

# MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL

Monday 20 July 2015

www.oxford.gov.uk



**COUNCILLORS PRESENT:** Councillors Humberstone (Lord Mayor), Cook (Deputy Lord Mayor), Malik (Sheriff), Abbasi, Altaf-Khan, Anwar, Benjamin, Brandt, Brown, Clack, Clarkson, Coulter, Darke, Fooks, Gant, Gotch, Haines, Hayes, Henwood, Hollick, Hollingsworth, Kennedy, Lloyd-Shogbesan, Lygo, Munkonge, Paule, Rowley, Royce, Sanders, Seamons, Simm, Simmons, Sinclair, Tanner, Tarver, Taylor, Thomas, Turner, Upton, Van Nooijen, Wade, Wilkinson and Wolff.

## 10. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors Fry, Goddard, Pressel, Price, and Smith submitted apologies. Councillors Wade and Wilkinson submitted apologies for lateness and arrived during the first part of the meeting. Councillor Hayes arrived during Minute 31.

## 11. MINUTES

Council agreed to approve the minutes of the ordinary meeting held on 18 May 2015 as a true and correct record.

## 12. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

There were no declarations.

## 13. APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEES

Council agreed to appoint with immediate effect:

- Licensing and Gambling Acts Committee - Councillor Altaf Khan to replace Councillor Goddard
- Scrutiny Committee - Councillor Gant to replace Councillor Altaf Khan.

## 14. ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Lord Mayor informed Council of his visit to the city's twin town of Bonn; and his attendance at the granting of the Freedom of the City to the Rifles. He informed Council of his attendance at the celebration of the centenary of Flying Officer Johnny Smythe, and gave a brief biography.

The Sheriff informed Council of the successful inspection of Port Meadow and a recent Aunt Sally match.

## **15. PUBLIC ADDRESSES AND QUESTIONS THAT RELATE TO MATTERS FOR DECISION AT THIS MEETING**

Mark Lodge, Director, International Network for Cancer Treatment and Research addressed Council in support of Minute 31 Motion 3. The text of his address is attached in the supplement to the agenda.

John Semple addressed Council in opposition to the recommendations in Minute 20. The text of his address is attached in the supplement to the agenda.

The Lord Mayor thanked both speakers.

## **16. HOUSING STRATEGY 2015-2018**

Council had before it a report setting out the proposed Housing Strategy and Action Plan 2015-2018 and the recommendations of the City Executive Board meeting on 14 May 2015.

Councillor Seamons moved the recommendation with three amendments to the strategy set out below to correct typographical errors, remove a statement, and remove a completed action.

**Council resolved to adopt the Housing Strategy and Action Plan 2015-2018 as set out in the report with the following changes:**

- 1. Figure 1.1 – dates on the inner circle of the diagram to read 2015-2018;**
- 2. Section 4.3.3 – delete sentence ‘~~However access to family homes may be improved by the introduction of such tenancies in the case of 3 and 4 bedroom homes.~~’**
- 3. Summary of actions and objectives – Priority 4 remove action ‘~~Improve the environments where people live~~’.**

## **17. HOUSING ASSET MANAGEMENT STRATEGY**

Council had before it a report setting out the proposed Housing Asset Management Strategy and associated action plan for Oxford City Council’s housing stock and the recommendations of the City Executive Board meeting on 11 June 2015.

**Council resolved to adopt the Housing Asset Management Strategy along with the Oxford Standard as part of the Council’s policy framework.**

## **18. TENDER FOR WASTE COLLECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT SERVICES**

Council had before it a report which sought approval to tender for commercial waste collections and environmental improvement services to a public body and the recommendations of the City Executive Board meeting on 27 April.

**Council resolved to approve a capital supplementary estimate of £55,000 for a compactor and bins to support delivery of the contract.**

## **19. TOWER BLOCKS REFURBISHMENT PROJECT**

Council had before it a report setting out proposals to increase the project budget for the Tower Block Refurbishment Scheme and the recommendations of the City Executive Board meeting on 12 June.

Councillor Seamons, Councillor Turner and the Chief Executive answered questions about the need for the additional provision.

**Council resolved to approve an additional budgetary provision within the HRA Capital Programme of £1.750m, funded as detailed at paragraph 19 of the report, so that the revised total project budget envelope for the Tower Block Refurbishment Scheme is £20.108m.**

## **20. NORTHERN GATEWAY AREA ACTION PLAN: INSPECTOR'S REPORT**

Council had before it a report setting out the conclusions of the Inspector's Report on the examination into the Northern Gateway Area Action Plan and proposing adoption of the plan.

Councillor Hollingsworth thanked officers, in particular Rachel Williams, for their hard work in preparing this plan and moved the recommendations.

**Council resolved to:**

- 1. note the conclusions of the Inspector's Report on the examination into the Northern Gateway Area Action Plan;**
- 2. adopt the Northern Gateway Area Action Plan as part of Oxford's Local Plan; and**
- 3. endorse the Northern Gateway Area Action Plan's associated documents as part of the Northern Gateway Area Action Plan adoption (including the Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment Adoption Statement and Equalities Impact Assessment).**

## **21. SAFEGUARDING REPORT 2014-2015**

Council had before it a report setting out progress made on Oxford City Council's Section 11 (Children Act of 2004) Self-Assessment Action Plan 2014-15 and the relevant minute of the City Executive Board.

**Council resolved to:**

- 1. note the progress and development of the Council's safeguarding function in 2014-15; and**
- 2. note the Oxford City Council Safeguarding Action Plan 2015-16 as set out in Appendix 1.**

## **22. EMPLOYMENT POLICIES - DATA MONITORING AND RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION**

Council had before it a report setting out one new and one revised employment policy for approval.

**Council resolved to:**

- 1. approve the following policies appended to the report with immediate effect:**
  - Employee Data Monitoring Policy including current list of monitoring tools**
  - Recruitment and Selection Policy; and**
- 2. authorise the Corporate Lead (HR Policy & Organisational Development) to amend the policies and procedures from time to time in order to correct any factual or legal errors.**

## **23. NEW PROCEDURES FOR THE DISMISSAL OF STATUTORY OFFICERS**

Council had before it a report recommending changes to the Council's Constitution relating to changes to arrangements for the dismissal of statutory officers following new statutory provisions set out in the Local Authorities (Standing Orders)(England)(Amendment) Regulations ("the Regulations") which came into effect on 11 May 2015.

**Council resolved to:**

- 1. agree to amend the Terms of Reference of the Disciplinary Committee for chief executive, directors and heads of service as set out in the report;**

- 2. agree that the Council's appointed Independent Persons be invited to advise the Disciplinary Committee whenever there is the prospect of dismissal of a statutory officer;**
- 3. agree the proposed amendments to the Employment Rules in Part 20 of the Constitution; and**
- 4. delegate authority to the Head of Law and Governance to make any consequential amendments that are required to be made to the Constitution to fully implement the requirements of the Regulations.**

#### **24. ARRANGEMENTS FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION AGAINST STATUTORY OFFICERS**

Council had before it a report recommending that the contractual arrangements for disciplinary action against the statutory officers are not changed by the new statutory provisions set out in the Local Authorities (Standing Orders)(England)(Amendment) Regulations ("the Regulations") which came into effect on 11 May 2015.

**Council resolved to:**

- 1. agree that contractual arrangements are made in respect of an Independent Person to investigate any allegations of a disciplinary nature against the Statutory Officers; and**
- 2. delegate authority to the Head of Law and Governance to make the necessary amendments to the Constitution.**

#### **25. FEES AND CHARGES FOR ROSE HILL COMMUNITY CENTRE**

The Lord Mayor stated that he certified this item to be considered as urgent business at this meeting under the provisions of S100 (B) of the Local Government Act 1972 because this decision must be taken before bookings can be made to allow the new community centre to be used from its opening.

Council had before it a report, submitted as urgent business in accordance with S100B (4) (b) Local Government Act 1972 (as inserted by the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985), recommending Council to agree the process for setting the fees and charges for Rose Hill Community Centre.

**Council resolved to delegate the setting of fees and charges for Rose Hill Community Centre to the Executive Director of Community Services in consultation with the Executive Member for Communities.**

## **26. CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD MINUTES**

Council had before it the minutes of six City Executive Board meetings.

On Minute 167, Councillor Fooks asked when the review of the grants process would be complete. Councillor Rowley replied that while no formal resolution was made a review of the effectiveness of this year's grants would take place before the next round of awards.

On Minute 15, Councillor Fooks asked when the Head of Community Services would be able to respond. Councillor Rowley replied this would be in due course.

On Minute 38, Councillor Fooks asked whether tenant satisfaction should have been discussed, and how the risk of non-recruitment of key staff was mitigated. Councillor Turner referred to that minute, and to the motion on key worker housing to be debated later.

On Minute 41, Councillor Gant asked the Board member to comment on North Oxfordshire Association's wish to remain in their building and confirm discussions were on-going. Councillor Hollingsworth responded that final decisions depended on a number of factors and had not been taken.

## **27. QUESTIONS ON NOTICE FROM MEMBERS OF COUNCIL**

Questions were asked of the Board members and Deputy Leader and responses given in writing and at the meeting.

### **Board Member for Customer Services and Corporate Services**

#### **1. From Councillor Fooks to Councillor Brown**

As the performance of the Council lies very largely in the hands of its staff, whose wellbeing is thus of great importance, can you assure Council that the working conditions in St Aldate's chambers are as good as they should be?

#### **Written Response:**

Councillor Fooks will be aware that St Aldates Chambers underwent a significant modernisation programme four years ago which radically improved the working environment. This has allowed for more modern working practices including hot-desking and home working but also increased the number and quality of toilets and kitchen facilities. More recently security arrangements have been improved. All staff, including the chief executive and directors, benefit from working in an open plan office with access to shared meeting rooms.

In the recent hot weather staff have benefitted from the passive ventilation system (a greener and less expensive alternative to air conditioning), and the chilled water on tap in every kitchen.

The Facilities Management Helpdesk enables staff to log any concerns with the environment or facilities on a day to day basis, and an office champions' group made up of at least one member of staff from each service area meets quarterly to address feedback and any concerns such as storage, health and safety,

maintenance and housekeeping. Actions are logged and progress reported back to staff.

64% of staff scored the office environment as "Excellent" or "Good" in the latest survey in May 2015, a further 25% said it was "Satisfactory".

The City Council has a comprehensive Wellbeing Programme in place for all staff which includes: an employee assistance scheme offering help and advice covering a range of topics; discounted membership for various leisure facilities; health and wellbeing practice groups and workshops and free health checks.

## **2. From Councillor Fooks to Councillor Brown**

The Council has rightly been promoting exercise to help staff be healthy. Do you think that this has been furthered by the decision to increase the cost to staff of a Slice card from £37 a year to £30 a month?

### **Written Response:**

Councillor Fooks is wrong in every detail in her question. There has been no change to the cost of the slice card in 2015/16. The Medium Term Financial Plan agreed by Council in February included a proposal to increase the cost to £20 per month from April 2016 to bring the subsidy in line with the cost to staff of utilising facilities negotiated with LA Fitness in the City Centre. The proposal will be reviewed in the autumn as part of the Council's medium term financial plan refresh process.

The slice card is just one of a number of measures the Council has put in place to promote health and wellbeing.

### **Supplementary question:**

When will a decision be made?

### **Response:**

Later in the year.

## **Board member for Climate Change and Cleaner, Greener Oxford**

### **3. From Councillor Fooks to Councillor Tanner**

How long has the City Council been aware of the imminent financial challenges relating to the funding of recycling, with the current providers, whose contract is up for renewal in October, proposing to charge the City, rather than pay it, for each tonne of materials recycled?

### **Written Response:**

Our existing contractual arrangements allowed the contract to be extended by mutual agreement for a further 3 years. Discussions began with the current contractor in January of 2015 about extending the contract however this was against a backdrop of falling market prices for the recycling material we collect. By March 2015, it was evident that our contractor wished to charge us a substantial per tonne gate fee to handle our material. The size of the fee prompted Officer's to consider alternatives, one of which was to go out to tender for a new contract.

An Invitation to Tender (ITT) has been prepared and will be published on 20th July 2015, with contractor submission required by 2nd September 2015. The

award date, after the “standstill” period, is 2nd October 2015 with a commencement date of 6th October 2015.

**Supplementary question:**

Will councillors be informed about progress?

**Response:**

Yes, and also about plans to reduce costs.

**4. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Tanner**

I understand that you have authorised the issuance of a Section 46 notice (under the 1990 Environmental Protection Act) to residents in HRA flats who are not correctly recycling. Those that persist will be given a Fixed Penalty Notice. Do you think that this response is fair and proportionate?

**Written Response:**

Our education and enforcement procedure applies to all households that do not comply with the waste collection service we provide, as stated in Section 46 of the 1990 EPA.

The procedure starts with our Collection Crews applying a reminder sticker and reporting the issue via their in-cab technology. This automatically produces an educational letter. A second occurrence receives a re-sticker and an in-cab report that stimulates a Field Officer educational visit. A third non-compliance is stickered again and activates an Enforcement Officer investigation with the potential of a S46 being served. Breaches of this notice can result in the issuing of a Fixed Penalty Notice.

The procedure is applied to all privately managed flat sites, HMO's, individual private residencies as well to all properties within the Council's ownership.

**Board member for Crime, Community Safety and Licensing**

**5. From Councillor Thomas to Councillor Sinclair**

How many hours of officers' time and at what cost (direct wages) were spent on the City Centre PSPO project prior to the PSPO paper being pulled from CEB on 11th June 2015?

**Written Response:**

The development of the PSPO proposal was absorbed into Officer's day to day activities and no such calculation exists. The report was only deferred, not withdraw, and will return to CEB. Therefore any time spent on preparation has not been wasted or aborted time.

**Supplementary question:**

Would you consider asking officers to track time and cost on this and similar projects?

**Response:**

No.

## **6. From Councillor Thomas to Councillor Sinclair**

Will the Council be issuing a formal response to Liberty's critique of the City Centre PSPO and commenting on its threat to start legal proceedings against the Council had CEB voted in favour of the PSPO on 11th June 2015?

### **Written Response:**

No. It was merely an opinion. Legal Officers time will be better spent on addressing any valid criticisms within the body of the CEB report, rather than issuing a counter opinion.

### **Supplementary question:**

Councillors would like to understand our response to this challenge: will we able to do this?

### **Response:**

The scrutiny committee working group will be able to examine these documents.

## **Board member for Culture and Communities**

## **7. From Councillor Wolff to Councillor Simm**

Will the Portfolio Holder agree to rescind the notice issued to the East Oxford Community Association to quit the Community Centre given that the new management committee have met all the Council's requirements?

### **Written Response:**

The Notice to Quit to East Oxford Community Association will not be rescinded as it is not apparent that all the requirements have been met. I am not going to provide detail of this in a public forum.

Instead efforts will be focused on supporting the Reference Group which the Council has established to support a positive future for the Centre and for the people that it should serve.

The Reference Group includes representatives from the Community Association, the current users of the Community Centre, local Councillors, tenants of the Community Centre, the Chinese Community Centre, the Games Hall and the local Residents Association. Its work is supported by City Council officers and Oxfordshire Community and Voluntary Action.

The purpose of the Reference Group is to facilitate the process of identifying the needs and aspirations of the local community to inform the development of the Centre, including design, and to support the process of consultation with that community. It is an opportunity for reflection and forward planning.

I am confident that by engaging with the wide range of opinions, interests, activities and talent the future of the Community Centre will be both supported and enhanced.

In the immediate future, the Council will support the continued use of the Centre for all its current activities, and will welcome new suggestions, proposals and initiatives. This process is already underway. By working together we can achieve a thriving Centre meeting the needs if the community it serves.

**Supplementary question:**

Will there be an opportunity for the centre to return to local management once conditions are met, and will you commit to this?

**Response:**

There will be once we are confident we have a management team who can run a large community centre but we will not commit to this. Management by the council does not stop activities and staff will be transferred to the council.

**Board member for Housing****8. From Councillor Hollick to Councillor Seamons**

The council is already missing its targets on keeping down the number of people sleeping rough before the effect of County Council cuts has started to be felt. What urgent action will the board member take to prevent people having to sleep rough?

**Written Response:**

Although rough sleeping numbers continue to be high in the city, our last four street counts show a downward trend (Sep 2014 counted 31; Nov 2014 counted 26; Feb counted 20; May 2015 counted 18). This is evidence of the good work that is done by services and in particular the outreach team that is funded by Oxford City Council. The outreach service was restructured following re-commissioning and the new service has been in place since 1st April 2015. We commissioned emergency provision – The ‘sit-up service’ – in O’Hanlon House in July 2014, providing 10 additional spaces for rough sleepers to come off the streets. This will remain in place initially until 31st March 2016, when it will be reviewed.

The adult homeless pathway is currently in live tender. This is led by the County Council and the City has had limited input into the development of the service specification, but will be involved in tender evaluation. In the meantime we will continue contingency planning work using the available resource and are currently modelling options.

**Supplementary question:**

Are we trying to understand the needs of rough sleepers and the pressures on young people?

**Response:**

Yes, and we will bring proposals to the Executive Board in due course.

**9. From Councillor Hollick to Councillor Seamons**

The HMO registration targets were missed this year, despite the target representing only half the number of HMOs in the city, and the compliance rates with license conditions is very low. What is the board member doing to address this poor performance?

**Written Response:**

The target for the number of licensed HMOs was only missed because of processing issues brought about because of delays due to legal requirements and steps have been taken to reduce the backlog that built up in the system. Compliance with licence conditions and the requirement to obtain a licence is the responsibility of landlords and it is their poor performance that the Council has been challenging, with 33 successful legal cases taken in the last 12 months resulting in fines of £110,000.

The HMO Licensing Review has highlighted the significant improvements made by regulating a sector that nationally has high levels of non-compliance and the review recognises that further work is required, which is why we are currently consulting on renewing the scheme for a further 5 years to enable the Council to continue the solid progress it has made so far.

**Supplementary question:**

Are there plans to improve enforcement of the scheme's conditions?

**Response:**

Yes, this is why we are seeking a renewal of the licensing scheme.

**10. From Councillor Hollick to Councillor Seamons**

Can the board member explain why we are yet again failing to meet our target for delivery of affordable housing? Could they explain what use, if any, has been made of compulsory purchase powers to make up for the failure of the private sector to deliver affordable housing?

**Written Response:**

There has been some slippage in the Council's development programme which has resulted in a number of units not being delivered at the end of March 2015. The 14/15 delivery targets were therefore not met, but these units will be handed over by September, and will result in the 15/16 affordable housing delivery targets being exceeded, as they are now falling into that financial year.

The Council has not yet used compulsory purchase powers to help in the delivery of affordable housing, but could consider this, for certain sites, as an option, if and when appropriate. In such instances, the City Executive Board would be required to approve this.

**Supplementary question:**

Will there be more resources put into measures such as compulsory purchases?

**Response:**

This is a difficult and expensive process: we are prioritising other less onerous ways of increasing housing stock.

**11. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Seamons**

The recent budget increased the tax relief offered to those who rent out spare rooms in their homes. Given that this continues to present one of the lowest cost options for those seeking full or part-time accommodation in Oxford, what is the Portfolio Holder doing to encourage home-owners with spare rooms to offer them for rent?

**Written Response:**

The Council provides a clear strategic commitment to consider private sector and 'renting rooms' as a housing solution. This is identified in the Homelessness Strategy 2013-17. This strategy includes a priority of: 'Preventing and Responding to Homelessness'. Actions to meet this priority are: 'Increase access to private rented sector homes'.

The Council also undertook a marketing campaign in October 2013 to boost the private rental sector as part of the solution to finding a suitable home for people in housing need. The campaign included publicity in the newspapers, websites, Social Media, bus shelters, schools etc. As a result, some family accommodation was made available rather than individual 'rent a room' opportunities.

We are keen to pursue all options to maximise housing opportunities, so following receipt of this question, officers have added additional and up to date information on this scheme to the Housing pages on the Council's website, with links to Government and Shelter websites for more advice and information.

**Supplementary question:**

Thank you for arranging updates to the website. Could this form part of the HMO licensing review?

**Response:**

Consultation on the licensing scheme is underway and comments are welcome. We are not opposed to people letting out their spare rooms, but this is not always the best solution for the lessor or tenant.

**Board member for Leisure, Parks and Sport****12. From Councillor Benjamin to Councillor Rowley**

Following the tragic drowning of 15 year old Mohammed Hussain near Donnington Bridge in 2012, former Green Iffley Wards Councillor David Williams put in several requests to install lifebelts on the Meadow Lane side of the Thames, funded from his ward member grant. Can the Portfolio Holder explain why the offer to fund these lifebelts was lost in the system and, despite reminders, still hasn't been acted upon?

**Written Response:**

The availability of lifebelts is checked on a regular basis, but there is a significant problem of vandalism which results in replacements often being required and gaps therefore occurring in their availability. We will re-assess the current number and placing of lifebelts and will also work with the EA and other partners to review the management of risk from drowning. Sadly, the most recent death occurred in a side channel where life belts would not generally be expected and re-emphasises the need for good provision of swimming lessons and lessons at school covering the hazards presented by the many watercourses around the city.

### **13.From Councillor Benjamin to Councillor Rowley**

The latest tragic drowning of 13 year old Aown Dogar has once again raised awareness of the lack of lifebelts on some stretches of the Thames. Will the Portfolio Holder assure me that the long promised life belts on the Meadow Lane side will be installed as a matter of urgency, and will the portfolio holder also instruct officers to conduct a review of lifebelts along all our waterways to ensure that there are no other gaps in provision?

#### **Written Response:**

The availability of lifebelts is checked on a regular basis, but there is a significant problem of vandalism which results in replacements often being required and gaps therefore occurring in their availability. We will re-assess the current number and placing of lifebelts and will also work with the EA and other partners to review the management of risk from drowning. Sadly, the most recent death occurred in a side channel where life belts would not generally be expected and re-emphasises the need for good provision of swimming lessons and lessons at school covering the hazards presented by the many watercourses around the city.

#### **Supplementary question:**

Will you keep relevant ward councillors informed and use their local knowledge to inform the review?

#### **Response:**

I have asked officers to undertake a thorough review of lifebelt provision and a broader review of how to improve safety around the city's waterways. I welcome contributions to this from councillors, residents and the Environment Agency, and will report to Council in due course.

### **Board member for Planning, Transport and Regulatory Service**

### **14.From Councillor Gotch to Councillor Hollingsworth**

You will hear an address relating to the petition to Council from Rob Whitty of Lower Wolvercote. Will the Portfolio Holder use his best endeavours to ensure that CIL funds are made available to contribute towards the total cost of an effective sound barrier between the A34 and houses in Home Close, Rosamund Rd and Elmthorpe Rd in Lower Wolvercote? Funding is also being sought from the County Council and central government. Section 106 funding should also be attached to any planning consents for the Mill Site and Northern Gateway to protect those sites against A34 noise. Noise levels in Lower Wolvercote from the A34 exceed EEC and UK legal limits.

#### **Written Response:**

I agree that environmental noise is a serious concern and that noise barriers could be worth considering as a means of reducing exposure to some properties, though funding or a power to require them are beyond the City Council's remit. Whilst sympathetic to the request for CIL funding, the principle underlying CIL funding is that it should be used to support development rather than to remedy existing problems like this. As the A34 is part of the national trunk road network

it should be the responsibility of Highways England to fund a barrier, if one is required (although if it is not in their current spending programme, then this could be an uphill task). I doubt that the County Council will be willing to contribute as it isn't responsible for the A34.

We have already identified a number of schemes to be funded from CIL receipts, indeed the cost of the schemes on the CIL list already outweighs the amount of CIL that we have collected or expect to collect. If we were to spend CIL receipts on an A34 sound barrier it would inevitably mean that another scheme elsewhere would miss out on funding. (This proposal isn't on our CIL Regulation 123 list at present)

The decisions on the CIL spending programme are taken, by all Councillors, as part of annual budget setting process.

The CIL regulations do however also specify that 15% of CIL receipts from development in areas without a parish council (such as Wolvercote) have to be spent in accordance with the wishes of the community under the neighbourhood funding element of CIL. If the local community considers the sound barrier to be a key priority, then this project could be a candidate for funding from the 'neighbourhood' CIL pot.

It should be borne in mind that infrastructure projects cannot be funded through both CIL and S106 as this would constitute double charging, so if the City Council did decide to allocate some CIL funds towards the A34 barrier this would preclude us from seeking S106 contributions towards the same project.

In any event the Council can only require planning obligations or impose planning conditions that are necessary to resolve some issue that otherwise makes the development unacceptable. It cannot use them to remedy a pre-existing problem or issue not created by the proposed development. The Council also cannot impose requirements that the developer is unable to comply with.

**Supplementary question:**

Given that a barrier could be funded from S106 money for 2/3 of its length, can this be added to the list of CIL funded projects?

**Response:**

It would be helpful to have more detailed costs and specifications before commenting on this proposal.

**15. From Councillor Brandt to Councillor Hollingsworth**

What attempts were made to try and find a developer to build housing - rather than a hotel - on the site of the Cooper Callas building on Paradise Street?

**Written Response:**

This is a privately owned site, and if a landowner/prospective landowner wishes to develop the site for a hotel or any other uses they will submit the proposal and the City Council will consider any such application on its merits against the policies that apply.

The relevant policies are contained within the West End AAP which identified sites for development (Appendix 2 of the AAP). The Cooper Callas site was identified as being potentially suitable for flats, offices, food and drink uses and/or arts and cultural uses but this is not a site allocation. As such these

identified sites are not restricted to the indicative uses. Other uses may also be suitable.

The AAP seeks to deliver a renaissance of the West End area and to deliver high quality development that matches Oxford's international reputation. An important element of the AAP was for sites to be mixed use which ensure vibrancy area throughout the day and support a wider range of activities. The AAP sought to encourage not just office and residential development but other types of development such as commercial leisure and tourist related development. As such the Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016 site allocation for primarily residential on this site was removed and the AAP brought in more flexibility in potential uses on any site in the West End. The AAP itself was adopted by the Council in 2008.

In terms of policy the West End Area Action Plan (Policy WE26) states that hotels are a suitable use throughout the West End and therefore would be appropriate on the Cooper Callas site in principle (subject to design matters and other policy matters). The Oxford Hotel and Short Stay Accommodation Futures published in 2007 was important evidence to justify the policy approach of encouraging more hotels in the West End. It showed that there was a high demand for hotel rooms in Oxford and strong potential for growth in demand for hotel and short stay accommodation in Oxford. It summarised "the buoyancy of the hotel, hostel and serviced apartment sector and keen commitment of operators and developers to be part of Oxford's future, represent a real opportunity for the sector to make a positive contribution to the development of this world class city."

The AAP also requires sites to be mixed use so we would expect more than one use to be developed on the site.

A planning application for a hotel development has not been received although a public exhibition of potential development has recently been held.

## **16. From Councillor Brandt to Councillor Hollingsworth**

Has the Oxford Association of Hotels and Guest Houses been consulted with, regarding the plan to greatly increase the number of hotel rooms in the city centre?

### **Written Response:**

An increase in hotel bed spaces was agreed in Policy CS32 of the Core Strategy, which was adopted in 2011 after a five year consultation and development process. The Policy CS32 identified the West End as an area where new hotel accommodation will be supported. The West End Area Action Plan (AAP) Policy WE26 and supporting text provides some further direction on new hotel accommodation. Both the Core Strategy and the West End AAP policies are derived from the evidence within The Oxford Hotel and Short Stay Accommodation Futures Study produced in 2007.

The Oxford Association of Hotels and Guest Houses were not consulted specifically on the West End AAP but they were consulted on the Core Strategy at three stages (Issues and Options in June 2006, Further Preferred Options in March 2008 and Proposed Submission in September 2008). The Association did not respond on any occasion.

The consultants of The Oxford Hotel and Short Stay Accommodation Futures Study which informed the West End AAP and the Core Strategy hotel policies,

also directly contacted local hotels and guest houses. Research for the Study included:

- A review of national hotel performance and development trends;
- An audit of the existing supply of hotel and short-stay accommodation and assessment of recent and planned future changes to the city's accommodation supply in terms of closures and planned developments;
- Interviews with managers and owners of hotels and short-stay accommodation in and around the city to assess recent and current performance levels and trends;
- An assessment of factors that could influence future demand for hotel and short stay accommodation, including the impact on demand of planned major development projects;
- The preparation of forecasts for the potential growth in hotel accommodation demand over 5, 10, 15 and 20 year periods;
- Consultations with a sample of hotel developers to assess their interest in developing in Oxford.

The study was supported by Tourism South East whose own documents also informed the study.

**Supplementary question:**

Is it time to review the Oxford Hotel and Short Stay Accommodation Futures Study?

**Response:**

Yes it may be, although this is likely to show a need for a higher not lower number of hotel beds.

**Board member for Young People, Schools and Skills**

**17.From Councillor Fooks to Councillor Kennedy**

The Council allocated £250,000, an increase of £150,000 over the original scheme, to the Equity Loans Scheme in the February 2015 budget to support the employment of senior teachers in city schools. How many loans have been made since the scheme started in July 2013?

**Written Response:**

No loans have been granted to date under the criteria of the original scheme which was focussed on new appointments to 'head and senior leadership' posts. Additional funding to extend the criteria was included as part of the Council's approved budget for 2015/16. The revised Equity Loans Scheme, which is being launched this month, now allows housing assistance to be provided to all existing and newly appointed teachers, in permanent leadership posts, within target schools. Opening up the scheme in this way recognises the importance of having settled staff in these key roles as this in turn, helps to drive educational improvement.

**Supplementary question:**

Would you agree this is a failed initiative and our group's proposal of a fund schools could bid for would have been better?

**Response:**

No, this is a good scheme which will help retain teaching staff, and although it has taken longer to get underway it will be launched very shortly.

**Deputy Leader of the Council, Board Member for Finance, Corporate Asset Management and Public Health****18. From Councillor Fooks to Councillor Turner**

At the April Audit and Governance Committee, the City's internal auditors, PriceWaterhouseCoopers, criticised the management of the Rose Hill Community Centre building project. There were substantial criticisms of the procurement process and the project management which ultimately led to an overspend of almost £500,000 or about 12% of the original budget. It was worrying to read in the June CEB report on the Tower Blocks refurbishment project that again a large increase in budget is being requested. An extra £1.75m was requested to increase the budget to over £20m. Using £700,000 of unallocated S106 affordable housing contributions towards the Council's new build programme to help fund an agreed project, not provide a single extra unit of social housing, seems to be contrary to the aim of increasing housing supply. Are you satisfied that sufficient measures are now in place to ensure that such significant overspends do not become a regular feature of City finance reports?

**Written Response:**

First of all, it would not be right to view this as an "overspend (this would be the case if contract costs had been exceeded), but rather, it is a matter of fact that the Council incorrectly estimated the cost of the new building, not least as the specification in the end agreed upon was higher than that originally proposed. A similar point applies in relation to the Tower Blocks. The report from PWC was instigated by officers as a learning point for future projects. Whilst there were a number of recommendations included within this report these were not viewed as criticisms but areas upon which the council could improve its approach towards project management. Indeed at the time of the increase in costs on the Rose Hill Project the Capital Gateway process had only just commenced and the Gateway itself would not necessarily have led to a different outcome regarding the increased cost on this project which was caused mainly by external factors outside the council's control. The reason for the increased cost on the tower blocks has been well documented in the report to City Exec Board and with regard to the issue of the S106 grant the Head of Finance advised at the June CEB that this was more down to a confusing paragraph in the report, rather than an inappropriate use of S106 monies as is suggested here. The Tower Block report was attempting to say that unallocated section 106 receipts held by the Council for affordable housing would be used to fund such expenditure in the Council's existing capital programme currently funded by capital receipts. The released capital receipts would in turn be used to fund the budget increase in the Tower Block programme. Whilst price variations, especially on contracts of this size cannot be ruled out in future I am satisfied that the embedding of the Capital Gateway process for project management will provide a robust process by which the council can as far as possible budget, procure, identify, mitigate and report

issues and provide overall good governance to capital projects that it undertakes.

**Supplementary question:**

Would you agree the project management was poor and this contributed to the increase in costs?

**Response:**

Neither the auditor's report nor our own review draw that conclusion and the increased costs were a result of improved specification after consulting with residents and partners.

**19. From Councillor Thomas to Councillor Turner –**

What is the Portfolio Holder doing to address the slippage in the Capital Programme which has again occurred despite the introduction of the Gateway Process?

**Written Response:**

The overall slippage on the capital budget was around £12million in comparison to the original budget of £63million. This primarily related to three schemes, Rose Hill Community Centre, Affordable Homes Programme and Vehicles. The average spend on capital over the last 9 years has been around £20million and the delivery of £48.7 million in 2014/15 is significantly above this and represents the largest investment in the city in as many years. The Council will continue to embed and improve its monitoring through the Capital Gateway process which the Council is continually improving. However, the councillor should note that some delays (particularly where external contractors are involved or the conclusion of financial agreements is required) are beyond the Council's control.

**Supplementary question:**

What assurance can you give that there will not be further slippage in the programme?

**Response:**

This is a very ambitious programme and we have processes in place to help us deliver this effectively.

**20. From Councillor David Thomas to Councillor Turner**

Can the portfolio holder explain why the HRA budget of 2013/14 underestimated depreciation by a worrying 50% to the tune of £3m, contributing substantially to the fact the HRA account was only able to support the Capital programme by £10.1m rather than the anticipated £16.8m?

**Written Response:**

The question refers to 2013/14 but I suspect means 2014/15. Please note that the movement in depreciation does not have a detrimental impact on the availability of resources for revenue contributions to capital as inferred in the question. Through a series of allowable accounting adjustments they both represent resources available to fund HRA capital expenditure in the year.

This is because depreciation in the HRA whilst initially budgeted for in accordance with proper accounting practices is effectively overridden at year-end with the actual Major Repairs Allowance (MRA) figure the Government has pre-determined and insisted we show as part of the self-financing valuation agreement first implemented in April 2012. This is best exemplified by the tables below:

<b>2014/15</b>	<b>£'000's</b>
HRA Capital Programme Expenditure	21,134
<b>Total Spend</b>	<b>21,134</b>
<b>Sources of Finance</b>	
Major Repairs Reserve	8,704
Revenue Contribution to Capital	10,109
Grants and Contributions	221
Capital Receipts	2,100
<b>Total Financing</b>	<b>21,134</b>

<b>2014/15</b>	<b>£'000's</b>
<b>HRA Extract</b>	
Depreciation	8,704
Revenue Contributions to Capital	10,109

The highlighted lines within Sources of Finance are the two elements identified within the HRA, namely depreciation and revenue contributions to capital. Therefore, there was no need to provide £16.8m revenue contributions to capital as it was not required, we only needed the £10.109m as shown above. What has been undertaken is the balance of unused resources in the HRA was transferred to an HRA reserve to finance slippages in the 2014/15 HRA capital programme that will now take place in future financial years. So in effect all the 2014/15 revenue funding for capital will indeed follow the capital spend as and when it is incurred.

**Supplementary question:**

Can this be explained further?

**Response:**

The S151 officer can give a full technical explanation.

## **21. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Turner**

Given that you have agreed to roll over unspent ward member budgets into the next financial year, why have you refused Scrutiny Committee's request to rollover unspent grants money? (I am referring to the underspend to the small grants and social inclusion funds which amount to about 25% of the total.)

### **Written Response:**

Underspends are considered by City Executive Board each year in the context of the financial outturn and approval given to carry unspent balances is then considered. In particular, projects work can be carried forward, but that is not the case here. Unfortunately not all underspends can be carried forward since the underspends are required to mitigate overspends or other emerging budgetary pressures such as the increased cost of recycling highlighted in the 2014/15 outturn report. We will monitor the call upon our grants budgets throughout the year and see if variation to the budget is required. The Councillor will note the long-standing commitment of the administration to supporting community and voluntary organisations in Oxford and the fact that, even in times of austerity, budgets have been maintained and indeed increased.

## **22. From Councillor Simmons to Councillor Turner**

Will the Portfolio Holder (a) join me in congratulating the organisers of the Cowley Road Carnival for another excellent event and (b) commit to extending their funding at the same time as (c) looking at ways to increase the City Council's contribution to costs?

### **Written Response:**

First of all, I enjoyed attending the carnival with my family and would absolutely agree with the congratulations to the organisers, as well as the council staff and other public services who helped make the event such a success. The council committed a three year programme of funding which ends this year. This funding was put in place to give the event organisers time to develop a sustainable carnival model; they are due to present their business plan to the council's events team this August, and we will obviously need to consider the outcome of this meeting. We want the Carnival to continue to flourish – at the same time, other potential sources of finance obviously need to do their bit as well. I find it puzzling that the suggestion from the outset is that the Council should look to increase its contribution to costs from the outset, and that does not reflect the good sense of the councillor in most financial matters, nor does it demonstrate an awareness of the financial situation of local government at the moment.

### **Supplementary question:**

Can it be seen as profligate given that support for the carnival would, for each person at the event, amount to a very small sum?

### **Response:**

We are proud to support the event in kind and financially and are discussing what support the council can offer, but cannot commit to funding.

### **23.From Councillor Fooks to Councillor Turner**

Can you tell Council whether there are still plans to change the name of the Panel Room to the Freeman's Room, at an estimated cost of between £15k and £20k?

#### **Written Response:**

The change of name forms part of the wider re-signage plan for the Town Hall, which is likely to take place over the course of the next year, as part of the general maintenance and refurbishment programme. The cost of the change of name for the Panel Room itself will be very small.

#### **Supplementary question:**

Will councillors be consulted on the proposed refurbishment and changes?

#### **Response:**

Yes once proposals are available.

### **Leader of the Council, Board Member for Corporate Strategy and Economic Development**

### **24.From Councillor Fooks to Councillor Price**

The Town hall café is I gather losing money. I understand that service areas are charged for any refreshments, including water provided in Council rooms. Do you not think that water, as an important health provision, should be provided in every room where a meeting is to be held as a matter of course and without charge to the service areas holding such a meeting? Is it true as it appears that these charges are subsidising the operation of the cafe?

#### **Written Response:**

Water is provided free of charge in all rooms when requested.

#### **Supplementary question:**

Could water be provided as a matter of course for all meetings?

#### **Response:**

In principle, but this would need to be discussed with the town hall managers.

### **25.From Councillor Fooks to Councillor Price**

The Forward Plan for July 2015 to April 2016 has three items listed as Delegated Officer Executive Key decisions. Two involve the delegated authority to make decisions resulting in the Council incurring expenditure of more than £500,000, the third has a significant effect on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards. In the interest of transparency in decision making, can the portfolio holder tell Council where the decisions will be publicised when made?

#### **Written Response:**

These decisions, when made, will be published on the council's web site and can be viewed on the "Council and Democracy" page under the "Decisions" tab.

**Supplementary question:**

Can decisions be publicised to councillors?

**Response:**

Yes, I will ask committee services to do this.

**26. From Councillor Thomas to Councillor Price –**

Each councillor is allocated £1,500 per year to spend on anything that improves the economic, social or environmental well-being of their ward. At the end of 2013, Labour Councillors had failed to disperse £27,848. This situation deteriorated further during 2014/15, with Labour Councillors dispersing just £25,896 (54%) out of a budget of £48,000, meaning that at the end of 2014/15 Labour Councillors were sitting on a staggering £49,953 - a whole year's budget! As of 2015/16, the Labour Councillors have an available budget of just short of £100,000 at their disposal. What assurances can the Leader of the Labour Group give that this money will be used for the purpose it was intended and actually dispersed to those in need, and will he commit to setting a target that his group's councillors will have a total carry-over of under £5,000 at the end of 2015/16.

**Written Response:**

Members have discretion to use their ward budgets as and when they wish. It would be unwise to spend public money if there are no projects for which the funds would be appropriate.

**Supplementary question:**

As there is no guarantee this money will carry forward and there are surely needs in each ward, are you willing to distribute these funds more quickly?

**Response:**

I will recommend this carries forward and it may be members wish to use a few years' funding for a larger project rather than several small ones.

**27. From Councillor Thomas to Councillor Price**

Can Councillor Price please disclose the consultation strategy officers will adopt in the redrafting the City Centre PSPO legislation to avoid the repetition of an 11th hour threat of a legal challenge from Liberty.

**Written Response:**

Officers are currently developing their advice on the points in the letter from Liberty and a fresh report will be the subject of a Scrutiny review and CEB decision in September or October.

**Supplementary question:**

Why are you not developing a coherent consultation strategy to minimise the risk of litigation or challenge?

**Response:**

There is a strategy and we will take comments into account: we have exceeded the requirements in Government guidance on the PSPO process.

### **28. From Councillor Hollick to Councillor Price**

Would the board member support the idea of the city centre ambassadors being able to provide first aid to members of the public, and will they arrange for providing publicly accessible first aid kits and training for the ambassadors in first aid and in using the publicly accessible defibrillators?

#### **Written Response:**

This is a very interesting proposal and it will be discussed with the City Centre manager and town team.

### **29. From Councillor Wolff to Councillor Price**

The National Pensioners Convention has created a Dignity Code and is inviting councils to sign up to it. The purpose of this Dignity Code is to uphold the rights and maintain the personal dignity of older people, within the context of ensuring the health, safety and wellbeing of those who are increasingly less able to care for themselves or to properly conduct their affairs. This Code recognises that certain practices and actions are unacceptable in the care of older people. (Full details of the Code are available on line via the National Pensioners Convention.)

Could the portfolio holder indicate if they are willing to sign up as a supporter of the Code of Dignity and to uphold these standards in those services provided to older people?

#### **Written Response:**

Yes.

### **30. From Councillor Benjamin to Councillor Price**

How can the Council expect other landlords to charge reasonable rents when it is letting out the two bedroom flat in its own Town Hall (previous let for an affordable rent to staff) for the advertised price of £1,000 per week? (Note this is about three times the average rent for a two bedroom flat in Oxford).

#### **Written Response:**

The Town Hall flat is a General Fund asset. Housing Services considered it for letting but felt that it was unsuitable for their purposes. The flat was therefore let through a Landlord and Tenant Act tenancy to J C Penny Ltd for £15,000 per annum. The company refurbished the flat and is now letting it on the open market.

#### **Supplementary question:**

Can you explain the decision?

#### **Response:**

We do not use short-hold tenancies for housing tenancies, and we can invest the general fund revenue generated for other housing projects.

## **28. PUBLIC ADDRESSES AND QUESTIONS THAT DO NOT RELATE TO MATTERS FOR DECISION AT THIS COUNCIL MEETING**

Rob Whitty addressed Council. The text of his address is attached in the supplement to the agenda.

Councillor Hollingsworth, the Planning Transport and Regulatory Services portfolio holder, responded. He referred to his response to Question 14 in Minute 27 and assured the speaker that he would work with the highways authority and City Council colleagues to seek a solution.

Howard Crapper addressed Council. The text of his address is attached in the supplement to the agenda.

Mr Artwell addressed Council. On a point of order, Council requested that he moderate his address and not to make personal attacks on officers as these were out of order. A summary of his address as submitted is attached in the supplement to the agenda and his moderated address is available in the video recording.

Councillor Simm, the Culture and Communities portfolio holder, responded. She drew attention to the written response to Mr Artwell's question and explained the work of the reference group of councillors and officers, centre trustees, users, and local people in securing the centre's future. Councillor Clarkson and Councillor Simmons also responded briefly to points raised.

Sietske Boeles addressed Council. The text of her address is attached in the supplement to the agenda.

Councillor Hollingsworth responded. He said the address created a false dichotomy, and that had there been ongoing revisions to the Green Belt in the past the current problems faced by the city and pressure on the Green Belt would have been reduced.

Mr Artwell asked his question of the Deputy Leader of the Council.

Councillor Simm drew attention to the written response.

Rosemary Harris asked her question of the Deputy Leader of the Council.

Councillor Hollingsworth responded and said that further to the written response he could confirm that Network Rail had accepted the typographical error, noted it had no effect and was content the intent was clear.

The Lord Mayor thanked the speakers.

Peter Hulley submitted an address but was unable to attend to make this. The text of his proposed address is attached in the supplement to the agenda.

Four further questions were submitted but the questioners did not ask these at the meeting.

The text of the questions and written responses supplied before the meeting is attached in the supplement to the agenda.

## **29. OUTSIDE ORGANISATION/COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORTS AND QUESTIONS**

The Lord Mayor proposed and Council agreed to suspend procedures and allow Councillor Sinclair to report on the meeting of the Police and Crime Panel on 17 July 2015.

Councillor Sinclair referred councillors to selected reports to the panel (circulated with the minutes) and outlined the pressures on police budgets resulting from the Government's budget. She encouraged councillors to attend their local NAG meeting and read the reports.

Council had before it the report of the Leader of the Council outlining the work of the Oxfordshire Strategic Partnership.

Councillor Tanner moved the report and asked for Council's support in writing to local members of parliament to express concern about the direction the Government was taking on climate change.

Council noted Councillor Sinclair's update, the report, and Councillor Tanner's proposal without comment.

## **30. SCRUTINY COMMITTEE REPORT**

Council had before it the report of the Scrutiny Committee Chair.

Councillor Simmons moved the report.

Council noted the report without comment.

## **31. MOTIONS ON NOTICE**

Council had before it seven motions on notice and amendments submitted in accordance with Council procedure rule 11.17, and reached decisions as set out below.

### **1. Provision of key worker housing**

Councillor Wade proposed her submitted motion, seconded by Councillor Gotch.

*This Council welcomes the progress of the Barton Park development but notes that there is no provision for key worker housing on this estate.*

*This Council believes that key workers are vital to the continuing success of this City, and in particular consider that the lack of key worker housing for teaching professionals has contributed to the poor results in City schools.*

*This Council asks the Executive Board to request a report from officers (a) suggesting the categories of workers who should be eligible for key worker housing, and (b) recommending how quality housing should be provided specifically for key workers in our City.*

Councillor Wade accepted a minor amendment proposed by Councillor Hollingsworth and circulated at the meeting:

‘to amend the last sentence to read *This Council notes that the Executive Board has already requested a report from officers (a).....*’ and this was accepted by Council.

Councillor Hollick proposed an amendment, seconded by Councillor Turner: to add to end of motion “*without impacting on the level of social housing provision.*”

On being put to the vote, the amendment was declared carried.

On being put to the vote, the motion as amended was declared carried.

**Council agreed to adopt the motion as set out below:**

***This Council welcomes the progress of the Barton Park development but notes that there is no provision for key worker housing on this estate.***

***This Council believes that key workers are vital to the continuing success of this City, and in particular consider that the lack of key worker housing for teaching professionals has contributed to the poor results in City schools.***

***This Council notes that the Executive Board has already requested a report from officers (a) suggesting the categories of workers who should be eligible for key worker housing, and (b) recommending how quality housing should be provided specifically for key workers in our City without impacting on the level of social housing provision.***

## **2. Government austerity cuts**

Councillor Hollick proposed his submitted motion, seconded by Councillor Thomas.

*This Council is deeply concerned at the benefit, and other funding, cuts announced by the Government on 8th July and the likely hardship that this will cause to the residents of Oxford, in particular those in housing need.*

*We therefore ask CEB to look carefully at this year's £4m underspend with a view to formulating a mid-year 'emergency budget' aimed at mitigating the impact of these cuts on the most vulnerable.*

*We also ask the Leader to write to the Ministers responsible expressing our serious concern at the austerity cuts and their effect on Local Government and the City's most vulnerable people.*

Councillor Turner proposed and Councillor Fooks seconded an amendment: to delete the middle paragraph and replace with  
*We therefore ask CEB to continue to focus its efforts on mitigating the impact of government and county council cutbacks on the most vulnerable, to strive to make the city a fairer, more equal place to live, and to redouble its efforts to reflect these priorities in proposals on the Medium Term Financial Strategy which it will table to Full Council.*

On being put to the vote, the amendment was declared carried.

On being put to the vote, the motion as amended was declared carried.

**Council agreed to adopt the motion as set out below:**

***This Council is deeply concerned at the benefit, and other funding, cuts announced by the Government on 8th July and the likely hardship that this will cause to the residents of Oxford, in particular those in housing need.***

***We therefore ask CEB to continue to focus its efforts on mitigating the impact of government and county council cutbacks on the most vulnerable, to strive to make the city a fairer, more equal place to live, and to redouble its efforts to reflect these priorities in proposals on the Medium Term Financial Strategy which it will table to Full Council.***

***We also ask the Leader to write to the Ministers responsible expressing our serious concern at the austerity cuts and their effect on Local Government and the City's most vulnerable people.***

### **3. Encouraging collaboration for action on cancer**

Councillor Coulter proposed his submitted motion, seconded by Councillor Lygo.

On being put to the vote, the motion was declared carried.

**Council agreed to adopt the motion, set out below:**

***Oxford City Council congratulates each of the organisations meeting together at Oxford Town Hall on 4 February to mark "World Cancer Day". Council thanks each of those organisations for providing advocacy, for highlighting the suffering caused by cancer, and for providing hope through the development of innovative treatments and supportive care - all***

***of which is centred on improving outcomes for patients, their families and their carers.***

***Each year, 8.2 million die worldwide from cancer. Four million die prematurely. And, one out of every two of us will experience painful illness through cancer.***

***Oxford has a significant role in medical science and in cancer research, with 450 post-doctoral researchers working on cancer related investigations - bringing £22 million to our local economy and with the likelihood such work will expand, for example, with the Churchill Hospital's recognition as a lead centre for targeted cancer therapy.***

***Oxford City Council resolves to ask the Executive to support "World Cancer Day" as an annual event and to seek to find cost effective ways to work with the charitable, voluntary and academic communities and organisations for improved outcomes for cancer sufferers, their families and their carers.***

#### **4. CIL funding for Northern Gateway development**

Councillor Gant proposed his submitted motion, with an amendment: to delete the words struck out '~~measures to mitigate the effects of various forms of pollution from the consequent increased traffic in the neighbourhood of the Northern Gateway development~~' and replace with 'measures compatible with policies NG4 and NG5 of the Northern Gateway AAP to mitigate any traffic increases in the neighbourhood'.

Councillor Gotch seconded this, and the amendment accepted by Council.

On being put to the vote, the motion as amended by its proposer was declared carried.

**Council agreed to adopt the motion, set out below:**

***Council notes the likelihood of a substantial Community Infrastructure Levy (C.I.L.) from the prospective development at Northern Gateway.***

***Council asks the Executive Board to allocate a substantial proportion (the exact amount to be decided at a later date) of the C.I.L. for funding for measures compatible with policies NG4 and NG5 of the Northern Gateway AAP to mitigate any traffic increases in the neighbourhood of the Northern Gateway development. These measures should include, but not be restricted to, improved cycle lanes and traffic calming, especially for routes into and from the site itself and should be developed in consultation with the local community.***

## **5. Compact of Mayors**

Councillor Simmons proposed his submitted motion, seconded by Councillor Tanner.

On being put to the vote, the motion was declared carried.

**Council agreed to adopt the motion, set out below:**

***Council notes that the Compact of Mayors, launched at the 2014 United Nations Climate Summit, is the world's largest coalition of city leaders addressing climate change by pledging to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions, tracking their progress and preparing for the impacts of climate change.***

***The Compact of Mayors was launched by the UN Secretary-General under the leadership of the world's global city networks – C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group, ICLEI – Local Governments for Sustainability and the United Cities & Local Governments – with support from UN-Habitat, the UN's lead agency on urban issues.***

***The Compact establishes a common platform to capture the impact of cities' collective actions through standardized measurement of emissions and climate risk, and consistent, public reporting of their efforts. Through the Compact, cities are:***

- ***Increasing their visibility as leaders responding to climate change;***
- ***Demonstrating their commitment to an ambitious global climate solution, particularly important in the run-up to a new round of climate talks in Paris in December 2015;***
- ***Encourage investments in cities by meeting transparent standards that are similar to those followed by companies and national governments;***
- ***Building a consistent and robust body of data on the impact of city action; and***
- ***Accelerating more ambitious, collaborative, and sustainable local climate action.***

***Council asks the Council Leader to sign up for the Compact and commit to engaging with the Compact's climate change management programme.***

## **6. Oxfordshire Transport Strategy**

Councillor Tanner proposed his submitted motion amended to include two of the points in the amendment proposed by Councillor Wolff. This was seconded by Councillor Hollingsworth:

***The City Council welcomes the County Council's new transport strategy for Oxford as far as it goes but believes a number of key improvements are needed. We endorse the submission from the City Council about the OTS. In particular we believe that:***

1) *Tunnelling under the centre of Oxford is a costly nonsense which will damage the beautiful heart of Oxford and destroy archaeology.*

2) *The County are right about the increase in journeys in future but the Rapid Transit Buses (RTB) they propose will not provide the number of extra buses and seats that are needed.*

3) *The new Oxford Transport Strategy (OTS) does not make it clear which modes of transport should have most priority. We want to give priority to pedestrians, cyclists and buses especially during rush hours.*

4) *The City Council wants a speedy end to the effective moratorium on urgently needed improvements for cyclists on Oxford's roads.*

5) *The City Council supports the same balanced transport policy for the Headington hospitals and the Cowley business park that has operated successfully for the city centre for many years. At present very many people who work in the eastern arc have little choice but to drive.*

6) *The County's latest OTS has failed to indicate sensible routes for the RTBs. Using crowded roads like the Cowley Road and London Road, or driving a bus lane across a golf course in Lye Valley, are unworkable.*

7) *The City Council will continue to keep open its Park & Rides (P & R) in the city. Indeed we want to expand Seacourt P & R. But we also support more Park & Rides beyond Oxford in addition.*

8) *We support some ideas in the OTS such as more electric vehicles, cleaner air, a passenger rail link to Cowley and consulting about a work-place parking levy. We are opposed to road pricing as an unworkable burden on car drivers and businesses.*

and adding:

9) *We are also concerned that the OTS does not properly consider carbon dioxide emissions which will increase under the proposed future transport scenarios.*

10) *We are disappointed that measures to reduce the need to travel, for example, a strategy to promote more remote working, have not been given serious consideration as the increasing broadband provision within Oxfordshire will allow many in the service sector to work entirely, or for some of the time, remotely either from home or from internet office 'hubs'.*

Councillor Wolff withdrew the remaining parts of his submitted amendment.

On being put to the vote, the motion as amended by its proposer was declared carried.

Council agreed to adopt the motion, set out below:

***The City Council welcomes the County Council's new transport strategy for Oxford as far as it goes but believes a number of key improvements are needed. We endorse the submission from the City Council about the OTS. In particular we believe that:***

***1) Tunnelling under the centre of Oxford is a costly nonsense which will damage the beautiful heart of Oxford and destroy archaeology.***

***2) The County are right about the increase in journeys in future but the Rapid Transit Buses (RTB) they propose will not provide the number of extra buses and seats that are needed.***

***3) The new Oxford Transport Strategy (OTS) does not make it clear which modes of transport should have most priority. We want to give priority to pedestrians, cyclists and buses especially during rush hours.***

***4) The City Council wants a speedy end to the effective moratorium on urgently needed improvements for cyclists on Oxford's roads.***

***5) The City Council supports the same balanced transport policy for the Headington hospitals and the Cowley business park that has operated successfully for the city centre for many years. At present very many people who work in the eastern arc have little choice but to drive.***

***6) The County's latest OTS has failed to indicate sensible routes for the RTBs. Using crowded roads Like the Cowley Road and London Road, or driving a bus lane across a golf course in Lye Valley, are unworkable.***

***7) The City Council will continue to keep open its Park & Rides (P & R) in the city. Indeed we want to expand Seacourt P & R. But we also support more Park & Rides beyond Oxford in addition.***

***8) We support some ideas in the OTS such as more electric vehicles, cleaner air, a passenger rail link to Cowley and consulting about a work-place parking levy.***

***9) We are also concerned that the OTS does not properly consider carbon dioxide emissions which will increase under the proposed future transport scenarios.***

***10) We are disappointed that measures to reduce the need to travel, for example, a strategy to promote more remote working, have not been given serious consideration as the increasing broadband provision within Oxfordshire will allow many in the service sector to work entirely, or for some of the time, remotely either from home or from internet office 'hubs'.***

## **7. Guidance on external insulation**

Councillor Benjamin proposed her submitted motion, seconded by Councillor Simmons:

On being put to the vote, the motion was declared carried.

**Council agreed to adopt the motion, set out below:**

***Council notes the lack of clear and consistent advice for property owners wanting to install external wall insulation. Council therefore asks the Executive to prepare guidance, such as that available from Havering Council, to post on the council website.***

## **32. MATTERS EXEMPT FROM PUBLICATION**

None.

**The meeting started at 5.00 pm and ended at 9.30 pm**

**Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel  
17 July 2015**

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Page No</b>
12 <b>GENERAL ISSUES</b> Update on:-  Neighbourhood Policing Review Legal Highs MASH Update	<b>3 - 14</b>





## **Report to the Police and Crime Panel**

**17 July 2015**

### **MULTI-AGENCY SAFEGUARDING HUBS AND REFERRAL CENTRES UPDATE**

#### **1 Purpose**

- 1.1 The purpose of this paper is to provide the Police and Crime Panel with an update regarding the roll-out of Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hubs and Referral Centres (MASH) across the Thames Valley.

#### **2 Oxfordshire MASH**

- 2.1 There is continued progress within the partnership. There are now two education representatives in the MASH, one for primary and secondary schools interface and one for early years. Fire and Rescue have provided a virtual interface and a drug and alcohol team worker is also to join the MASH. An experienced analyst has recently joined the MASH and is starting to examine patterns, repeat demand, and areas of heightened risk.
- 2.2 Oxfordshire MASH records the highest level of MASH episodes, leading to both Children's Social Care and TVP are experiencing significant challenges in meeting the demand. Both have recruited additional staff to manage this. Domestic Abuse Triage is working very well and extended pathways are being looked at to develop appropriate and proportionate information sharing further.
- 2.3 The use of MASH to identify hidden harm for adults is planned to go live in November. This will be challenging with outstanding issues for IT systems, accommodation and partner interface processes (including expected levels of demand on partners).
- 2.4 Monthly MASH audits have been established which have proved very positive in highlighting best practice, showing how information provided informs decision making and gives good examples of excellent work where partner agency information has made a significant difference to a CSC decision and outcome.

### **3 Bucks MASH**

- 3.1 Teams from police (incorporating the old referral centre), social care (which includes both children and adults), and health representatives have been co-located at Aylesbury. The number of MASH episodes was low. This did not reflect the amount of information sharing going on and the early discussions, including strategy meetings, which have been greatly improved. The number of recorded MASH episodes has recently improved significantly. Bucks County Council have commissioned a full review of child social care and their expectations of the MASH. BCC acknowledge the gap between initial resourcing and demand under the intended model. A re-design of the MASH process is being commissioned including the process of s47 cases & those initially intended for MASH, eg jigsaw of information to identify hidden harm.
- 3.2 The new process will need extra staff from health and social care. The continued absence of educational staff is noted. TVP will absorb additional demand with current staff, by adapting the research model that is completed in MASH and s.47 cases.

### **4 Milton Keynes MASH**

- 4.1 There has been a successful co-location of teams, further enhanced by the addition of support from probation services. The unit has developed a strong culture of information sharing confidently in a secure environment. In common with Bucks the recorded numbers of MASH episodes were low as the recorded figures did not accurately capture the high number of cases where information was shared between partners and this was confirmed by an audit.
- 4.2 Consequently work is ongoing to reflect the work done accurately and record more of the work TVP are engaged in. Positive qualitative data reflects a very good customer experience for user and research subjects and an overall good direction of travel for the MASH.

### **5 Berkshire PVP Referral Centre into MASHs in Reading, Slough, Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead, Wokingham, Bracknell and West Berkshire**

- 5.1 Staff from the TVP Referral Centre have moved into Slough Police Station. They are co-located with CSC partners from the Borough but the MASH processes are not yet commenced. Funding for the IT installation for social care has now been agreed and we are awaiting an installation date. The business process workstream is progressing.
- 5.2 Staff from TVP Referral Centre have now moved into Reading MASH which will go live on 14th July 2015.
- 5.3 Windsor & Maidenhead, Wokingham, Bracknell and West Berkshire will have police co-located in their MASH arrangements. Individual MASHs for the six Berkshire unitaries was not TVP's preferred option as it is not cost effective for TVP, may not be readily supported by other Pan Berkshire partners and as

information sharing must reflect that many Berkshire residents have a footprint across different unitary authorities.

- 5.4 TVP are currently working with these authorities to support their projects, on the basis of additional funding from Windsor & Maidenhead, Wokingham, Bracknell and West Berkshire over three years. All are in the process of securing project managers. Windsor & Maidenhead LA are seeking an October 'Go live' date; the detailed critical pathway is being constructed which will inform the viability of this. The others have not yet set their timelines.

Anthony Stansfeld

Police and Crime Commissioner for Thames Valley





## **Report to the Police and Crime Panel**

**17 July 2015**

### **NEIGHBOURHOOD POLICING REVIEW UPDATE**

#### **1 Purpose**

- 1.1 The purpose of this paper is to provide the Police and Crime Panel with an overview of the Neighbourhood Policing Review and proposed next steps.

#### **2 Overview**

- 2.1 The operating environment for policing remains challenging and uncertain. The service will experience further organisational change much of which will be driven by macroeconomic realities. There is a requirement to reconfigure policing to meet changing demands and increasing expectations at a time of reducing resources. If these challenges are not managed appropriately public confidence will be undermined.
- 2.2 Concerns have been raised by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary regarding the loss of Neighbourhood Policing capacity in forces where response and investigative responsibilities have crowded out community based activity focused on prevention, building public confidence and crime reduction<sup>1</sup>. There is a risk the service, as a response to financial challenges, will retreat to reactive, response oriented policing, with resources deployed to respond to immediate needs rather than longer term requirements.
- 2.3 The review seeks to avoid a slide towards managed decline by proposing a redefining of the Neighbourhood Policing role, its relationship with communities and other police functions. The review is informed and supported by a literature review commissioned from the Police Foundation, engagement with the College of Policing and other forces and a series of focus groups and interviews held with Neighbourhood Policing practitioners and Local Policing Area (LPA) Senior Management Teams. The Review has been independently quality assured by the Police Foundation.

### **3 Review structure**

- 3.1 The document opens with a PEST analysis which concludes that police leaders need to ensure forces are locally responsive to communities, and their elected representatives, as well as dealing with further reductions in funding through business process reengineering, the proactive management of demand and prioritisation of reactive resource deployment.
- 3.2 The middle section of the review proposes a strategy for Neighbourhood Policing enabled by partnership and focused on visibility, engagement, problem solving and community resilience. At the heart of the strategy is a requirement for Neighbourhood Policing Teams (NPTs) to focus on reducing demand through preventative interventions.
- 3.3 The third section recognises the need to establish an efficient model to enable the local delivery of reactive policing functions whilst allowing sufficient capacity to ensure dedicated Neighbourhood Policing resources. A draft structure is proposed that suggests the establishment of an appropriately balanced local policing model based on a systems thinking approach. The model is enabled by a commitment to reduce demand by NPTs, a recommendation to “triage” calls for service and revisit “all crimes investigation/attendance” policies to mitigate the impact of a reduced establishment and support the continuation of Neighbourhood Policing. The importance of understanding the value of Neighbourhood Policing against the proposed strategy is recognised through the development of a series of measures presented within a balanced scorecard model.
- 3.4 The review recognises the contribution Neighbourhood Policing can make in respect of preventative activity relating to terrorism, serious and organised crime and cybercrime. The use of technology is considered a key enabler to measuring value and supporting targeted patrol, automated analysis and effective engagement. The paper concludes by proposing the reconfiguration and reorientation of Neighbourhood Policing to reduce the exposure of communities to harm and, by extension, reducing demand for police responses focused on managing crisis.

### **4 A Strategy for Neighbourhood Policing**

- 4.1 In 2013 the NPIA stated “*a clearer understanding is needed of the role and function of Neighbourhood Policing and what should be prioritised, given the reduction in resources*”<sup>ii</sup>. During the review process practitioners reinforced this recommendation by articulating a desire for the establishment of a corporate strategy to focus, guide and support Neighbourhood Policing Team (NPT) activity<sup>iii</sup>.
- 4.2 Anxiety and harm in communities reflected in demand for policing can be addressed in the short term by changing expectations, in the medium term through increasing participation and in the long term by reducing need. This is achieved by addressing mismatched expectations through changes in process

and communication, reducing over-supply, collaborative work to address threat and building community capacity to reduce need. The review suggests NPTs can make communities safer by adopting a strategy comprised of four elements:

- **Visibility:** To reassure communities through an accessible police presence (physical and online)
- **Engagement:** To better understand the 'grain' of communities, their needs, assets, and resources
- **Problem-solving** (in partnership): To work with other agencies to prevent and reduce demand and build policing capacity.
- **Building Resilience:** To mobilise social capital within communities.

4.3 Effective demand management will necessitate the scaling up of isolated, service based practice and embedding a culture shift in respect to partnership work. The review suggests the biggest potential gains will be found when public managers are able to look across a whole place and understand the relationships between public services as a whole and the diverse needs and resources of the area. The default assumption should therefore be towards a fluid, outcome-focused collaboration between NPTs and local agencies. Enhanced partnership working is considered a key enabler for the delivery of the Neighbourhood Policing Strategy. However partner organisations, like policing, also face austerity challenges.

4.4 The development of a Neighbourhood Policing Strategy is intended to compliment the organisational aim of working in partnership to make communities safer. The hypothesis that underpins the strategy can be summarised as:

Communities will be made safer by a Neighbourhood Policing approach enabled by partnership and focused on visibility, engagement, problem solving and building community resilience. Safer communities will reduce the demand for reactive policing services.

## 5 Next steps

5.1 The Neighbourhood Review was presented to the Chief Constable's Management Team in April. Following discussion the approach outlined within the paper was supported.

5.2 Neighbourhood Policing and Partnership are now in the process of developing the operational principles that will enable the delivery of the four pillars of the Neighbourhood Review, Visibility, Engagement, Problem Solving and Building Community Resilience, and are working with a number of LPA's in order to develop these principles.

5.3 The Neighbourhood Policing and Partnership Team have presented the strategy at a College of Policing conference on Local Policing. Considerable

interest was expressed in the work being undertaken within Thames Valley Police which is viewed as being at the forefront of national thinking as to how to sustain Neighbourhood Policing within the current policing landscape.

- 5.4 A steering group has been established to manage the implementation of the Neighbourhood Review and this will meet in July.
- 5.5 In August the Neighbourhood Policing and Partnership Team will visit each LPA in the force to outline the recommendations of the review and their proposed implementation. This will be an opportunity to engage with Neighbourhood Teams and partners to discuss the contents of the review and the proposed operational principles.
- 5.6 In September Neighbourhood Policing and Partnerships will be holding a force level seminar to outline the Neighbourhood Review, its recommendations and the proposed implementation
- 5.7 Milton Keynes will be initially used to pilot the problem solving approach, other areas are also likely to adopt some recommendations as pilots later in the year.

## 6 Summary

- 6.1 The Neighbourhood Review seeks to retain, but refocus, the concept of Neighbourhood policing. It is underpinned by the assertion that policing is best delivered locally and that only by trying new approaches will policing break free of the trap of seeking to do more with less but in effect doing the same only worse. Austerity will continue. The approaches of the past; pumping in more money, driving up performance through complex, costly processes and reducing 'supply' side costs through increased efficiency will no longer be sufficient and will not deliver necessary savings and service standards. "Supply side' cost management will only achieve finite savings. The Neighbourhood Strategy therefore focuses on addressing risk, harm and threat by promoting the principles of visibility, engagement, problem-solving and building community resilience and thereby reduce demand for "crisis" policing.

Anthony Stansfeld

Police and Crime Commissioner for Thames Valley

---

<sup>i</sup> [http://www.excellenceinpolicing.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/2-4\\_Valuing-the-Police.pdf](http://www.excellenceinpolicing.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/2-4_Valuing-the-Police.pdf)

<sup>ii</sup> *Neighbourhood Policing Stocktake*, NPIA, 2013

<sup>iii</sup> *PCSO Workshop Summary*, NH Review, 2014, *PC/PS Workshop Summary*, NH Review, 2014, *Buckinghamshire Inspectors*, NH Review, 1<sup>st</sup> July 2014 and *LPA Commander Consultation*, NH Review, 2014



## Report to the Police and Crime Panel

17 July 2015

### “LEGAL HIGHS” LEGISLATION

1 “Legal highs” is a term used to refer to new types of psychoactive substance. The chemical structure of these substances is continually changing and hence the government’s desire to legislate for them generically. They tend to be used as intoxicants and are thought to be unsafe (they have been blamed for deaths and admissions to mental health units) and illegal. According to the Home Office, during 2013 there were 120 deaths involving new psychoactive substances (NPS) across England, Scotland and Wales.

2 At the moment the substances are put under a temporary Misuse of Drugs Act (temporary class order) that has the effect of subjecting the following substances and products to temporary control under the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971:

- 3,4-Dichloromethylphenidate (3,4-DCMP)
- 4-Methylmethylphenidate
- Ethylnaphthidate
- Ethylphenidate
- Isopropylphenidate (IPP or IPPD)
- Methylnaphthidate (HDMP-28)
- Propylphenidate
- Any stereoisomeric form of a substance specified above.
- Any salt of a substance specified above
- Any preparation or other product containing a substance specified above.

3 The Secretary of State may make an order like this (a “temporary class drug order”) if two conditions are met. The first condition is that the substance is not a Class A, B or C drug. The second condition is that the Secretary of State has either consulted with the Advisory Council on the Misuse of Drugs (“the ACMD”) and has

determined that the temporary class drug order should be made, or otherwise has received a recommendation to that effect from the ACMD. If it appears after consultation that the drug is one that is being, or is likely to be, misused, and that misuse is having, or is capable of having, harmful effects then the relevant legislation can be passed to bring it under control of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971 and / or pass legislation to allow for its safe production for lawful purposes (eg, pharmaceutical). Where orders are made enforcement of the legislation falls to the Police.

4 Legislation to blanket ban psychoactive substances, the Psychoactive Substances Bill, was included in the Queen's Speech. The Bill has been introduced in the House of Lords and is now published. The Bill is available on the Parliament website at: <http://services.parliament.uk/bills/2015-16/psychoactivesubstances.html>.

5 This Bill draws upon the Irish model and reflects previous discussions the Home Office has had with the NPS National Policing Working Group and the outcome of an Expert Panel's report.

6 The Bill creates new criminal offences to produce, supply, offer to supply, possess with intent to supply, import and export psychoactive substances. As recommended by the NPS Expert Panel, the Bill focuses on the supply of NPS and so does not include a personal possession offence. The maximum sentence, on conviction on indictment, would be seven years' imprisonment.

7 Due to the nature of the market the government has deliberately broadly defined a psychoactive substance, covering any substance consumed for its psychoactive effect. Substances, such as food, alcohol, tobacco, caffeine and medicines are excluded from the scope of the offences, as are controlled drugs which would continue to be regulated by the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971.

8 Under the Bill:

- it will be an offence to produce, supply, offer to supply, possess with intent to supply, import or export psychoactive substances; that is, any substance intended for human consumption that is capable of producing a psychoactive effect. The maximum sentence will be seven years' imprisonment.
- all of the UK will be affected by the blanket ban and law enforcement powers would be extended to all NPS supply from UK websites, so they can be shut down.
- substances, such as alcohol, tobacco, caffeine, food and medical products, will be excluded from the scope of the offence, as will controlled drugs, which will continue to be regulated by the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971.
- there will be powers to seize and destroy NPS and powers to search persons, premises and vehicles, as well as to enter and search premises by warrant if necessary.
- similar to the legislation introduced in Ireland, it will also capture substances that, although not new, are psychoactive, have been used as intoxicants for many years and are not harm free.

- there will be provision for civil sanctions – prohibition notices and prohibition orders – to enable the police and local authorities to adopt a proportionate response to the supply of NPS in appropriate cases.

9 The Bill creates civil sanctions – prohibition notices and orders and premises notices and orders – with breach of an order being a criminal offence. These sanctions will enable the police, local authorities and Border Force to take proportionate action to stop the supply of NPS, especially by “head shops”. The Bill also provides bespoke powers to seize and destroy NPS and powers to search persons, premises and vehicles as well as to enter premises by warrant if necessary.

10 The government has said that it appreciates that legislation alone will not solve the problem of NPS and will continue to develop and deliver a range of actions to enhance its approach to health, prevention and treatment with partners.

11 The Bill will proceed through the various Parliamentary stages over the next six months with anticipated implementation in April 2016. The Home Office will work with the National Law Enforcement NPS Working Group to develop an enforcement strategy over the coming months. They will also be working with experts to strengthen the forensic capacity and capability to support implementation of the Bill under the Home Office’s Forensic Early Warning System (FEWS).

12 This Bill has already had a difficult passage in the House of Lords where two former police officers police chiefs have argued that the same legislation in Ireland left police unable to prosecute as there is was accepted methodology that existed for testing a substance for psychoactivity. The policing minister however has said he is working with the Home Office to resolve this. The impact for the Police Service in terms of enforcement will become clearer as the Bill develops.

Anthony Stansfeld

Police and Crime Commissioner for Thames Valley

