

# Agenda

www.oxford.gov.uk



## City Executive Board

Date: **Thursday 6 April 2017**

---

Time: **5.00 pm**

---

Place: **St Aldate's Room, Town Hall**

---

For any further information please contact:

**Sarah Claridge, Committee and Member Services Officer**

Telephone: 01865 529920

Email: [executiveboard@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:executiveboard@oxford.gov.uk)

---

As a matter of courtesy, if you intend to record the meeting please let the Committee Services Officer know how you wish to do this before the start of the meeting.

# City Executive Board

## Membership

<b>Chair</b>	Councillor Bob Price	Corporate Strategy and Economic Development
	Councillor Ed Turner	Finance, Asset Management and Public Health
	Councillor Susan Brown	Customer and Corporate Services
	Councillor Alex Hollingsworth	Planning and Regulatory Services
	Councillor Pat Kennedy	Young People, Schools and Skills
	Councillor Mike Rowley	Housing
	Councillor Christine Simm	Culture and Communities
	Councillor Dee Sinclair	Community Safety
	Councillor Linda Smith	Leisure, Parks and Sport
	Councillor John Tanner	A Clean and Green Oxford

The quorum for this meeting is three, substitutes are not allowed.

Future items to be discussed by the City Executive Board can be found on the Forward Plan which is available on the Council's [website](#)

### **HOW TO OBTAIN A COPY OF THE AGENDA**

In order to reduce the use of resources, our carbon footprint and our costs we will no longer produce paper copies of agenda over and above our minimum requirements. Paper copies may be looked at the Town Hall Reception and at Customer Services, St Aldate's.

A copy of the agenda may be:-

- Viewed on our website – [mycouncil.oxford.gov.uk](http://mycouncil.oxford.gov.uk)
- Downloaded from our website
- Subscribed to electronically by registering online at [mycouncil.oxford.gov.uk](http://mycouncil.oxford.gov.uk)

# AGENDA

## PART ONE PUBLIC BUSINESS

	<b>Pages</b>	
1	<b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b>	
2	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>	
3	<b>ADDRESSES AND QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC</b>	
4	<b>COUNCILLORS ADDRESSES ON ANY ITEM FOR DECISION ON THE BOARD'S AGENDA</b>	
5	<b>COUNCILLOR ADDRESSES ON NEIGHBOURHOOD ISSUES</b>	
6	<b>ITEMS RAISED BY BOARD MEMBERS</b>	
7	<b>SCRUTINY COMMITTEE REPORTS</b>	
a	<b>SCRUTINY RESPONSE: HEALTH INEQUALITIES</b> Board Member response to follow	9 - 20
b	<b>SCRUTINY RESPONSE: UNIVERSITY HOUSING NEEDS</b> Board Member response to follow	21 - 28
c	<b>SCRUTINY RESPONSE: AIR QUALITY</b> Board Member response to follow	29 - 32
d	<b>SCRUTINY RESPONSE: WORKPLACE PARKING LEVIES</b>	33 - 38
e	<b>SCRUTINY RESPONSE: THAMES VALLEY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL</b>	39 - 44
f	<b>SCRUTINY RESPONSE: PUBLIC SAFETY ON OXFORD'S WATERWAYS</b> Report and Board Member response to follow	

## 8 PUBLIC SAFETY ON OXFORD'S WATERWAYS

45 - 56

**Lead Member:** Councillor Sinclair, Board Member for Community Safety

The Executive Director for Sustainable City has submitted a report which outlines the outcome of the consultation regarding the proposal to make a Public Spaces Protection Order in respect of the waterways of Oxford and make recommendations as to the way forward.

**Recommendations:** That the City Executive Board resolves to:

**Not progress** the proposal for a Public Spaces Protection Order for the generality of the waterways of Oxford;

**Commission** officers to develop localised solutions to public safety concerns for four identified priority areas;

**Commission** officers to further develop policy proposals that will address public safety and antisocial behaviour problems and improve public enjoyment of the city's waterways resources.

## 9 OXFORD FLOOD ALLEVIATION SCHEME

57 - 62

**Lead Member:** Councillor Price, Board Member for Corporate Strategy and Economic Development

The Executive Director for Sustainable City has submitted a report which requests approval to increase Oxford City Council's project contribution towards Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme by up to £1,000,000 funded from in-kind contributions in terms of land disposal and compensation values foregone.

**Recommendations:** That the City Executive Board resolves to:

1. **Approve** the increase of Oxford City Council's project contribution towards Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme by up to £1,000,000 funded from in-kind contributions from land disposal and compensation foregone; and
2. **Delegated authority** to Executive Director for Community Services, in consultation with the Heads of Financial Services and Law and Governance, to be able to enter a funding agreement with Environment Agency.
3. **Note** that a detailed report on proposed disposals to facilitate the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme and discounts proposed will be made to the City Executive Board in due course.

**10 MINUTES**

63 - 68

Minutes of the meeting held on 9 March 2017

**Recommendation:** The City Executive Board NOTES the minutes of the meeting held on 9 March 2017 as a true and accurate record.

**11 MATTERS EXEMPT FROM PUBLICATION**

If the Board wishes to exclude the press and the public from the meeting during consideration of any of the items on the exempt from publication part of the agenda, it will be necessary for the Board to pass a resolution in accordance with the provisions of Paragraph 21(1)(b) of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2000 on the grounds that their presence could involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as described in specific paragraphs of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

The Board may maintain the exemption if and so long as, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

**PART TWO**  
**MATTERS EXEMPT FROM PUBLICATION**

**12 EXEMPT APPENDIX 1\_ OXFORD FLOOD ALLEVIATION SCHEME**

69 - 70

**Lead Member:** Councillor Price, Board Member for Corporate Strategy and Economic Development

**13 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

Meetings are scheduled for the following dates:

11 May 2017  
15 June 2017 – Special: Local Plan  
20 June 2017  
18 July 2017  
15 August 2017 - Provisional  
19 September 2017  
17 October 2017  
21 November 2017  
19 December 2017

All meetings start at 5pm.

## **DECLARING INTERESTS**

### **General duty**

You must declare any disclosable pecuniary interests when the meeting reaches the item on the agenda headed “Declarations of Interest” or as soon as it becomes apparent to you.

### **What is a disclosable pecuniary interest?**

Disclosable pecuniary interests relate to your\* employment; sponsorship (ie payment for expenses incurred by you in carrying out your duties as a councillor or towards your election expenses); contracts; land in the Council’s area; licences for land in the Council’s area; corporate tenancies; and securities. These declarations must be recorded in each councillor’s Register of Interests which is publicly available on the Council’s website.

### **Declaring an interest**

Where any matter disclosed in your Register of Interests is being considered at a meeting, you must declare that you have an interest. You should also disclose the nature as well as the existence of the interest.

If you have a disclosable pecuniary interest, after having declared it at the meeting you must not participate in discussion or voting on the item and must withdraw from the meeting whilst the matter is discussed.

### **Members’ Code of Conduct and public perception**

Even if you do not have a disclosable pecuniary interest in a matter, the Members’ Code of Conduct says that a member “must serve only the public interest and must never improperly confer an advantage or disadvantage on any person including yourself” and that “you must not place yourself in situations where your honesty and integrity may be questioned”. What this means is that the matter of interests must be viewed within the context of the Code as a whole and regard should continue to be paid to the perception of the public.

\*Disclosable pecuniary interests that must be declared are not only those of the member her or himself but also those of the member’s spouse, civil partner or person they are living with as husband or wife or as if they were civil partners.

## **HOW OXFORD CITY COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC CAN ENGAGE AT THE CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD**

### **Addresses and questions by members of the public, (15 minutes in total)**

Members of the public can submit questions in writing about any item for decision at the meeting. Questions, stating the relevant agenda item, must be received by the Head of Law and Governance by 9.30am two clear working day before the meeting (eg for a Thursday meeting, the deadline would be 9.30am on the Tuesday). Questions can be submitted either by letter or by email ([executiveboard@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:executiveboard@oxford.gov.uk)).

Answers to the questions will be provided in writing at the meeting; supplementary questions will not be allowed. If it is not possible to provide an answer at the meeting it will be included in the minutes that are published on the Council's website within 2 working days of the meeting.

The Chair has discretion in exceptional circumstances to agree that a submitted question or related statement (dealing with matters that appear on the agenda) can be asked verbally at the meeting. In these cases, the question and/or address is limited to 3 minutes, and will be answered verbally by the Chair or another Board member or an officer of the Council. The text of any proposed address must be submitted within the same timescale as questions.

For this agenda item the Chair's decision is final.

### **Councillors speaking at meetings**

Oxford City councillors may, when the chair agrees, address the Board on an item for decision on the agenda (other than on the minutes). The member seeking to make an address must notify the Head of Law and Governance by 9.30am at least one clear working day before the meeting, stating the relevant agenda items. An address may last for no more than three minutes. If an address is made, the Board member who has political responsibility for the item for decision may respond or the Board will have regard to the points raised in reaching its decision.

### **Councillors speaking on Neighbourhood issues (10 minutes in total)**

Any City Councillor can raise local issues on behalf of communities directly with the Board. The member seeking to make an address must notify the Head of Law and Governance by 9.30am at least one clear working day before the meeting, giving outline details of the issue. Priority will be given to those members who have not already addressed the Board within the year and in the order received. Issues can only be raised once unless otherwise agreed by the Board. The Board's responsibility will be to hear the issue and respond at the meeting, if possible, or arrange a written response within 10 working days.

### **Items raised by Board members**

Such items must be submitted within the same timescale as questions and will be for discussion only and not for a Board decision. Any item which requires a decision of the Board will be the subject of a report to a future meeting of the Board



**To: City Executive Board**

**Date: 6 April 2017**

**Report of: Scrutiny Committee**

**Title of Report: Health Inequalities**

## **Summary and Recommendations**

**Purpose of report:** To present the recommendations of the Health Inequalities Panel on health inequalities

**Executive lead member:** Councillor Ed Turner, Council Leader and Board Member for Corporate Strategy and Economic Development

**Recommendation** of the Scrutiny Committee to the City Executive Board:

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

## **Appendices**

*Appendix 1: Health Inequalities recommendations relevant to Oxford City Council.*

## **Background**

1. The Health Inequalities Panel followed on from the work of the Inequalities Panel by meeting on 7 March 2017 to consider the report of the Oxfordshire Health Inequalities Commission. The Panel comprised of Councillors Van Coulter (Chair), Sian Taylor, David Thomas and Liz Wade. The Panel would like to thank the following people for attending the meeting and contributing to the discussion:
  - Professor Sian M Griffiths, Independent Chair of the Oxfordshire Health Inequalities Commission;
  - Cllr Gill Sanders, Older People's Champion;
  - Val Johnson, Policy and Partnerships Manager;
  - Frances Evans, Strategy and Service Development Manager (Housing Services);
  - Chris Harvey, OD, Learning and HR Support Manager.

## Summary and recommendations

2. The Chair of the Health Inequalities Commission said the fact that the meeting was taking place represented exactly the sort of response that the Commission had hoped for. She said health is not just a matter for the health service because it is a product of wider socio-economic factors and joint working is essential to addressing inequalities. Although inequality is easier to understand in a city context the County Council should not dismiss this work because inequality is an issue for the whole of Oxfordshire and some aspects need to be addressed at county council level or on a county-wide basis.
3. The Panel heard that the Commission took evidence from various sources and held a number of public meetings. There had been difficulties in obtaining data on particular groups due to national data gaps and this had made it difficult to accurately assess needs. The first eleven recommendations in the Commission's report relate to five common principles: strong partnership engagement, recognising the impact of poverty on health, a commitment to prevention, data collection and utilisation, and the need to allocate resources to reduce inequalities. These themes run through the Commission's report, as do the themes of beginning well, living well and aging well. The challenge is to focus on helping the poorest and knowing whether you have made a difference over time. Some measurable data is available on some indicators such as healthy life expectancy, low life satisfaction and educational attainment but there is a need to specifically monitor inequalities, keep it on the agenda and influence partners at a time when it is getting harder to do so due to funding cuts.
4. The Panel noted that almost all Council services can be seen as having some impact on health inequalities. Housing, homelessness and the work of the welfare reform team are the most obvious ones, but green spaces, safeguarding, anti-social behaviour, environmental health, licensing and air quality are also important. The main themes as far as the council is concerned are about income, education, employment, the material environment (including housing) and lifestyle (e.g. promoting physical activity). The Council is very active in these areas and does a lot of good work but there is a need to work in partnership, share knowledge and define gaps in order to reduce inequalities. The Panel voiced support for a number of specific council initiatives, such as; the council's approach to health and wellbeing for council employees, proposals to develop a food poverty action plan, the Healthy New Town at Barton Park, and the proposed extension of licensing across the private rented sector.
5. The Policy and Partnerships Manager provided a list of the Commission's recommendations that are most relevant to district councils (see Appendix 1). The Panel note that some of these recommendations require a partnership approach and that leading on their implementation would potentially have resourcing implications for the City Council (e.g. making benefits advice available in all health settings). The Panel hope however that the Council can support and embed these recommendations as a far as possible within existing resources.

***Recommendation 1 - That the recommendations of the Health Inequalities Panel that have been identified as being most relevant to district councils***

***(see appendix) are supported as far as possible by the Council within existing resources.***

6. The Chair of the Health Inequalities Commission said that the Council was doing lots of good work but was being hit by external factors, such as cuts to supported housing. The Council should continually ensure that it prioritises its resources in order to reach the most affected groups and maximise its impacts on health inequalities. She also urged the Council to also look at adopting the 'health in all policies' approach, as recommended by the Commission for all NHS and local authority organisations. This approach is about systematically taking into account the health implications of decisions, seeking synergies and avoiding harmful health impacts to improve the health of the population and health equity.

***Recommendation 2 - That the Council supports reducing health inequalities and will adopt the 'Health in All Policies' approach, which is supported by government and the World Health Organisation.***

7. The Policy and Partnerships Manager said that there is a challenge in measuring the impacts of numerous council activities through a health inequalities lens. The Council employs a data analyst but is limited in what it can measure due to national data gaps (e.g. health data specific to BME groups). The high level of population churn in the city is also a factor. The Council is however very aware of health inequalities. Officers do look at data and try to create measures when introducing new policies or refreshing existing policies. There are opportunities to join up better with other agencies and the stronger communities groups – involving the Council, CCG, Public Health and DWP – are good examples of this partnership approach already happening.
8. The Housing Strategy and Service Development Manager said that Housing Services have a duty of care and are required to take account of health issues when housing people. Housing Services also do a lot of work with the Welfare Reform Team and organisations such as Shelter and CAB. They have referral systems in place and provide information on accessing services to people in housing need such as those living in temporary accommodation and those at risk of homelessness. Where people are placed in private sector accommodation, Tenant Liaison Officers act as mediators if problems occur and tenants are provided with coaching on how to sustain tenancies. Landlords are subject to fit and proper person tests and properties are inspected for suitability and hazards. All of this support can help people through or prevent suffering but the impacts on health and wellbeing are not currently measured. A health and wellbeing impact question could potentially be added to existing satisfaction surveys.

***Recommendation 3 - That the Council looks at how it can improve monitoring the health and wellbeing impacts of key services that impact on health and wellbeing.***

9. The Older Person's Champion said that loneliness amongst the elderly is a huge issue in the city and that the withdrawal of subsidised buses has compounded this problem. There is a need to build accommodation that older people want to live in if they are to be tempted to move out of larger properties and potentially

further from their friends and soft networks. The Council has been doing a lot of work in this area and overall is working very hard supporting things like supported accommodation, which has been cut by the County Council. However, the Council needs to be realistic about the task ahead and what can be achieved given that funding will continue to diminish and the demographic challenges facing public services will continue to increase. It is suggested that there may be an opportunity to link in with the Jo Cox Foundation's Loneliness Commission. The Older Person's Champion also said that advice agencies are doing a brilliant job in encouraging people to claim benefits they are entitled to and the Council should continue to support them.

***Recommendation 4 - That consideration is given to whether more could be done within existing resources to tackle loneliness and isolation among the city's growing elderly population through community services, with reference to the work of the Jo Cox Foundation's Loneliness Commission.***

***Recommendation 5 - That the Council continues to support and encourage advice agencies in helping people to claim the benefits they are entitled to.***

10. The Panel raised the importance of early years and child health. The 1001 Days Critical Manifesto highlights the importance of acting early to enhance outcomes for children, and supports that every child deserves an equal opportunity to lead a healthy and fulfilling life. County Council cuts to children's centres are a big concern and the Council has committed some money to mitigate some of the worst impacts in the city. The Panel heard that the Commission visited a children's centre in Banbury, looked at a range of data and tried to reflect these serious issues in their report.

***Recommendation 6 - That consideration is given to how the 1001 Critical Days Manifesto, which focuses on the importance of the conception to age 2 period, is relevant to the work of the Council, including support provided to children's centres in the city.***

11. The Panel commented that some schools in the city are really suffering due to a lack of funding and heard that the Council is involved with partners in looking at attainment in the city. Proposals are being developed and there is a small budget but addressing poor educational attainment in city schools is a huge challenge. The Panel also noted that the introduction of universal free school meals has made it very difficult for schools to maximise their pupil premium funding.

***Recommendation 7 - That the Council looks again at whether it could provide funding for struggling city schools with poor levels of attainment, perhaps focused on sports provision or other activities that can reduce health inequalities.***

12. The Panel commented that low income combined with the very high cost of housing is a major issue for many people in the city who typically pay 50-60% of their income in housing costs. The Panel questioned whether the Council can do more to promote the Oxford Living Wage (OLW) to other employers in the city given that one in five jobs don't pay the OLW, and considered whether this would

be a good use of Council resources. The Panel heard that the Council requires payment of the OLW through procurement and grant funding and has convinced the local health trust, which has some 1400 employees, of the benefits of paying the OLW to their staff. The Panel noted that there is an opportunity to push the OLW again given that the Westgate Shopping Centre will be reopening later in the year, creating 3000 jobs, and that shops and restaurants are reportedly struggling to fill these posts. The Panel suggest that the OLW should become a more widely recognised scheme for employers to sign up to, with increased visibility of the scheme online and in shop windows around the city, for example.

***Recommendation 8 - That the Council redoubles efforts to publicise, promote and enhance the visibility of the Oxford Living Wage scheme (as well as other good employment practices), given that the new Westgate Shopping Centre will reopen in autumn 2017.***

13. The Panel also noted that there may be opportunities for the Council to maximise social value through procurement in other ways, for example by requiring that contractors adopt other progressive employment policies. The Panel commented that Manchester City Council has developed good procurement practices that the Council should look to learn from.

***Recommendation 9 - That the Council uses procurement as a tool for tackling poverty and to extracting measurable social value, drawing on good practice from Manchester City Council, and reinforces rules for contractors to pay Oxford Living Wage***

14. The Panel questioned the progress of a social prescribing pilot at Bury Knowle Health Centre and heard that while there is a strong local interest in social prescribing, the national evidence base supporting such interventions is not yet particularly strong. The Panel noted that the most deprived communities tend to be the areas with the fewest facilities to support social prescribing and suggest that the Council-owned community assets could be utilised to support health services.

***Recommendation 10 - That the Council continues to engage constructively with partners, including through discussions about the emerging local NHS Sustainability and Transformation Plan, about delivering more health services in community facilities and improving access to health and other services in estates.***

15. In discussion the Panel identified the following actions for the Scrutiny Committee to consider:
- a) Keeping health as an underlying principle when considering issues of inequality;
  - b) Considering the emerging food poverty action plan at a future meeting (expected in autumn 2017);
  - c) Requesting a 12 month progress report on the implementation of agreed recommendations.

**Name and contact details of author:-**

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

**List of background papers: None**  
**Version number: 0.1**

**Appendix 1: OCCG Inequalities Commission Recommendations Relevant to Oxford City Council**

	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Work already underway</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>1</b>	Statutory funding bodies need to do more to demonstrate their commitment to reducing inequalities. Their policies and plans should be scrutinized by HWB on an annual basis	The City Council Corporate Plan has addressing inequalities as a key priority. The council targets its resources to reduce health inequalities and to promote life chances, across all service areas.	
<b>3</b>	Local indicators on progress towards reducing inequalities should be developed, with regular reporting on progress to the Health and Wellbeing Board. This should be in place by the end of 2017	The City Council fully supports the recommendation. Local indicators are essential for targeting resources effectively in geographic areas or to different community needs.	
<b>12.</b>	Benefits Advice should be available in all health settings, including GPs networked into local areas to support CABs	Oxford City Council provides @£500k in grants to Advice Centers and part of this funding is to enable people to access the benefits that they are entitled to.  The City Council Welfare Report Team also provides benefit advice and support to those affected by the changes to the benefit system.	
<b>13</b>	A sub group working on income maximization should be established, and asked to report back to the HWB/CCG within a year	If a sub group on income maximization is established the City Council would be happy to participate and actively contribute to its work.	
<b>14.</b>	District Councils should be approached to seek matched funding for benefits in	See above.	

	Practice, dependent on existing contribution (for benefits maximization)		
<b>16.</b>	<p>Public agencies, universities and health partners should work together to develop new models of funding and delivery of affordable homes for a range of tenures to meet the needs of vulnerable people and key workers.</p> <p>Specifically, public agencies should work together to maximise the potential to deliver affordable homes on public sector land, including provision of key worker housing and extra care and specialist housing by undertaking a strategic review of public assets underutilized or lying vacant</p>	<p>The City Council has established a Housing Company, to deliver new affordable homes with a range of tenures to help address the city's acute housing need.</p> <p>It has invested £20m in refurbishment of the city's tower blocks to improve their appearance and structure, upgrade insulation, windows, heating, and electrics and refurbish lifts.</p> <p>Construction of 900 new homes in Barton is underway through our joint venture company with Grosvenor Developments Ltd.</p> <p>There are agreed plans for the construction of new homes in Cowley and Oxpens, and the redevelopment of Blackbird Leys District Centre, and Knight's Road.</p>	
<b>17.</b>	<p>Consideration should be given to the potential of social prescribing for improving the health and wellbeing of Oxfordshire residents, addressing health inequalities in particular, and learning from other areas</p>	<p>There is an OCCG pilot scheme at the Burry Knowles Health Centre.</p> <p>The City Council is keen to pursue social subscribing in other areas and to develop closer relationships between our community and leisure centers and local GP surgeries and health centers.</p>	
<b>18</b>	<p>In 2014 9.1% of households were fuel poor. This should be reduced in line with the targets set by the Fuel Poverty</p>	<p>The City Council has improved energy efficiency in private homes so they are warmer and cheaper to heat. We have provided grants and encouraged positive action by landlords.</p>	<p>The Health Improvement Boars is due to hold a workshop on addressing</p>

	Regulations of 2014.	We work closely with the Affordable Warmth Network.	<p>fuel poverty and health inequalities in March/April (date tbc)</p> <p>The aims are:</p> <p>To encourage greater join up between organisations tackling fuel poverty and identify areas for further targeted work.</p> <p>To set the strategic direction for Oxfordshire fuel poverty work.</p>
<b>19.</b>	<p>All public authorities are encouraged to continue their collaboration and invest in supporting rough sleepers into settled accommodation, analyzing the best way of investing funding in the future.</p> <p>Homelessness pathways should be adequately resourced and no cut in resources made with all partners at the very least maintaining in real terms the level of dedicated annual budget for housing support.</p>	<p>The City Council provide £1.4m grants to homelessness organisations.</p> <p>It has invested £5m in a £10m fund for our Real Lettings Scheme to acquire properties to house local families in temporary accommodation.</p> <p>It has launched a new Rent Guarantee Scheme to provide access to the private rented sector, for 40 households a year.</p> <p>It has protected services for homeless people to mitigate reductions in county funding through joint commissioning of services with the County Council, NHS and district councils.</p>	<p>There is the Homelessness Support Sub Group of the Health Improvement Board who oversees and coordinates homelessness activities across the county and report to the health Improvement Board annually.</p>

		It has secured £790K of government funding to help prevent homelessness and improve services for homeless people.	
<b><u>20.</u></b>	The numbers of people sleeping rough in Oxfordshire should be actively monitored and reduced.	The numbers of people sleeping rough are monitored at the Health Improvement Board. Monitoring and activities to address homelessness is planned and coordinated through the Supported Housing Group (see above).	
<b><u>25.</u></b>	Funding for locally enhanced services for refugees and asylum-seekers should be made available to all GP practices, with the expectation that funding for this service would primarily be drawn on by practices seeing large numbers of refugees and asylum seekers.	<p>The City Council is actively engaged in the VPRS scheme to support the resettlement of Syrian refugees. To date it has helped 14 families.</p> <p>The City Council facilitates a Refugee and Asylum Seeker Group aimed at improving the coordination of services to refugee and asylum seekers. This group is actively working with the OCCG to identify resources to provide enhanced services at GP practices with large numbers of asylum seekers and refugees.</p>	
<b><u>27.</u></b>	Outreach work in communities with high numbers of refugees, asylum seekers and migrants, should be actively supported and resources maintained, if not increased, especially to the voluntary sector, to improve access to the NHS, face to face interpretation /advocacy and awareness	<p>The City Council Communities Team undertakes outreach into areas of the city with high numbers of refugee and asylum seekers.</p> <p>The City Council is also working with voluntary sector organizations to improve access to ESOL provision and to improve access to health provision</p>	

	raising amongst health care professionals	and other services.	
<b>28.</b>	A set of Oxfordshire-grounded targets for increasing activity should be developed, targeting people living in deprived areas, older people, and vulnerable groups.	<p>Oxford City Council already has a range of targets to promote increased activity for people living in deprived areas and for particular groups, such as young people, older people and other vulnerable groups.</p> <p>These are targets are set for the delivery of:  Leisure services  Cultural services  Youth provision</p>	
<b>29.</b>	Continuing investment and coordination of existing initiatives should be maintained supported by social marketing and awareness-raising of the benefits of physical activity to targeted populations.	<p>The City Council has a Wellbeing Strategy to ensure that services are delivered in line with county-wide strategies, such as the Healthy Weight Strategy.</p> <p>The City Council uses a host of social marketing techniques to promote its leisure, cultural and youth activities. These include Facebook, Twitter and Instagram. Each building has its own Facebook account, including the Museum and community centers.</p> <p>Posts are targeting particular communities are made almost daily.</p>	
<b>58.</b>	Promoting general health and wellbeing through a linked all ages approach to physical activity, targeting an increase in	The City Council has a Wellbeing Strategy promoting general health and wellbeing in the city	

	activity levels in the over 50s, especially in deprived areas, using innovative motivational approaches such as 'Good Gym' and Generation Games	aimed at all ages.  See above.	
<b><u>42.</u></b>	Use of food banks needs to be carefully monitored and reported to HWB	The City Council is working closely with 'Good Food Oxford' and 'Managing the Gaps' to map services which support those in food poverty.  These will be made available on Good Food Oxford Website.  The information will also be used to identify any gaps in provision.	
<b><u>47.</u></b>	Promoting the health of those in work should be a priority and examples of good practice shared by establishing a county wide network.	The City Council has a comprehensive programme of support and activities to promote the good health of their staff.	

**To: City Executive Board**

**Date: 6 April 2017**

**Report of: Housing Panel (Panel of the Scrutiny Committee)**

**Title of Report: University Housing Needs**

## **Summary and Recommendations**

**Purpose of report:** To present the recommendation of the Housing Panel on University Housing Needs

**Scrutiny Lead Member:** Councillor David Henwood, Chair of Housing Panel

**Executive lead member:** Councillor Alex Hollingsworth, Board Member for Planning and Regulatory Services

**Recommendation** of the Scrutiny Committee to the City Executive Board:

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

## **Introduction**

1. The Panel convened a discussion with representatives of both universities to hear their plans for accommodating students in the city and consider the impacts of the council's current adopted planning policies on their growth proposals. This meeting took place on 9 November 2016 and the Panel would like to thank William James and Carolyn Puddicombe from the University of Oxford, and Paul Large and Sue Holmes from Oxford Brookes University. The Panel would also like to thank Councillor Alex Hollingsworth, Board Member for Planning and Regulatory Services, David Edwards (Executive Director for Housing and Regeneration) and Mark Jaggard (Planning Policy and Specialist Services Manager). The Panel also held an informal follow-up meeting with the Board Member and Executive Director to reflect on the evidence provided.

## **Summary of discussions with the University of Oxford**

2. The Pro Vice-Chancellor for Planning and Resource Allocation at the University of Oxford said that the University has over 10,000 under-graduate students who are mostly housed in university-provided accommodation, plus about 10,000 graduate students including 4,500 postdoctoral researchers. The University is within its planning policy target of having no more than 3,000 full-time students living in the city outside of university-provided accommodation (Core Strategy Policy CS25). The Panel heard that the University of Oxford has two asks of the City Council:
  - a) That postdoctoral researchers be exempt from Oxford University's target of having no more than 3,000 students living in the city outside of university-provided accommodation.
  - b) That the development of employee housing schemes (including purpose built accommodation for postdocs) be exempt from planning policies requiring the delivery of new affordable housing (either onsite or via financial contributions).
3. The Pro Vice-Chancellor said that postdocs are typically young professionals from around the world who need to live close to their research for 3-4 years, and should be treated differently from taught students because their accommodation requirements are different, for example they are more likely to live with a partner or have a family. Postdocs are the group most adversely affected by the housing situation in the city, spending up to 60% of their earnings on housing costs. The Panel heard that the University is looking to develop 2,000 new units of purpose built accommodation for postdocs to rent at affordable rates. The only impediment to doing so is the council's current affordable housing policy, which makes such schemes unviable by requiring the delivery of at least 50% of the proposed new dwellings as affordable housing to meet wider needs such as social rent.
4. The Executive Director for Housing and Regeneration said that the adopted affordable housing planning policy includes a mechanism for reducing affordable housing contributions if the proposal demonstrates in a clear and transparent way why the requirement makes the scheme unviable. The University's proposals to develop 2,000 units have not been tested against this policy or proper viability evidence provided. There is no impediment to the University of Oxford entering into pre-application discussion to look at viability or submitting a planning application if it has the evidence to justify departing from the policy. The Board Member for Planning and Regulatory said that during the Core Strategy period (2006/07 to 2015/16), affordable housing completions have accounted for 30% of all net dwellings completed; a significant achievement given that small scale developments have been exempt.
5. The Panel commented that the delivery of new affordable housing is a key priority for the City Council and questioned whether the University of Oxford could use some of its own land to support affordable housing delivery, given that staff members employed by the University are also affected by the high cost of housing. The Pro Vice-Chancellor said that it would not be in the University's interests to provide loss-leading social housing that would be subject to Right to Buy after a period of time. However, the proposed developments totalling 2,000 units would have wider benefits for the housing sector in the city because they would free up private market rented homes for the wider market, relieving some

of the pressure on the lower end of the private rented sector. The University and its partners have land available and can access very competitive interest rates to finance the delivery of 2,000 units across multiple locations in the city, with the first tranche at Osney Mead. The University would not be seeking to make a profit from these schemes but where university-owned land is sold for commercial development the affordable housing policies would be applied to developments on those sites.

6. The Panel asked whether 2,000 new units will be sufficient if the number of postdocs in the city continues to grow (the number of undergraduates at the University has remained steady since 2000/01). The Pro Vice-Chancellor said that this sector has grown by about 7% per year since the global financial crisis, and that this growth had not been anticipated in the early 2010s. Further expansion is expected and 2,000 units should be seen as a start. Lenders are keen to finance these types of developments and if they are successful, more schemes could come forward in time.
7. The main areas of disagreement between the University of Oxford and the Housing Panel can be summarised as centring on:
  - The University's claim that the Council had not delivered new housing.
  - The University's claim that sites in Wolvercote and Northern Gateway are too far from university facilities to be suitable for student or postdoc accommodation.
  - The Panel's view that the University should do more to maximise accommodation on sites they own.
  - The Panel's view that the University should do more to ensure that their lower paid support staff can be suitably accommodated in the City.

### **Summary of discussions with Oxford Brookes University**

8. The Director of Infrastructure Investment at Oxford Brookes University said that Brookes is currently breaching the target of having no more than 3,000 full-time students living in the city outside of university-provided accommodation. While the number of undergraduates at Brookes has been on an upward trajectory since 2000/01, the increase in students living in houses of multiple occupations (HMOs) was not what Brookes wanted to see because HMO accommodation was expensive and often of poor quality. Brookes has three asks of the council:
  - a) The allocation of additional sites for university student housing and the recognition that Brookes would need to develop/fund new student accommodation in partnership with private sector developers, as Brookes does not have the same extensive level of land ownership as the University of Oxford does.
  - b) That nursing and teaching students be exempt from the council's planning policy target to have no more than 3,000 Brookes students living in the city outside of university-provided accommodation.
  - c) Tougher regulation to improve standards in the HMO sector.
9. The Panel heard that Oxford Brookes University is focused on investing in its academic estate over the coming decade following years of under-investment. Brookes wants to provide an attractive accommodation offer to its students but

the lack of land availability and high cost of housing presents a double whammy. Land values in the city are incredibly expensive and Brookes have no land or significant capital to fund the construction of new student accommodation.

10. Brookes plan to decamp from the Wheatley campus over the coming 10 years and redevelop their facilities at Harcourt Hill Campus (in the Vale of White Horse). A Student Residences Strategy (2016) has recently been published by Brookes which sets out the aims of increasing the capacity and improving the quality of older halls, but without available new sites or capital then Brookes would need to work with private sector developers. The 3,000 target is seen as a blunt instrument that should be revisited to ensure there are no perverse impacts on local services. For example, Brookes could train their share of the government's planned 10,000 additional nurses, who would spend half of their time working in local placements. In 10 or 20 years' time Brookes may be in a position to consider new developments that include a proportion of social housing.

### **Conclusions and recommendations**

11. The Panel support the continued success and expansion of the two universities and note the positive contributions that students from the two universities make to the city, and in particular groups such as postdocs and nursing and teaching students. These groups earn wages for the work they do but are not highly paid.
12. The Panel recognise that the housing situation in Oxford is now affecting everybody including university staff and students. The continued growth of the city needs to be carefully managed, with a package of policy measures that encourage and balance new student and keyworker accommodation as well as new social housing. The Panel agree that while the current planning policies have generally been effective in helping to deliver much-needed affordable housing, they are fairly rigid and there is a strong case for reviewing how the policies could be improved and strengthened to ensure they are fit for the future as we move forward with the new Oxford Local Plan 2036. The Panel support strong regulation of the private rented sector and the proposed extension of licensing to non-HMO private rented sector accommodation.
13. The Panel note that some land-owning colleges have taken a very commercial approach to new developments in order to maximise their profits. This contrasts to the approach taken to developing new student and keyworker housing in Cambridge. The Panel also note that the University of Oxford had prioritised private residential developments at the Wolvercote Paper Mill site, taking the view that it was too far away from research sites to be suitable for student or postdoc accommodation. The Panel also noted that one of the Colleges has an option to develop one of their City centre sites for speculative student accommodation, rather than using it for University of Oxford student or key worker accommodation.
14. The Panel suggest that officers discuss potential alternative policy positions with the universities at an early stage in the local plan review process. Given that a number of colleges have significant land holdings outside of the city, there is also

a need to engage with neighbouring authorities and where possible, agree cross-border policies that incentivises colleges to bring forward land for development to help meet Oxford's housing needs including student accommodation.

### **Student accommodation**

15. The Panel would wish to encourage flexibility on both sides in respect of new developments of student accommodation for the two universities, given that increasing supply would help relieve pressure on the wider housing market in the city. The Panel is mindful however that that new student accommodation should not be built at the expense of new general needs housing.
16. The Panel note that the council's planning policies set criteria for determining which locations are suitable for student accommodation. This limits new student accommodation to district centres or areas adjacent to main thoroughfares or existing academic or research sites. The Panel suggest that specific sites should be allocated for new university student accommodation during the local plan processes.
17. As well as (or perhaps instead of) allocating specific sites for new student accommodation, it is suggested that consideration should be given to whether it would be possible to set limits on the amount of student accommodation allowed within any given geographical area. A similar principle is already applied when the Council assesses applications for new houses in multiple occupations (HMOs). It is envisaged that limits on the amount of new student accommodation would help to maintain a diversity of accommodation and prevent very large numbers of students being concentrated in certain parts of the city.
18. It has also been suggested that there is a shortage of accessible student accommodation within the city but no definitive framework for providing new accommodation for students with disabilities. The universities should be encouraged to provide accessible accommodation within any proposed developments.
19. The Panel suggest that consideration should be given to exempting post-doctoral researchers and nursing and teaching students from the planning policy target of having no more than 3,000 full-time students from each university living outside of university-provided accommodation in the city. This may require the 3,000 figure to be reviewed at the same time, through the Local Plan review. Any exemptions should be balanced by a decrease in the target figures and careful consideration would need to be given to the new levels of those targets. The Panel support maintaining the existing sanction, which is that the universities are unable to increase their academic floor space without complying with the policy.
20. The Panel note that the targets for no more than 3,000 full-time students from each university living outside of university-provided accommodation in the city do not apply to other large educational institutions based in the city that have significant numbers of students living in private rented accommodation. The Panel suggest that consideration should be given to options for extending this policy to other educational institutions if it is considered that there is a strong case for extending these obligations as the best means of reducing pressure on

the private rented sector. This approach would need to be balanced against placing restrictions on the usage of new student accommodation by such organisations.

21. The Panel understand that the previous Local Plan limited the use of new student accommodation only to the University of Oxford and Oxford Brookes University. The Planning Inspector for the Oxford Core Strategy removed this requirement. The Panel suggest that the new Oxford Local Plan 2036 could seek to reintroduce this policy given the constrained nature of the Oxford, and the competing demands on the limited availability of sites. (Note: student accommodation needs to provide an affordable housing contribution). The Panel heard that covenants could restrict the use of new student accommodation to university students and this would prevent them being used by language school students for example.
22. The Panel note that there is an increasing trend for private developers to build speculative student accommodation and rent units to students of various educational institutions including but not limited to the two universities. University students housed in private student accommodation are counted as living outside of university-provided accommodation because those units are not always guaranteed as available to the university. Consideration should be given to the case for addressing this anomaly when the policy is reviewed and refreshed.
23. The Panel heard that it may be desirable to prioritise accommodating more students of the two universities in any new private developments of student accommodation, to manage the competition from other institutions. Consideration should also be given to how private developers could be encouraged to work more closely with the universities and where possible, for the universities to collaborate as co-developers to help ensure that developments meet their students' needs.

#### **Key worker housing**

24. Local areas are allowed to define what constitutes a key worker. The current definition used by the City Council includes employees of the universities who are lecturers, academic research staff or laboratory technicians, as well as qualified teachers and all NHS clinical staff (apart from doctors and dentists) and a range of other professional occupations. This definition could be broadened to include additional specific groups such as post-doctoral researchers, nursing and teaching students, and university support staff.
25. The Panel recognise that there is a case for doing more to encourage employee housing schemes, including but not limited to the postdoc accommodation schemes proposed by the University of Oxford. Currently the council's policies support key worker housing where its provision is in addition to the required level of social rent affordable housing (set at 80% of the 50% affordable housing target), so there may be a case for allowing some flexibility to substitute some of the social housing obligations with key worker housing obligations on some specific sites. Any changes to affordable housing contributions would be applied across the board to all residential development proposals, not just to the two universities, so the degree of flexibility and precise mechanism for enabling this

flexibility would need to be carefully considered and balanced with the need to continue to encourage new social housing and other forms of affordable housing for wider needs in the city than just the two universities.

26. Encouraging key worker housing schemes could also involve making changes to the balance of dwellings policy, given that there is likely to be less demand from larger properties amongst groups such as postdocs. There may be a case for stipulating separate and more flexible balance of dwellings requirements for key worker housing schemes.

***Recommendation – That options are explored through the new Local Plan 2036 processes relating to student accommodation, and that early discussions are sought with the two universities (and neighbouring authorities where relevant) aimed at building shared concerns and shared efforts to improve the housing situation in the city. Consideration should be given to:***

- a) Encouraging the University of Oxford to present proposals for accommodating postdocs in the city; (para. 4)***
- b) Allocating specific sites for new student accommodation for the two universities; (paras. 8a & 16)***
- c) Limiting the amount of student accommodation allowed within any given geographical area; (para. 17)***
- d) Encouraging the universities to provide accessible accommodation as part of any proposed new developments of student accommodation; (para 18)***
- e) Exempting groups such as post-doctoral researchers and nursing and teaching students from the target of no more than 3,000 students from each university living outside of university-provided accommodation in the city, balanced by a reduction in the target figures; (paras. 2a, 8b & 19)***
- f) Extending the targets for students living outside of provided accommodation to other large educational institutions based in the city; (para. 20)***
- g) Limiting the use of new student accommodation to the two universities; (para. 21)***
- h) Whether university students housed in non-university provided student housing should count towards the 3,000 target figure; (para. 22)***
- i) Encouraging private developers of student accommodation to work closely with the universities; (para. 23)***
- j) Reviewing the local key worker definition to potentially include post-doctoral researchers, nursing and teaching students and lower-paid university support staff; (para. 24)***
- k) Providing some flexibility to substitute some of the social rent planning obligations with key worker housing obligations in order to encourage key worker housing schemes (including accommodation for post-doctoral researchers and lower-paid university support staff); (para. 25)***
- l) Providing additional flexibility in the balance of dwellings policy specifically for key worker housing schemes. (para. 26)***

27. It is noted that these recommendations would also need to be supported with action from the universities to address the housing needs of their students and

lower paid workers, as discussed earlier in this paper. For example using university or college-owned land to provide student and key worker accommodation, rather than selling it for private residential development.

**Name and contact details of author:-**

Andrew Brown on behalf of the Housing Panel  
Scrutiny Officer  
Law and Governance  
Tel: 01865 252230 e-mail: [abrown2@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:abrown2@oxford.gov.uk)

**List of background papers: None**

**Version number: 1.0**

**To: City Executive Board**

**Date: 6 April 2017**

**Report of: Scrutiny Committee**

**Title of Report: Air Quality**

## **Summary and Recommendations**

**Purpose of report:** To present the recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee on Air Quality

**Scrutiny Lead Member:** Councillor Andrew Gant, Chair of Scrutiny

**Executive lead member:** Councillor John Tanner, A Clean Green Oxford

**Recommendation** of the Scrutiny Committee to the City Executive Board:

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

## **Background**

1. The Scrutiny Committee held a discussion on air quality at a meeting on 28 February 2017, having previously considered this topic in November 2016. The Committee would like to thank Cllr John Tanner, Board Member for A Clean Green Oxford, Martin Kraftl and Stewart Wilson from Oxfordshire County Council, and Jo Colwell, Environmental Sustainability Service Manager, for attending and contributing to this discussion.

## **Findings and recommendations**

2. The Board Member presented the report. He said the County Council was committed to introducing a zero emission zone by 2020. The City and County councils had appointed a consultant to look into practical ways to achieve this in the city centre and ideas were still being formulated. When the low emission zone was introduced buses caused the majority of the air quality problems but buses now produced lower emissions.
3. Martin Kraftl from Oxfordshire County Council addressed the committee. He said the Oxford Transport Strategy 2015-2030 included plans to begin implementing a

zero emission zone by 2020. How quickly it could be rolled out would depend on what types of vehicles would be affected. Improved technology will assist the move to zero emissions. There was now 25% less traffic in the city than there was 20 years ago so progress had been made but there was still a huge amount to do. The Oxford Transport Strategy set out the priorities, which included working on creating better cycling and walking routes as well as a zero emissions zone.

4. The Committee asked how the City Council's comments on the Oxford Transport Strategy had been received by the County Council. Cllr Tanner said the County agreed with the City Council's comments. It was going to take a lot of co-operation to deal with the ongoing problems but improving air quality in the city centre would have a knock on benefits for other parts of the city.
5. The Environmental Sustainability Manager said that the City monitored air quality based on DEFRA advice. Diffusion tubes were placed in areas in the city known to have poor air quality. These were places with high levels of traffic close to residential homes and businesses. There were 75 diffusion tubes in the city which were checked every month. Data needed to be collected, analysed and audited over a 12 month period to show the long term trend of air quality at a site.
6. The Committee asked why there were so many diffusion tubes in close proximity in the city centre and why few were positioned close to the bypass. The Board Member said it was important to have lots of diffusion tubes in the city centre to monitor the situation on a number of main streets. Often two diffusion tubes were put close together to act as a control. The monitoring of different sites informed the City Council areas of concern and provided the basis of reporting on Air Quality in Oxford to DEFRA. Diffusion tubes were placed along the ring road (e.g. on the A40 near Sunderland Avenue), main traffic corridors and the city centre. There were location specific hotspots that were set out in the Annual Monitoring Report.
7. The Committee asked what specific steps could be taken to improve air quality in the worst areas, e.g. St. Clements, and whether there were plans for additional monitoring or public signage. The Board Member said he'd much prefer to focus on the causes of the problem rather than tell people how bad it was. The Environmental Sustainability Manager added that daily air quality levels were already publically available on the City Council website.
8. The Committee questioned whether as a planning authority the City Council put mitigating conditions on major planning applications approved at sites with poor air quality, such as the Westgate Shopping Centre or Northern Gateway. The Environmental Sustainability Manager confirmed after the meeting that the Council did require mitigation where air quality was forecast to be impacted by development and had secured mitigation measures and a full air quality action plan for the Westgate.

***Recommendation 1 – That as part of the Local Plan review consideration is given to policies to mitigate the negative impacts of development in areas with poor air quality.***

9. The Committee asked about the reason why Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) levels had risen since 2014 and whether they were attributable to a particular type of fuel. The Committee heard that all combustion engines produced NOx emissions that were harmful to human health but diesel engines produced more. The Environmental Sustainability Manager said that road works at Frideswide Square and elsewhere were thought to have contributed to some of these increases. However the long term trend was one of reducing levels on NOx. The Board Member commented that the government needed to stop offering tax incentives for diesel vehicles and incentivise electric vehicles instead.
10. The Committee noted that the City Council had the power to adopt parking zones with differentiated charges and questioned whether the Council could offer free parking for electric vehicles (e.g. up to 5 spaces). The Board Member said it would be hard to enforce differentiated parking zones in the city and that he would prefer focusing on improving air quality by tackling its primary cause.

***Recommendation 2 – That consideration is given to implementing differentiated car-parking charges in order to offer cheaper parking for electric vehicles.***

11. The Committee commented that they would like to see officers review the measures in the City's Air Quality Annual Status that had not progressed and the feasibility and impact of progressing these. The Environmental Sustainability Manager advised that a review and update of actions was carried out annually as part of the Annual Status Report for DEFRA. The City Council went some way beyond its statutory responsibilities to monitor and report on air quality and had developed an array of initiatives and funding to improve air quality.

***Recommendation 3 – That the feasibility and impact of measures contained in the City's Air Quality Annual Status report that have not been progressed to date are reviewed annually.***

**Name and contact details of author:-**

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

**List of background papers: None**  
**Version number: 0.2**



**To: City Executive Board**

**Date: 6 April 2017**

**Report of: Scrutiny Committee**

**Title of Report: Workplace parking levies**

## **Summary and Recommendations**

**Purpose of report:** To present the recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee on workplace parking levies

**Scrutiny Lead Member:** Councillor Andrew Gant, Chair of Scrutiny

**Executive lead member:** Councillor Alex Hollingsworth, Board Member for Planning and Regulatory Services

**Recommendation** of the Scrutiny Committee to the City Executive Board:

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

## **Background**

1. The Scrutiny Committee considered the County Council's decision to develop proposals for a workplace parking levy (WPL) and a congestion charge in Oxford. This item took place at a meeting on 28 February 2017 and the Committee would like to thank Martin Kraftl and Stewart Wilson from Oxfordshire County Council, and Jo Colwell, Environmental Sustainability Service Manager, for attending and contributing to this discussion.

## **Findings and recommendations**

2. The Committee heard that County Council's cabinet had approved the development of proposals for both a WPL and a congestion charge at their meeting in November 2016. Officers were at the pre-planning phase of the project and hadn't yet started any engagement activities. The County Council had however held discussions with a former director of Nottingham City Council, which was the only local authority in England to have implemented a WPL.

3. In response to questions about the Nottingham WPL scheme the Committee heard that the charge was approximately £375 to £400 per space per year. Nottingham had used the proceeds of their WPL scheme to fund a tram system and a connected bus service. Employers were liable for the charge and it was up to them whether the charge was passed on to employees. Businesses were only charged for the spaces they used and Nottingham City Council had exempted groups such as hospital workers and employers with fewer than ten employees. As no proposals had yet been developed for a WPL scheme in Oxford no decisions had been taken about what sorts of exemptions might be applied here.
4. The Committee commented that public transport would have to be significantly improved for a WPL scheme to be widely supported in Oxford. The Board Member responded that if nothing was done then the issues with parking and traffic jams in the city would only get worse and it was unlikely that improvements such as high speed rapid buses could be funded without such a scheme. Businesses would benefit from more staff getting to work on time and had the option of avoiding the charge by not providing car parking spaces, which could instead be used for more productive means.
5. The Committee questioned whether a congestion charge could have the same benefits and impacts as a WPL. The Committee heard that the County Council was looking at both but that initial findings were that the running costs of a congestion charging scheme would be higher and it would therefore raise less revenue for improving transport links into the city.

***Recommendation 1 – That the City Council supports the County Council’s development of proposals for a workplace parking levy and a congestion charge given that both approaches have the potential to generate significant additional funding for transport improvements in the city and reduce congestion.***

6. The Committee raised concerns that a WPL could encourage more people to park their vehicles in residential areas and catch buses to work in the city. The Committee heard that a WPL was likely to be applicable to the whole of the city and potentially to parts of neighbouring local authority areas that border the city as well. The Committee suggest that consideration would need to be given to how people could be discouraged from parking in residential areas to avoid the WPL, perhaps through the introduction of a citywide controlled parking zone.
7. The Committee questioned whether it would be possible to vary the price of a WPL in different parts of the city, e.g. charging higher rates in the city centre. The Committee heard that this suggestion was worth considering but could have unintended consequences, such as city centre businesses deciding to relocate away from the city centre.

***Recommendation 2 – That consideration is given to how the City Council could help to mitigate and manage the wider impacts of the future implementation of either a workplace parking levy or a congestion charge on parking in the city, for example through additional controlled parking zones.***

**Name and contact details of author:-**

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

**List of background papers: None**

**Version number: 0.1**



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

**Provided by the Board Member for Planning and Regulatory Services**

<b><i>Recommendation</i></b>	<b><i>Agreed?</i></b>	<b><i>Comment</i></b>
1. That the City Council supports the County Council's development of proposals for a workplace parking levy and a congestion charge given that both approaches have the potential to generate significant additional funding for transport improvements in the city and reduce congestion.	Yes	
2. That consideration is given to how the City Council could help to mitigate and manage the wider impacts of the future implementation of either a workplace parking levy or a congestion charge on parking in the city, for example through additional controlled parking zones.	Yes	



**To: City Executive Board**

**Date: 6 April 2017**

**Report of: Scrutiny Committee**

**Title of Report: Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel**

## **Summary and Recommendations**

**Purpose of report:** To present the recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee on Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel

**Scrutiny Lead Member:** Councillor Andrew Gant, Chair of Scrutiny

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

**Recommendation** of the Scrutiny Committee to the City Executive Board:

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

## **Background**

1. The Scrutiny Committee considered the work of the Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel at a meeting on 28 February 2017. The Committee would like to thank Councillor Dee Sinclair and Clare Gray, Police and Crime Panel Scrutiny Officer, for attending the meeting to present the report and answer questions.

## **Findings and recommendations**

2. The Board Member for Community Safety and Oxford City Council's representative on Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel (PCP) presented the report. She explained that the PCP existed to scrutinise the work of the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) for Thames Valley, who attended every PCP meeting with the Chief Constable. The PCP consisted of 18 councillors from across the Thames Valley region, mostly Conservatives, and 2 independents with backgrounds in victim support and cybercrime. The PCP was funded by a £65k grant from the Home Office and had one dedicated member of staff.

3. The Board Member said that PCC had recently appointed Matt Barber, Leader of the Vale of White Horse District Council, as Deputy PCC but the PCP had not yet been informed of Mr Barber's specific responsibilities. The idea of having Associate PCCs had also been floated and it was possible that these would have a specific geographical focus.
4. The Police and Crime Panel Scrutiny Officer, said the Thames Valley Police budget had reduced by £88m over 6 years, an overall saving of 25%, at a time when crime was changing and becoming more complex. As a result, police assets were being reviewed and St. Aldate's police station in Oxford could be closed, with proviso that there was still a city centre police presence.
5. The Board Member for Community Safety said she used the PCP as an opportunity to inform the PCP and the representatives from the other local authorities of the issues faced in the city, e.g. safeguarding and human trafficking. However the PCP's powers were limited by legislation and the PCP could only bring things to the attention of the PCC. The PCP felt that they were hampered by legislation whereas the PCC thought the PCP were limited by resourcing constraints.
6. In response to a question the Committee heard that there were few tangible examples of the PCP having influenced the PCC. The PCP had recently held a themed meeting where they had looked at taxi licensing issues across the Thames Valley and discussed the need for a regional database. The PCC was trying to raise the issues of the taxi licensing regime at the national level but the attendees were unaware of the PCC having successfully influenced national policing, although he was engaged in a number of national groups. The PCC was able to set the local policing agenda through his Police and Crime Plan. A new plan would be launched in April but to date there had been no consultation on it. The Committee commented that the PCC should be encouraged to consult on his emerging plan.

***Recommendation 1 – That the Council encourages the Thames Valley Police and Crime Commissioner to publicise and consult on his new Police and Crime Plan.***

7. The Committee heard that the PCP met in Aylesbury 6 times a year and most meetings were themed. The Committee asked whether meetings could be held in different locations across the Thames Valley and perhaps include a focus on more local issues. The Police and Crime Panel Scrutiny Officer said that this had happened originally and that one meeting had been held in Oxford. However, this had required some members of the PCP to travel a long way to meetings so the PCP had settled on Aylesbury on the basis that it was fairly central.

***Recommendation 2 – That the PCP are asked to look again at rotating meetings around the Thames Valley area to encourage public engagement and focus on local issues.***

8. In response to a question the Committee heard that there was very limited public engagement in the PCP, with only one member of the public having attended any

meeting to date. This may be reflective the fact that the powers available to the PCP were very limited. The Committee considered how public engagement could be encouraged and suggested that he Council could help to promote meetings through its own media channels.

***Recommendation 3 – That consideration is given to whether the Council could help to raise awareness of the PCP e.g. by publicising meetings of the PCP through Council media channels.***

**Name and contact details of author:-**

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

**List of background papers: None**  
**Version number: 0.1**



**Suggested City Executive Board response to the recommendation of the Scrutiny Committee on the Thames Valley Police and Crime Panel**

**Provided by the Board Member for Community Safety**

<b><i>Recommendation</i></b>	<b><i>Agreed?</i></b>	<b><i>Comment</i></b>
1. That the Council encourages the Thames Valley Police and Crime Commissioner to publicise and consult on his new Police and Crime Plan.	Agreed	
2. That the PCP are asked to look again at rotating meetings around the Thames Valley area to encourage public engagement and focus on local issues.	Agreed	
3. That consideration is given to whether the Council could help to raise awareness of the PCP e.g. by publicising meetings of the PCP through Council media channels.	Agreed	



**To:** City Executive Board  
**Date:** 6 April 2017  
**Report of:** Executive Director for Community Services  
**Title of Report:** Public safety and addressing anti-social behaviour on Oxford's Waterways

<b>Summary and recommendations</b>	
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	Report back on the outcome of the consultation regarding the proposal to make a Public Spaces Protection Order in respect of the waterways of Oxford and make recommendations as to the way forward.
<b>Key decision:</b>	Yes
<b>Executive Board Member:</b>	Cllr Dee Sinclair, Board Member for Community Safety
<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Strong, Active Communities
<b>Policy Framework:</b>	Corporate Enforcement Policy
<b>Recommendations:</b> That the City Executive Board resolves to:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Not progress</b> the proposal for a Public Spaces Protection Order for the generality of the waterways of Oxford;</li> <li>2. <b>Commission</b> officers to develop localised solutions to public safety concerns for four identified priority areas;</li> <li>3. <b>Commission</b> officers to further develop policy proposals that will address public safety and antisocial behaviour problems and improve public enjoyment of the city's waterways resources.</li> </ol>	

<b>Appendices</b>	
Appendix 1	Overview of the four areas of concern
Appendix 2	Equalities Impact Assessment

## Introduction and background

1. Oxford City Council began preliminary consultation on a draft Public Spaces Protection Order for the waterways of Oxford in May 2016. The draft Order proposed area included the parts of the River Thames and its main tributaries, the

River Cherwell and the Oxford Canal that lie within Oxford City Council's boundaries.

### **Consultation**

2. The consultation process sought views on the proposal and to elicit any further evidence of behaviour relevant to the proposed restrictions.
3. The consultation process was split into two phases. Phase 1 sought the views of key stakeholders who:
  - owned land next to the waterways (riparian land owners)
  - lived on the waterways
  - clubs or businesses who relied on the waterways
  - statutory partners involved in the management of the waterways or in addressing behaviour on the waterways.
4. Phase 2 of the consultation was to involve a public survey.
5. In September 2016, Phase 1 of the consultation process was extended to February 2017 to allow officers more time to engage with these issues. Councillors visited the waterways, hosted by the Environment Agency, to gain some first-hand knowledge of the issues facing this important Oxford feature.

### **Consultation analysis**

6. Over thirty responses were received. In addition a series of meetings took place with boat dwellers, businesses and riparian owners. Many of the responses raised concerns not directly concerned with public safety or anti-social behaviour.
7. Analysis of the consultation found that the evidence does not support the proposal for a PSPO for the waterways, both in terms of the extensive area covered and its suggested prohibitions. Analysis of the engagements supports the view that the nature of problems identified differs across locations and requires bespoke solutions, many of which are already available through existing legislation. Other findings included:
  - There are a wide range of waterways concerns and opportunities including mooring provision, carbon emissions, public safety, safeguarding, tourism and community engagement.
  - A small number of locations on the waterways generate most public safety concerns. These concerns include alcohol-related disorder, unauthorised mooring and camping, fire lighting, vulnerable adults living on poorly maintained boats, squalid living conditions, dog fouling, fly-tipping, drug misuse and the safety of river users.
  - The need to improve safety and safeguarding of the vulnerable on and near the waterways was accepted by most respondents; there were widely differing views on the methods to achieve this.
  - Riparian landowners who responded tended to be in favour of a PSPO that addressed mooring and anti-social behaviour affecting their land.

- The Oxford Canal is owned and managed by the Canal and Rivers Trust (CaRT) who had concerns over all the prohibitions in the draft PSPO on their land, due to lack of evidence or the use of existing interventions.
- Oxford has numerous riparian owners and the added complexity that much of the River Thames south of Folly Bridge to the Southern By-pass is unregistered in terms of ownership and interests.
- The provision of additional temporary and permanent mooring sites is proposed as being integral to addressing the safety issues in the locations set out in this report.

## Proposals

8. The consultation process has been very fruitful and leads to a conclusion that a blanket Public Spaces Protection Order for the waterways is not necessary or desirable to deal with the identified issues of anti-social behaviour, public safety and health. It is therefore proposed that the draft PSPO is not progressed and the consultation process should not continue onto Phase 2.
9. The work on the draft Order has indicated that there are four specific areas in which there are significant problems of public safety and anti-social behaviour, and it is proposed to work with partners and stakeholders to develop localised action plans to deal with the problems that have been identified. Consideration will also be given to the possible displacement effects of any local interventions. The four areas identified are:
  - Castle Mill Stream
  - Aristotle Lane
  - Aston's Eyot
  - The south bank of the River Thames between Folly Bridge and the southern Ring Road
10. In addressing the problems in these areas a range of possible interventions will be considered, including area-specific Public Spaces Protection Orders, referrals to support agencies, statutory abatement notices, Community Protection Notices, injunctions, the removal of derelict vessels, the regulation of mooring locations and boat licensing enforcement.
11. In tandem with these area reviews, it is proposed to undertake a review of the ways in which the city's waterways are being used and how the opportunities which they present could be developed. This review will include carbon emissions, public safety, safeguarding, tourism and community engagement and an assessment of the temporary and permanent mooring locations.
12. The timetable for addressing the four areas listed in paragraph 9, and the undertaking of a review into the wider use of the waterways is dependent upon identifying resources to take this work forward.
13. The Community Safety Team has begun initial discussions with the Friends of Aston's Eyot and the team are also taking forward the project at Castle Mill Stream. Aristotle Lane will be dealt with using a case management approach where there is evidence of environmental nuisance. The Private Sector Safety Team provides this service.

14. The tow path area from Folly Bridge to the southern bypass is a significantly larger project that will need consultation with a wide range of interested parties. This is the most significant recreational area of the waterways in Oxford and public safety interventions must address the needs of all river users in this busy section of the river.

#### **Financial implications**

15. There are no financial implications at present. Work within the areas identified will be funded through existing budgets. If further financial considerations are identified the appropriate report will be presented.

#### **Legal issues**

16. There are no legal issues.

#### **Equalities impact**

17. An Equalities Impact Assessment can be found in Appendix 2. Whilst it is not possible to provide an in-depth assessment of the equalities concerns relating to each of the localities identified, early indications are that persons affected by the reports proposals will include those with vulnerabilities or proscribed characteristics.

<b>Report author</b>	Richard Adams
Job title	Community Safety Manager
Service area or department	Community Services
Telephone	01865 252283
e-mail	<a href="mailto:rjadams@oxford.gov.uk">rjadams@oxford.gov.uk</a>

<b>Background Papers:</b> None
--------------------------------

## **Appendix 1: Overview of the four areas of concern.**

### **Castle Mill Stream**

#### *Current concerns*

- Vulnerable adults living on poorly maintained and potentially unsafe boats
- Environmental issues including dog fouling, fly tipping, broken glass
- Drug use, discarded needles and drug dealing

#### *Intervention options*

- Land ownership to be registered by land owner.
- Work is undertaken to improve the condition of the area including the removal of dilapidated boats.
- Case by case assessment of residents' vulnerability and appropriate support put in place.
- Boat safety to be assessed and appropriate insurance, safety certificates and licensed to be checked.
- Community Protection Notices served for environmental issues including detritus in the water.
- Application of the City Centre PSPO where applicable
- Enforcement of no camping in the area

### **Aristotle Lane**

#### *Current concerns*

- Complaints from residents of smoke and fumes from boats on the mooring.

#### *Intervention options*

- Quiet Zone in place and managed by the CaRT
- Diffusion tube in place to assess pollution levels.
- Statutory nuisance notices served if applicable.

### **Aston's Eyot**

An area owned by Christ Church, accessible by the public for recreation.

#### *Current concerns*

- Unauthorised mooring and camping
- Alcohol consumption and associated litter
- Drug misuse
- Unauthorised fires and destruction of habitat
- Unauthorised camping

#### *Intervention options*

- Restrictions on unauthorised camping, unauthorised mooring, unauthorised fires, alcohol consumption and litter.
- Actions for trespass by the landowner

## **Folly Bridge – Iffley Lock**

A long stretch of the River Thames south bank containing a mix of registered and unregistered land.

### *Current concerns*

- Alcohol-related disorder
- Safety of rowers training on the water due to double mooring and lack of access to the water from the towpath for throw lines
- Noise issues affecting residents
- Anti-social behaviour and criminal activities.
- Vulnerable adults living on poorly maintained and potentially unsafe boats
- Lack of mooring access for visiting vessels
- Extensive “permanent” mooring location with no services contrary to planning guidance on the suitability of mainline river residential moorings.

### *Intervention options*

- A PSPO for this stretch of the water to regularise long term mooring, including free mooring for a reasonable period on unregistered towpath in accordance with the Thames Conservancy Act 1932 Part III, s79. Consultation on the Order would need to include both banks of the river due to the high risk of displacement.
- Land owners to consider using a company to manage their permitted mooring times.
- Community Protection Notices, injunctions and other legislative actions against individuals who cause anti-social behaviour and criminal activities.
- Case by case assessment of residents’ vulnerability and appropriate support put in place.
- Boat safety to be assessed and appropriate insurance, safety certificates and licensed to be checked.
- Planning enforcement options to be assessed.

Appendix 2: Equalities Impact Assessment – Public Safety on Oxford’s waterways



**Form to be used for the Full Equalities Impact Assessment**

51

<b>Service Area:</b> Community Services		<b>Section:</b> Community Safety	<b>Date of Initial assessment:</b> 14 February 2017	<b>Key Person responsible for assessment:</b> Richard Adams	<b>Date assessment commenced:</b> 14 February 2017	
<b>Name of Policy to be assessed:</b>			Draft Waterways Public Spaces Protection Order			
<b>1. In what area are there concerns that the policy could have a differential impact</b>			<i>Race</i>		√ <i>Disability</i>	
			<i>Gender reassignment</i>		<i>Religion or Belief</i>	
			<i>Sex</i>		<i>Pregnancy and Maternity</i>	
<b>Other strategic/ equalities considerations</b>			√ <i>Safeguarding/ Welfare of Children and vulnerable adults</i>		√ <i>Mental Wellbeing/ Community Resilience</i>	
<b>2. Background:</b>  Give the background information to the policy and the perceived problems with the policy which are the reason for the Impact Assessment.			<p>Oxford City Council consulted on a draft Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) for the waterways of Oxford, restricting a number of behaviours. A breach of the order is a criminal offence that can result in the offender being reported to the court or the breach being discharged through a £100 Fixed Penalty Notice.</p> <p>This CEB report recommends not progressing the proposal for a Public Spaces Protection Order for the generality of the waterways of Oxford, and recommends taking a bespoke approach to localities where public safety or anti-social behaviour is a concern. This approach is likely to have an impact</p>			

**Appendix 2: Equalities Impact Assessment – Public Safety on Oxford’s waterways**

	<p>on protected characteristics or other strategic equalities considerations. Without further information on the individuals involved it is hard to say the extent to which these characteristics could be impacted. Operating in accordance with the Council’s Corporate Enforcement Policy, all activities will need to consider the vulnerabilities and needs of those affected, including the safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults, mental well-being and community resilience, and disability. The assessment makes due regard to whether consultation on the draft order will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited under the Equalities Act;</li> <li>• Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;</li> <li>• Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Methodology and Sources of Data:</b></p> <p>The methods used to collect data and what sources of data</p>	<p>Data used to identify the types of behaviours within the proposed PSPO has come from complaints to the City Council and police, and responses to the consultation. In addition, site visits by officers have further identified the needs of some individuals.</p>
<p><b>4. Consultation</b></p> <p>This section should outline all the consultation that has taken place on the EIA. It should include the following.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why you carried out the consultation.</li> <li>• Details about how you went about it.</li> <li>• A summary of the replies you received from people you consulted.</li> </ul>	<p>Implementation of a Public Spaces Protection Order requires public consultation as set out in the Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014.</p> <p>The consultation methodology suggested is described in the reported and agreed by the city council’s Public Involvement Board.</p> <p>This assessment does not offer a comprehensive insight into the needs and considerations of the persons affected as details of those have not been identified.</p>

**Appendix 2: Equalities Impact Assessment – Public Safety on Oxford’s waterways**

53

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An assessment of your proposed policy (or policy options) in the light of the responses you received.</li> <li>• A statement of what you plan to do next</li> </ul>													
<p><b>5. Assessment of Impact:</b> Provide details of the assessment of the policy on the six primary equality strands. There may have been other groups or individuals that you considered. Please also consider whether the policy, strategy or spending decisions could have an impact on safeguarding and / or the welfare of children and vulnerable adults</p>	<p><b>Bespoke local interventions to address public safety and anti-social behaviour.</b> We know that a number of people resident in the localities identified as contained risks to public safety or anti-social behaviour have protected characteristics as set out below.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="701 613 2037 1286"> <tr> <td data-bbox="701 613 1121 818"> <p><b>Race</b> Neutral</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1121 613 1583 818"> <p><b>Disability</b> Negative Mental health considerations will be taken into account by officers.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1583 613 2037 818"> <p><b>Age</b> Neutral</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="701 818 1121 915"> <p><b>Gender reassignment</b> Neutral</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1121 818 1583 915"> <p><b>Religion or Belief</b> Neutral</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1583 818 2037 915"> <p><b>Sexual Orientation</b> Neutral</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="701 915 1121 1013"> <p><b>Sex</b> Neutral</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1121 915 1583 1013"> <p><b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b> Neutral</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1583 915 2037 1013"> <p><b>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnership</b> Neutral</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="701 1013 1121 1286"> <p><b>Safeguarding/ Welfare of Children and vulnerable adults</b>  Negative Mental health considerations and other vulnerabilities will be taken into account by officers.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1121 1013 2037 1286"> <p><b><i>Mental Wellbeing/ Community Resilience</i></b>  Negative Mental health considerations will be taken into account by officers.</p> </td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	<p><b>Race</b> Neutral</p>	<p><b>Disability</b> Negative Mental health considerations will be taken into account by officers.</p>	<p><b>Age</b> Neutral</p>	<p><b>Gender reassignment</b> Neutral</p>	<p><b>Religion or Belief</b> Neutral</p>	<p><b>Sexual Orientation</b> Neutral</p>	<p><b>Sex</b> Neutral</p>	<p><b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b> Neutral</p>	<p><b>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnership</b> Neutral</p>	<p><b>Safeguarding/ Welfare of Children and vulnerable adults</b>  Negative Mental health considerations and other vulnerabilities will be taken into account by officers.</p>	<p><b><i>Mental Wellbeing/ Community Resilience</i></b>  Negative Mental health considerations will be taken into account by officers.</p>	
<p><b>Race</b> Neutral</p>	<p><b>Disability</b> Negative Mental health considerations will be taken into account by officers.</p>	<p><b>Age</b> Neutral</p>											
<p><b>Gender reassignment</b> Neutral</p>	<p><b>Religion or Belief</b> Neutral</p>	<p><b>Sexual Orientation</b> Neutral</p>											
<p><b>Sex</b> Neutral</p>	<p><b>Pregnancy and Maternity</b> Neutral</p>	<p><b>Marriage &amp; Civil Partnership</b> Neutral</p>											
<p><b>Safeguarding/ Welfare of Children and vulnerable adults</b>  Negative Mental health considerations and other vulnerabilities will be taken into account by officers.</p>	<p><b><i>Mental Wellbeing/ Community Resilience</i></b>  Negative Mental health considerations will be taken into account by officers.</p>												
<p><b>6. Consideration of Measures:</b></p>	<p>The individual’s needs will be assessed as is practical and considerations made. Areas of need are</p>												

## Appendix 2: Equalities Impact Assessment – Public Safety on Oxford’s waterways

<p>This section should explain in detail all the consideration of alternative approaches/mitigation of adverse impact of the policy</p>	<p>likely to include mental health support, housing need, drug and alcohol dependency. Council officers have undertaken a range of training related to safeguarding and people with support needs, including safeguarding vulnerable adults, safeguarding children, personal safety training, Mental Capacity Act and communication training. Other agencies involved in this work could include Oxford Outreach Team, housing advice, the police, mental health services and other health services.</p>				
<p><b>6a. Monitoring Arrangements:</b></p> <p>Outline systems which will be put in place to monitor for adverse impact in the future and this should include all relevant timetables. In addition it could include a summary and assessment of your monitoring, making clear whether you found any evidence of discrimination.</p>	<p>Each case will be managed through a well-established case management approach.</p>				
<p><b>7. Date reported and signed off by City Executive Board:</b></p>	<p>April 2017</p>				
<p><b>8. Conclusions:</b></p> <p>What are your conclusions drawn from the results in terms of the policy impact</p>	<p>The approach to addressing public safety and anti-social behaviour is complex. The Council’s Corporate Enforcement Policy clearly sets out the need to intervene at the lowest effective level and consider the needs of those affected. Often solutions lie in support for the individual, sometimes they hinge on a joint support and enforcement approach, and sometimes an enforcement option is the only workable solution.</p>				
<p><b>9. Are there implications for the Service Plans?</b></p>	<p>NO</p>	<p><b>10. Date the Service Plans will be updated</b></p>		<p><b>11. Date copy sent to Equalities Officer in HR &amp; Facilities</b></p>	<p>14 Feb 2017</p>

**Appendix 2: Equalities Impact Assessment – Public Safety on Oxford’s waterways**

<b>13. Date reported to Scrutiny and Executive Board:</b>	April 2017	<b>14. Date reported to City Executive Board:</b>	April 2017	<b>12. The date the report on EqIA will be published</b>	April 2017
---	------------	---	------------	--	------------



Signed (completing officer)

Signed (Lead Officer)

**Please list the team members and service areas that were involved in this process:**

Jarlath Brine, Organisational Development & Learning Advisor  
 Richard Adams, Service Manager  
 Jeremy Franklin, Litigation Team Leader, Law & Governance



**To:** City Executive Board  
**Date:** 6 April 2017  
**Report of:** Executive Director for Community Services  
**Title of Report:** Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme

<b>Summary and recommendations</b>	
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	To request approval to increase Oxford City Council's project contribution towards Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme by up to £1,000,000 funded from in-kind contributions in terms of land disposal and compensation values foregone.
<b>Key decision:</b>	Yes
<b>Executive Board Member:</b>	Cllr Bob Price, Board Member for Corporate Strategy and Economic Development
<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Clean and Green Oxford
<b>Policy Framework:</b>	None
<b>Recommendations:</b> That the City Executive Board resolves to:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Approve</b> the increase of Oxford City Council's project contribution towards Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme by up to £1,000,000 funded from in-kind contributions from land disposal and compensation foregone; and</li> <li>2. <b>Delegated authority</b> to Executive Director for Community Services, in consultation with the Heads of Financial Services and Law and Governance, to be able to enter a funding agreement with Environment Agency.</li> <li>3. <b>Note</b> that a detailed report on proposed disposals to facilitate the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme and discounts proposed will be made to the City Executive Board in due course.</li> </ol>	

<b>Appendices</b>	
Appendix 1	Partnership Contributions- CONFIDENTIAL
Appendix 2	Risk Register

## **Introduction and background**

1. At its meeting on 29 January 2015, the City Executive Board authorised the Council's entry into a Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") with the Environment Agency in regard to bringing forward a major flood relief scheme for the city ("the Scheme"). Under the provisions of the MOU, the City Council indicated its general support for the Scheme and its intention to provide certain funding in support of it, subject to contributions also being made by other relevant bodies, and the contract conditions being otherwise satisfactory.
2. At its meeting on 24 March 2016, the City Executive Board authorised the Council's entry into an agreement with the Environment Agency, under which the Council would play an active role in the establishment of the business case and provide funding to a capped sum of £1.5 million.
3. In the period since March 2016 the preferred route has been identified and Outline Business Case drafted for the preferred option (medium channel and defences) which will reduce the likelihood of flooding to 1,500 properties. Total scheme cost is £121.11m, which includes £116.36m for design and construction and £4.75m for future maintenance. The cost benefit ratio is 1:10.
4. Central Government Grant is being sought for majority of cost of scheme. However in addition, substantial partnership funding contributions have been secured or still in negotiation to ensure the costs of the scheme can be met. The Outline Business Case that has been submitted has identified a number of potential sources to close the current funding gap for scheme. Without these sources the scheme is at risk of not being fully funded and therefore a risk of scheme not being approved by HM Treasury. Appendix 1 sets out the current position in respect of funding, it is held to be confidential at present as it includes sums currently being negotiated.
5. As part of the 'partnership funding contribution in negotiation', the Environment Agency is asking landowners to facilitate the scheme by gifting their land and/or land compensation. In the case of the City Council the land interests are substantial and it is proposed that a cap on any land disposal or/and compensation gifted is made. Doing so at this stage provides certainty to the scheme in terms of partnership contributions and to the Council in its land dealings. It is proposed that a cap is imposed at the value of £1m.
6. Following the Outline Business Case, the Environment Agency will develop their Full Business Case where further efficiencies could be found. It is at Full Business Case stage that the Environment Agency must be putting forward a fully funded scheme to HM Treasury in order to secure approval to commence delivery of the Scheme we expect that this will be later in 2017

## **Financial Issues**

7. The City Council has already provided for the initial £1.5 million contribution to the scheme within its Medium Term Financial Plan. The background for which is stated in paragraph 2.
8. The additional contribution of up to £1 million will be funded from in-kind contributions by which we mean waiving land disposal and compensation costs which would be incurred to the Environment Agency by Oxford City Council in the delivery of the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme.

9. The in-kind contributions that would be accounted for as part of the Councils' up to £1 million does not include adoption of assets with future maintenance liability or waiving of compensation payable to tenant farmer of Manor Farm nor the tenants of allotments at Bullstake Close (Botley Road) or Cowmead. The principle will be for these tenants to seek compensation directly from the Environment Agency

### **Legal Issues**

10. A legal agreement between the Council and the Environment Agency will be entered into under which the principles for the in-kind provision up to the value of £1 million will be explicit. This will include an agreed definition of in-kind along the lines described in paragraph 4. This agreement will be entered into by Executive Director- Communities in consultation with the Heads of Finance and Law and Governance.
11. There may be a need for separate legal arrangements for specific in-kind contributions which make up this £1 million, in particular in the case of a "*direct provision of land that will form part of the scheme*". It is proposed that this would be done via a disposal of land order under market value as approved by Secretary of State under the General Disposal Consent (England) 2003 powers. The reasons for the potential disposal of land at an undervalue would be as follows:
  - a. The Council considers that the disposal for the purposes of delivering the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme is likely to contribute to the achievement of:
    - i) the promotion or improvement of economic well-being;
    - ii) the promotion or improvement of social well-being;
    - iii) the promotion or improvement of environmental well-being; and
  - b. the best price reasonably obtainable for each of the parcels of land does not exceed £2,000,000.
12. In circumstances where the Council wishes to retain the freehold, the in-kind provision of land could be done via issuing a rent free lease to OFAS for the duration of construction.
13. Any specific and separate legal agreements will be entered into by Executive Director- Communities in consultation with the Heads of Finance and Law and Governance.

### **Other implications**

14. OFAS will reduce the flood risk of 1,500 properties in Oxford. The in-kind contribution of up to £1 million will represent the Councils' continued commitment to the scheme and assist in proving the schemes affordability.

### **Environmental**

15. Whilst the Scheme will create a new riverside environment between North Hinksey and South Hinksey, during the construction of this Scheme there will inevitably be significant environmental implications. These are being evaluated and mitigated against by the Scheme via the Planning process. Opportunities to improve biodiversity are being included within the Schemes design including wetland features, scrapes and backwaters, wet woodland planting, tree and hedgerow planting.

## Equalities impact

16. No Equalities Impact Assessment is considered necessary after undertaking the screening process.

## Risk

17. The risk involved to the Council is primarily financial, due to its commitment to make a substantial financial contribution to the Scheme. This risk should be mitigated by the provisions of the Agreement itself, the on-going management of agreement between the Council and the EA and the Council's on-going presence on the Sponsor and Programme Boards.
18. The secondary risk is reputational if the Council's contribution is perceived to be lacking. This risk should be mitigated by the Council's on-going presence on the Scheme as a named Partner and standing member on Programme Executive, Programme Board and Project Board.
19. There is a risk that if the Council does not contribute, along with other potential sources of funding identified to bridge the funding gap, that the scheme will not be fully funded and therefore does not go ahead and thus not reducing the flood risk to 1500 properties. This risk could be mitigated by the Council contributing and/or continuing to advocate the project to other potential funders in its capacity as a named Partner and standing member on Programme Executive, Programme Board and Project Board.

<b>Report author</b>	Helen Vaughan-Evans
Job title	Project Manager
Service area or department	Environmental Sustainability
Telephone	01865 252156
e-mail	<a href="mailto:hvaughanevans@oxford.gov.uk">hvaughanevans@oxford.gov.uk</a>

**Background Papers:** None

Appendix 2: Risk Register

Title	Risk description	Opp/ threat	Cause	Consequence	Date Raised	Owner	Gross		Current		Residual		Comments	Controls				
							I	P	I	P	I	P		Control description	Due date	Status	Progress %	Action Owner
Financial	Council committing to waive monetary value by up to £1 million	Threat	Direct provision of land that will form part of the scheme. Waiving of known expenditure incurred such as land owner compensation, professional fees and increased costs of associated projects to accommodate the scheme.	Reduction of asset value and loss of income putting pressure on MTFP.	09.01.17	Nigel Kennedy	3	4	-	-	2	2	This risk only materialises if CEB approve the Contribution.	Prioritising costs that will be accounted for against the £1m which without the scheme the Council would not have enjoyed (e.g. lost rental and other land compensation costs).	2020	n/a	n/a	Nigel Kennedy Lyn Barker Helen Vaughan-Evans
Environmental/ Social/ Economic	Council does not agree to additional financial contribution and Environment Agency do not bridge funding gap and therefore scheme does not go ahead.	Threat	Funding gap as Central Government will not fully fund the scheme and expect partnership funding contributions.	Scheme does not go ahead and 1500 properties remain at risk of flooding.	09.01.17	Environment Agency	4	4	-	-	2	2		Council agreeing to contribute. Council continuing to advocate the project to other potential funders in its capacity as a named Partner and standing member on Programme Executive, Programme Board and Project Board.	17/04/17 August 2017	n/a G	50% ongoing	CEB Tim Sadler Jo Colwell Helen Vaughan-Evans
Reputational	Council's contribution perceived to be lacking compared to other funders	Threat	Lack of understanding as to City Council's role in relation to Flooding. County Council are the Lead Local Flood Authority not the City Council.	Poor publicity for the Council.	09.01.17	Tim Sadler	2	3	-	-	2	2		Council's on-going presence on the Scheme as a named Partner and standing member on Programme Executive, Programme Board and Project Board. Have clear messaging regarding the scope of City Council responsibility around flooding.	ongoing 17/04/17	G G	ongoing 100%	Tom Jennings Tim Sadler Jo Colwell Helen Vaughan-Evans



## MINUTES OF THE CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD

Thursday 9 March 2017

www.oxford.gov.uk



**COUNCILLORS PRESENT:** Councillors Price (Chair), Turner (Deputy Leader), Brown, Hollingsworth, Kennedy, Rowley, Sinclair, Smith and Tanner.

**OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT:** None

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Peter Sloman (Chief Executive), Lindsay Cane (Acting Head of Law and Governance), Nigel Kennedy (Head of Financial Services), Simon Howick (Corporate Lead - HR/OD), Richard Wyatt (Senior Planner), Mark Jaggard (Planning Policy Manager), Dave Scholes (Housing Strategy & Needs Manager), Ossi Mosley (Rough Sleeping & Single Homelessness Officer) and Mathew Metcalfe (Democratic and Electoral Services)

### 138. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Simm

### 139. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

### 140. ADDRESSES AND QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

None

### 141. COUNCILLOR ADDRESSES ON NEIGHBOURHOOD ISSUES

None

### 142. COUNCILLORS ADDRESSES ON ANY ITEM FOR DECISION ON THE BOARD'S AGENDA

None

### 143. ITEMS RAISED BY BOARD MEMBERS

None

#### **144. SCRUTINY COMMITTEE REPORTS**

None

#### **145. CAPITAL STRATEGY 2017-18**

The Head of Financial Services submitted a report which presented the Capital Strategy for approval.

Councillor Turner, Board Member for Finance, Asset Management and Public Health presented the report.

The City Executive Board resolved to:

1. **Approve** the Capital Strategy 2017/18-2020/21 as attached at Appendix A to the report.

#### **146. QUARTERLY INTEGRATED PERFORMANCE 2016/17 - Q3**

The Heads of Head of Financial Services and Business Improvement submitted a report which updated Members on Council's finances, risk and performance as at 31 December 2016.

Councillor Turner, Board member for Finance, Asset Management and Public Health presented the report. He thanked Oxford City Council staff for their hard work in continuing to provide high quality services to the citizens of Oxford despite the current uncertainty over the structure of local government in Oxfordshire.

The City Executive Board resolved to:

1. **Note** the projected financial outturn and current position on risk and performance as at the 31 December 2016
2. **Note** the transfer to HRA reserves of £0.700 million as at the 31 December 2016

#### **147. ESTABLISHING A LOCAL AUTHORITY TRADING COMPANY**

The Head of Direct Services has submitted a report which presents the business case and seeks approval for the establishment of a Local Authority Trading Company.

Councillor Turner, Finance, Asset Management and Public Health presented the report. He thanked senior officers and union representatives for their work towards the establishment of the company.

The Board noted the exempt appendix to this report which contained legal opinion about the creation of a trading company.

The City Executive Board resolved to:

1. **Agree** in principle the setting up of a Local Authority wholly owned trading group of companies ('the company') from April 2017.
2. **Delegate authority** to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Council's statutory officers and Board member for Finance, Asset Management and Public Health, authority to set up an appropriate company structure, including:
  - Selection of the name of the company(s)
  - Approval of the type of company, the articles of the company and the size and composition of its board
  - Recommending to the Shareholder Committee appointments to the posts of Managing Director, Directors, Company Secretary and Non-Executive Directors of the company
  - Preparation of a shareholder's agreement to be entered into between the company and the Council for consideration by the Shareholder Committee
  - Ensuring that the company holds appropriate insurances and/or benefit from insurances that the Council holds
3. **Agree** that new externally traded work is managed and accounted for through the new company once appropriate arrangements are in place and it is practical to do so.
4. **Approve** provision of an initial loan of £250k for working capital at state aid compliant interest rates.
5. **Delegate authority** to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Council's statutory officers, to undertake further work and report back to the City Executive Board on matters including:-
  - Which services should be transferred or not and if so into which part of the structure principally having regard to the financial impact on the Council.
  - Which if any staff should transfer from the Council to the Local Authority Trading Company.

- Client side arrangements as appropriate.
6. **Note** the establishment of a Shareholder Committee (comprising the members of the City Executive Board) which will represent the Council as shareholder in the company.

#### **148. HEADINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - (REGULATION 19) DECISION NOTICE**

The Head of Planning and Regulatory submitted a report to consider the Examiner's Report, approve modifications to the Headington Neighbourhood Plan and agree that the Headington Neighbourhood Plan is submitted to a referendum.

Councillor Hollingsworth, Board Member for Planning and Regulatory Services presented the report. He thanked officers and members of the Headington Neighbourhood Forum for their work on the Headington Neighbourhood Plan.

The City Executive Board resolved to:

1. **Approve** the Modifications to Policies in the Headington Neighbourhood Plan as recommended by the Examiner's Report (January 2017).
2. **Approve** the factual modifications that have been made for the purpose of correcting errors and approve the factual modifications relating to textual changes in the introductory chapters or in terms of the justification for the policies in the Headington Neighbourhood Plan.
3. **Agree** that the Headington Neighbourhood Plan (as modified in the form at Appendix 3) is submitted to a referendum.

#### **149. HOMELESS ACCOMMODATION PROPERTY INVESTMENT**

The Executive Director for City Regeneration and Housing submitted a report which requested officer delegation for property purchases over £500,000 for the Homeless Accommodation property investment project which would otherwise require City Executive Board approval for each transaction.

Councillor Turner, Board Member for Finance, Asset Management and Public Health presented the report.

The City Executive Board resolved to:

1. **Delegate authority** to the Chief Executive, having notified in advance the Board Members for Finance, Asset Management and Public Health, and Housing, to approve any property purchases over £500,000 for the Homeless Accommodation Property Investment project.

## **150. ALLOCATION OF HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION FUNDS IN 2017/18**

The Head of Housing and Property submitted a report which approved the allocation of homelessness prevention funds, with the purpose of meeting the objectives of the Homelessness Strategy.

Councillor Rowley, Board Member for Housing presented the report.

The City Executive Board resolved to:

1. **Approve** the allocation of Homelessness Prevention funds to commission homelessness services as outlined in paragraph 28.
2. **Agree** that any savings from 2016/17 budget allocations for Homelessness Prevention activities are, at the end of the financial year considered to be carried forward to fund necessary and additional services in 2017/18 and 2018/19 including those items as outlined in paragraph 22-27.
3. **Delegate authority** to the Head of Housing and Property, in consultation with the Board Member for Housing and the Chief Finance Officer, the discretion to revise the intended programme of use associated with the 2017/18 Homelessness Prevention budget.

## **151. PROPOSAL FOR AN OXFORD LOTTERY TO RAISE MONEY FOR GOOD CAUSES**

The Executive Director for Organisational Development and Corporate Services submitted a report which proposed to set up an Oxford Lottery to ease growing demand on the Council's open and small grants programmes.

Councillor Brown, Board member for Customer and Corporate Services presented the report.

The City Executive Board resolved to:

1. **Request** that the Executive Director for Organisational Development and Corporate Services bring a further report to City Executive Board following soft market testing for an External Lottery Manager and engagement with the voluntary and community sector to understand the appetite for and implications of setting up the lottery.

## **152. MINUTES**

The Board resolved to APPROVE the minutes of the meeting held on 9 February 2017 as a true and accurate record.

**153. MATTERS EXEMPT FROM PUBLICATION**

The Board did not go into private session.

**The meeting started at 5.00 pm and ended at 6.30 pm**

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

