, and if not, why not?
Promotional items will be printed upon 100% recycled paper that also is FSC approved and can be recycled. We will also make use of internet and other electronic media.
24. Will the Council lead by example and publish the recycling rates of each of its offices/departments?
This was not part of the original bid. The scheme is aimed at domestic properties.
25. Will the CEB lead by example and publish the recycling rates of CEB members?
The Council does not collect data about recycling from individual properties.
26. Will the Council lead by example and encourage councillors to publish their own recycling rates?
The Council does not collect data about recycling from individual properties.

Agenda Item 10, ICT Strategy

27. You state that the internet will be the primary channel for publishing information to citizens; how will you ensure equivalent information distribution to the significant number of people, particularly over 50, who do not or infrequently use the internet?

The Council will continue to utilise all of the same channels as a currently to convey information to residents.

28. You have previously refused to make public a list of Freedom of Information requests on the basis that the cost of storage would be “too high”; what provision are you making in this strategy to ensure this serious public access shortcoming is addressed?

The Council will utilise the website to publish as much information about the Council’s business as practical.

29. Which council offices now offer continuous access to free public wifi, and how do you make the public is aware of the facility in each area?

A full list of free wifi hotspots is provided on the council website -

<http://www.oxford.gov.uk/PageRender/decB/WirelessHotspots.htm>

30. Para 6.1 Staffing: can you please provide a proper Organisation Chart, identifying senior management (starting with the Chief Executive), and showing individual roles at the lower levels?

The council structure is already published in the council website at -

http://www.oxford.gov.uk/PageRender/decCD/Management_Structure_occw.htm

31. Para 6.1 Staffing: how many Business Partners are there (and for which areas), and who are their individual points of contact within the ICT organisation?

There are 5 Business Partners who are aligned with up to three service areas each dependant on the size and complexity of the area. Their main point of contact is the Head of Service.

32. Para 6.1.1 Vision: how many staff currently have ITIL certification?

Four

33. Para 6.1.1 Vision: can you please define an “incremental” change?

A small change to an existing system typical requiring less than 3 days of resource.

34. Why are you no longer partnering with the County Council?

The current partnership agreement has come to its natural end after 7 years.

35. You make no mention of joining a Shared Service as part of the strategy – there are many local authorities developing and operating highly successful Shared ICT Services, even where they are not geographically contiguous – have you looked at this as an option – if so, why is this not being considered as an option, and if not, why not?

Shared services are referenced in section 4.4 of the Strategy.

Agenda Item 11, HMO Licensing Scheme

36. Para 24: what HMO licensing schemes have you looked at in other Local Authorities as input to this scheme’s revision?

The Council has looked at similar schemes in the London Borough of Newham, Nottingham, Bath, and Cambridge.

37. Para 24: what aspects of the HMO licensing scheme do you consider to be “world class”, and what are you using as your benchmark city for such as an aspiration?

The context of “world class” relates to the aspiration for Oxford City as a whole and not the HMO Licensing Scheme solely. The Council’s aspiration is for Oxford to be a world class City for everyone and as such it has developed a range of priorities, of which meeting housing needs in a fully satisfactory way is a key element.

38. Is the intention (or simply consequence) of this scheme to increase income for the Council?*No. The Scheme is self financing and is cost neutral, so it does not create any additional income for the Council. The costs associated with scheme are covered by income which means that there is no financial burden placed upon the Council's budgets.*
39. Is the intention of this scheme to increase or decrease HMOs in Oxford?
Neither. HMO Licensing impacts on the quality not the quantity of HMOs. The Scheme is intended to improve living conditions and drive up standards of management to ensure that conditions within HMOs meet minimum statutory standards and are maintained.
40. How will introducing this scheme address the housing shortage?
The purpose of the scheme is not to increase housing provision but to ensure that accommodation used as HMOs complies with the statutory requirements.
41. How many HMOs are there in Oxford?
In 2005 there were estimated to be approximately 5,000 HMOs in Oxford. Census information for 2011 suggests that this is now around 6,900.
42. How many households in total are in HMOs in Oxford?
The number of households in HMOs varies considerably because of the transient nature of some of the occupants living in this type of accommodation. A household can also consist of an individual, or couples and couples with children or other relatives. It is therefore extremely difficult to predict. There is the potential for there to be between 20,000 to 30,000 households living in HMOs in Oxford.

Agenda Item 12, Housing Asset Management Strategy

43. Para 2.3: you summarise the housing need, including the number on the housing register by month for 2013/14. Can you please provide a breakdown of the housing register total by band, bearing in mind that the council has been forced to admit previously that those in the lowest band will never be automatically offered housing?
As at 1/6/15 Band 1 43, band 2 244, band 3 799 band 4 164 band 5 1913.
44. Para 2.4: what is your forecast increase in uptake of the Right to Buy given the new provisions being put in place by the Government?
If the question is referring to the previous coalition Government's Re-Invigorating RTB and One for One Replacement initiative for local authority landlords, introduced on 2 April 2012, then the authority has estimated 40 RTB disposals each year for the first 10 years of the HRA Business Plan, starting in 2012/13, as a result of these changes.
45. Para 2.4: do you guarantee to build replacement housing stock before each sale under the Right to Buy scheme?
The One for One replacement scheme that the Council has signed up to participate in requires local authority landlords to replace "additional" RTB disposals to that stated in Oxford City Council's self-financing valuation calculation, within 3 years of disposal. The Council as such is committed to complying with these rules and fully intends to replace the lost RTB "additional" stock within the timeframe allowed.
46. There are various places throughout the document where blank space appears to be in place of what seems to be significant words (including at least para 5.2 first sentence, para 1.3 whole section, page i top bullet at bottom of page) – can you please provide the missing text/graphics?
There is no missing text or graphics.

Agenda Item 13, Tower Blocks Refurbishment

47. Who are the external consultants?
EC Harris with support from Architects BM3 and Civil and Service Engineers Roultons.
48. At what point during the extensive procurement process did it become clear that the project was underfunded?
Initially upon opening the tenders and then later as the tenders were clarified with the contractors as part of the evaluation process.
49. Can you please provide more information about who exactly identified that the project was under budget?
The Council Officers leading the procurement process i.e. Procurement team lead and internal project manager together with the Councils external project managers.
50. Who carried out the initial estimate of £18.358m, which seems very precise for a competitive fixed price bid?
EC Harris .
51. Can you confirm what is not explicit in your report, that 5 firms were issued with the ITT, no further down-select was undertaken, resulting directly in a preferred supplier?
All five shortlisted contractors were invited to tender to give confidence to the tender process in the event contractors did not submit a proposal.
52. Why were you unable to select 3 firms at sift stage? All five contractors were competent to deliver the works at that stage of assessment.
53. You reference “Appendix A” as withheld from publication, but give no more information about it – what was it concerning?
Appendix 1 is an internal Council report which contains commercially sensitive information, namely tender analysis and costs which cannot be released until a contractor has been appointed; release of this information would jeopardise the tender process.
54. Appendix 2 – why is a “Technical Report” considered so commercially sensitive that you are unable to publish any part of it?
See answer to question 53
55. If Appendix 2 is so commercially sensitive that you are unable to publish any part of it, why have you referenced some detail from it in para 15 of your report (specifically p17, item 3.1.8)?
To facilitate members in their consideration of this matter.
56. Why are you unable to issue Appendix 1 in any form, even if it contained redacted items?
See answer to question 53.

Agenda Item 14, Blackbird Leys District Centre Regeneration

57. Can you confirm that as part of the Princes Foundation engagement, there was consideration given to additional housing on what is still part of the Blackbird Leys green space north of the new swimming pool?
The Princes Foundation gave consideration to a single line of houses backing onto the college site, on the eastern edge of the green space. That is not part of the proposals in this report.
58. Why are you proposing the use of an “OJEU negotiated route” rather than the use of an appropriate framework for appointing your development partner?
To ensure value for money through full market exposure and flexibility to suit the uniqueness of the scheme.
59. Can you confirm that the complete OJEU procurement covers June 2015-March 2016, not June-September 2015 as indicated in your table in para 42?
Dates in the report are indicative only. Work on the OJEU process will take place June-September. The full procurement exercise is estimated to run to March 2016.

60. What do you estimate the cost of programme delivery for this project to be (how much of the HCP of £200kpa will you need)?
The exact amount depends on the outcome of tender exercises for consultancy support and recruitment to backfill a post to release a Project Manager.
61. Where is the £300k for this procurement coming from (the £10.6m or the HCP budget, or separate)?
The HRA Capital programme.
62. How much are you expecting your new development partner to be investing?
That will depend on the final commercial structure following the OJEU exercise.
63. How will the development partner gain a return from their investment?
By way of development profit margins and /or revenue income.
64. What is the expected return on the Council's £10.6m investment?
This is a capital project. The return is in the form of assets, some of which may be income producing. Refer to the CEB report Para.28.
65. Para 32 references a "long term stewardship plan" to be drawn up and implemented by the Development Partner – how will this be funded, and who will be responsible for it?
This question cannot be answered until the plan is actually drawn up.
66. Why is Blackbird Leys being prioritised for this scheme over other areas of the city?
The Council is investing widely, in many areas right across the city –please see the Corporate Plan for details (available on the City Council website). Blackbird Leys is the largest of the regeneration areas with a population of c. 13,000 and therefore the scheme will have benefits for a large number of residents making efficient use of resources.
67. Blackbird Leys is clearly an area of deprivation, as are other areas of Oxford; how far up the deprivation scale do you aspire to move this area through this scheme, and which areas will be seen as more deprived than Blackbird Leys after the project is complete?
The position on scale of the Indices of Multiple Deprivation depends on what happens in all areas across the Country so the question cannot be answered definitively. The district centre scheme will provide significant benefits to the community at Blackbird Leys. It not considered that there will be any disbenefits to other areas.
68. Given the housing shortage, why are you only considering 190 dwellings as part of this scheme?
The scheme is mixed use. When community facilities are factored in, spatial analysis shows that the available Council land can accommodate 190 units or more in 5-6 storey buildings which is considered appropriate for the district centre. More housing can be accommodated on other landowners sites as these come forward.
69. What will the housing density be of the area once all building is complete?
This will depend on the outcome of the masterplan that it going to be drawn up.