

## Scrutiny Recommendation Tracker 2015-16

Leisure and Wellbeing Strategy – Scrutiny Committee 7 September				
Recommendation	Agreed Y/N	Executive response	Lead Member & Officer	Implemented Y/N / due date
That the City Council looks into extending the functionality of its mobile apps to enable leisure bookings.	Agreed	We will look into this in conjunction with Fusion.	Cllr Rowley & Ian Brooke	March 2016
That the City Council's Leisure and Wellbeing Strategy includes a greater emphasis on strengthening integration between leisure centres and the broader leisure offer, including community centres.	Agreed	This is already one of the main thrusts of the Leisure and Wellbeing Strategy, but we will look into strengthening the language.	Cllr Rowley & Ian Brooke	March 2016
That the City Council continues to monitor the accessibility of leisure provision across Oxford, including in those parts of the city that have no swimming pools within a 20 walk, such as Littlemore and Cowley, and how this relates to leisure target groups (the Committee noted that corporate performance measure LP106: To increase participation at our leisure centres by target groups was below target for 2015/16 quarter 1).	In Part	<p>We will of course continue to monitor leisure participation across the City.</p> <p>Transfer of membership from Temple Cowley to the Leys Pools and Leisure Centre has been a great success, and Oxford is over-provided with swimming pools by national standards. The new Spires Temple Cowley gym with associated public-access facilities is due to open in December.</p> <p>We are working with Fusion to ensure that the missed target is not repeated. It is very important that we continue to increase participation in physical exercise from areas of deprivation in particular, given the significantly above average levels of obesity in the Leys especially and also in Barton, Littlemore and Rose Hill. The Leys Pools and</p>	Cllr Rowley & Ian Brooke	March 2016

		<p>Leisure Centre is at the centre of our strategy for tackling this.</p> <p>We are also continuing to press the bus companies to improve connections between the Rose Hill/Littlemore and Leys/Cowley areas to help make our leisure facilities easier to get to.</p>		
<b>Oxford Growth Strategy – Scrutiny Committee 7 September</b>				
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Agreed Y/N</b>	<b>Executive response</b>	<b>Lead Member &amp; Officer</b>	<b>Implemented Y/N / due date</b>
That the Council's strategic approach to providing new affordable housing should be aligned with, and referenced in, the Oxford Growth Strategy.	Agreed	<p>It is important to note that the Oxford Growth Strategy is one of a range of documents which taken together outline Oxford City Council's approach to meeting both overall housing need and affordable housing need, and that therefore the Oxford Growth Strategy implicitly includes affordable housing in its coverage. For example, the documents that make up the Local Plan specify how the City Council's policies for affordable housing should be applied to development sites within Oxford's boundaries, the overall number of which are part of the Growth Strategy.</p> <p>However, as the Scrutiny Committee heard, the difference between the objectively assessed need for housing (SHMA<sup>1</sup>) for Oxford and the number of homes that can be</p>	Cllr Hollingsworth & Matthew Bates & Lynsdey Beveridge	Dec 2015

<sup>1</sup> Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment, 2014

	<p>accommodated within the City's administrative area (SHLAA<sup>2</sup>) is substantial, and the majority of unmet need will have to be met on sites outside Oxford's boundaries. This means that different affordable housing policies of other Local Planning Authorities will apply to those sites. Where the City Council is a landowner it may be possible to take a different approach above and beyond that laid down in the relevant LPA's planning policies, but in most instances the sites are owned by others.</p> <p>In the SHMA numbers the need for affordable housing was a major factor, alongside supporting expected economic growth. Even so, it is important to note that it has been estimated that to meet all of Oxford's unmet need for just affordable housing, using current planning policies, requires a number that is HIGHER than the highest figure in the SHMA range (24-32k). That is why the City Council will continue to argue strongly for housing allocations to meet unmet need in Oxford to be at the higher end of the range in the SHMA.</p> <p>In conclusion, it will be helpful for future iterations of the Oxford Growth Strategy to make clear both the origin of the SHMA range as being in part influenced by the assessed need for affordable housing, and the likely</p>		
--	---	--	--

<sup>2</sup> Oxford City Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, 2014

		impacts for affordable housing of different policy options being pursued by the City Council and by others in the current discussions over housing allocations in Oxfordshire.		
That the Oxford Growth Strategy includes a greater emphasis on mobile working and the opportunities presented by Better Broadband for Oxfordshire.	Not agreed	Not Agreed. For many years now the growth in technology-driven networked working, in particular fast broadband, has been used as an argument for reducing the absolute numbers of new homes that would be required, and for their dispersal over a wider geographic area, which appears to be the suggestion here. However the evidence that such dispersal is actually workable is no more compelling now that when the same arguments were produced to argue for reductions in housing numbers during debates over the emerging South East Plan in the early 2000s.	Cllr Hollingsworth & Matthew Bates & Lynsdey Be veridge	N/A
<b>Waste Water Flooding Panel – Scrutiny Committee 7 September</b>				
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Agreed Y/N</b>	<b>Executive response</b>	<b>Lead Member &amp; Officer</b>	<b>Implemented Y/N / due date</b>
That the City Council continues to engage with Thames Water Utilities (TWU) at a senior level through the Oxford Area Flood Partnership and other appropriate channels. This should include early engagement in relation to future development proposals that affect TWU.	Agreed	Happy to agree and endorse the work of the Waste Water Flooding Panel	Cllr Price & Tim Sadler	March 2016
<b>Report of the Cycling Review Group – Scrutiny Committee 7 September</b>				
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Agreed Y/N</b>	<b>Executive response</b>	<b>Lead Member</b>	<b>Implemented Y/N / due</b>

			<b>&amp;Officer</b>	<b>date</b>
1. That the City Council's unallocated cycling capital budget (approx. £110k over two years) should be used to fund the lower cost Cycling Review Group wish-list items in order of priority. The highest priority is signing City Council route 5, extending to Littlemore and the Leys Pool. This should include signing cyclists onto this route from key destinations such as Oxford Business Park, Vue Cinema and Oxford Academy.	In Part	This recommendation isn't wholly clear, as the definition of 'lower cost' isn't precise in reference to the list of items in Appendix 2, which includes both precise sums of money – albeit without confirmation that these figures are accurate – and very approximate bandings of potential expense. However the general direction of the policy, that lower cost and achievable items with significant positive impacts, should be the priority, is accepted. It is important to note that as the County Council is the Highways Authority there are considerable constraints on what the City Council is able to do on its own. The County Council has been clear that it is unwilling to progress schemes in areas where it is planning or already carrying out consultation on larger projects – for example in the Headington area. The sums of money set aside by the City Council for capital schemes can and should be progressed as soon as possible, and that means selecting schemes that do not require any input or permission from the County Council.	Cllr Hollingsworth & Mai Jarvis	Update March 2016
2. That the wish-list of cycling improvement projects drawn up by the Cycling Review Group, with advice from Cyclox and Sustrans, should be used to decide how future City and County Council funding for cycling improvements is spent. Flexibility should be applied so that new opportunities can also be funded where this is appropriate.	In Part	While the wish-list is a useful starting point, there needs to be greater assessment of the actual costs, benefits and feasibilities for each scheme or block of schemes before it can be used as the basis for spending prioritisation. A prioritisation scheme that referenced cost, impact, feasibility/deliverability against objective criteria would seem to be a more appropriate mechanism. This is particularly		

		<p>important for the County Council as the Highways Authority, who will be responsible for the vast majority of spending decisions about on-street schemes, and it is reasonable to expect them to carry out such as an assessment.</p> <p>Furthermore, almost all the schemes identified are on-street schemes, and don't include for example the funding of cycle parking and storage facilities off-street, whether on public (Council-owned) land or otherwise. For example there may be substantial benefits to a partnership approach with major employers, educational establishments (schools, colleges and universities) and other organisations to provide better cycle parking and storage; for the City Council, which is constrained in what it can carry out without County Council permission, these sorts of schemes may perform well in terms of benefits and deliverability.</p>		
3. That the City Council encourages the police and Direct Services to proactively send reusable abandoned bikes to Broken Spoke and other bike shops that are happy to take part, so that as many of these bikes as possible can be refurbished and reused locally.	Yes	Direct Services already makes repairable bikes available to shops and other schemes in this way; the remainder are recycled and are counted as part of the City's recycling figures. Direct Services will liaise with the police and any other institutions who collect abandoned bicycles to see if there is scope for greater co-ordination and efficiencies.		
4. That the City Council ensures that developer funding can be used to contribute to cycling improvements where appropriate, including by:	Agreed	a) The Regulation 123 list which sets out what CIL can be spent on already is consistent with the recommendations. See list here:		

<p>a) Ensuring that the City Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) list is consistent with funding the higher cost cycling improvement projects set out in our wish-list, next time the CIL list is reviewed;</p> <p>b) Using CIL funding as a local contribution to attract match funding, for example from the Local Sustainable Transport Fund, for cycling improvement schemes in accordance with the Council's CIL list (often these will be part of wider transport improvement schemes);</p> <p>c) Alerting Ward Members when significant sums (we suggest &gt;£5k) of the 'neighbourhood portion' of CIL have been allocated to their local area. We would encourage members to consider spending this funding on lower cost cycling improvement schemes from our wish-list where possible.</p>		<p><a href="http://www.oxford.gov.uk/Library/Documents/Planning/CIL%20Regulation%20123%20List.pdf">http://www.oxford.gov.uk/Library/Documents/Planning/CIL%20Regulation%20123%20List.pdf</a></p> <p>It includes:</p> <p>'Improved environment for pedestrians and cyclists in City centre, including Queen Street, St Giles, Magdalen Street, George Street and Broad Street', 'Improved City centre cycling environment' &amp; 'Orbital and radial cycle routes'. The Regulation 123 list is reviewed regularly, and is approved annually as part of the Budget process, and will be reviewed in the light of the wish-list and the responses above at that time.</p> <p>b) Agreed; this is largely how CIL is utilised already.</p> <p>c) Subject to the proviso that the 'neighbourhood portion' of CIL is only available in the non-parished areas of the city (in the parished areas it is transferred to the relevant parish council), and subject to final decisions on the process for allocating these funds to projects supported by the local community, agreed.</p>		
<p>5. That the City Council ensures that its planning policies are consistent with its vision for Oxford to become one of the great cycling cities of Europe, including by:</p> <p>a) Ensuring that cycling routes and provision are considered and included in all major new developments, prioritising</p>	Agreed	<p>a) These issues are already covered in a range of policies in the Local Plan, including Core Strategy Policy CS14, Saved Local Plan Policy TR.4 and associated car parking standards, Saved Local Plan Policy TR.5 and the Parking Standards, Transport Assessment and Travel Plans Supplementary Planning Document SPD approved in 2007.</p>		

<p>cycling and pedestrian access;</p> <p>b) Reviewing and updating planning policies relating to cycle parking standards for non-residential cycle parking, as part of the next full or partial review of the Local Plan.</p>		<p>(See <a href="http://www.oxford.gov.uk/Direct/61407AdoptedParkingStandardsSPD.pdf">http://www.oxford.gov.uk/Direct/61407AdoptedParkingStandardsSPD.pdf</a>)</p> <p>b) Agreed</p>		
<p>6. That the Council Leader or Board Member for Planning and Transport writes to the County Council and requests that they do the following in consultation with the City Council:</p> <p>a) Implement the Cycle Super Routes and Cycle Premium Routes as soon as possible;</p> <p>b) Bring together cycling organisations, county highways planners and highway engineers to agree a set of specifications for cycle infrastructure design in Oxford, drawing on findings from the London Cycling Campaign. This should include priority phasing of traffic lights for cyclists;</p> <p>c) Consider how cycle routes can be signed more consistently and what the standard should be. We suggest that destinations and distances, rather than route numbers, should be shown on cycle signage;</p> <p>d) Agree that highway maintenance works should not be signed off until they are safe and suitable for cycling;</p> <p>e) Work with Government and other local authorities to implement the All Party Parliamentary Group recommendation to achieve a £10 per head of population</p>	<p>Agreed</p>			



investment in cycling.				
7. That the City Council nominates a Member Cycling Champion (a Councillor) to lead on work to improve cycling in Oxford at a political level and maximise the City Council's influence.	Agreed			
8. That the City Council brings forward proposals for additional staffing resources to enable the City Council to engage proactively with cycling groups, work smarter with the County Council, and support the member champion (see recommendation 7). We would suggest 1 FTE dedicated to cycling, with a creative solution to funding this post which may involve other organisations. This role should include: a) Supporting the Member Cycling Champion (see recommendation 6) in convening a forum of the different cycling groups and representatives of other stakeholders such as schools to co-ordinate efforts and agree a common position when lobbying for cycling improvement schemes; b) Engaging with the County Council to maximise the City Council's influence as LTP4 is put into practice; c) Influencing the development of a set of specifications for cycle infrastructure design in Oxford (see recommendation 5e); d) Monitoring the County Council's Highway Asset Management Strategy	In part	<p>While on paper there is much to commend the idea of a City Council employed cycling officer, there are considerable practical concerns about proposed scope of the role, and the impact that it would have. The proposed responsibilities range from the organising of meetings to the identifying of ways in which to change motorists' behaviour, with many of the suggested responsibilities essentially overlapping with those already sitting with the County Council's Highways teams – this seems problematic in a single post.</p> <p>The proposal as it stands can of course form part of the annual budgetary discussions, but at a time of extremely constrained budgets and with many critical services facing cuts to their budgets, the Council may find it difficult to justify substantial expenditure on a new post in an area primarily covered by another local authority's statutory responsibilities. However, there may be scope to develop an innovative partnership approach with major employers/organisations that would share costs and responsibilities. For example a collaboration with the Universities and the local NHS Trusts could provide expertise for their internal travel planning, and at the same</p>		

<p>(road repairs) to identify opportunities for cycling provision to be improved during planned maintenance works (we have identified 4 such projects);</p> <p>e) Examining existing evidence on what works for improving cycling take up;</p> <p>f) Promoting active travel to school through Bikeability training and advocacy, particularly at the beginning of every academic year. Excellence in this area should be recognised perhaps through the Lord Mayor/Member Champion going in to schools to give prizes, or inviting winners to attend civic events.</p> <p>g) Identifying ways to change motorists' behaviour.</p>		<p>time input into the planning of the city-wide cycle network that would join-up their sites. I would suggest that this option is explored as one more likely to deliver the objectives of the review panel. It is important to note that staff resource will be required to develop this sort of 'sustainable transport partnership', but once established and supported by other organisations the need for time and financial resource would be less than for a stand-alone officer employed solely by the City Council.</p>		
<p>9. That the City Council promotes positive images of cycling in Council literature, particularly the soon to be signed route to Blackbird Leys pool.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>The City Council already promotes cycling through maps, leaflets and other publications which highlight cycling's benefits for both individual health and the collective well-being of the city, and will continue to do so.</p>		
<b>Municipal Bonds – Finance Panel 2 July</b>				
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Agreed Y/N</b>	<b>Suggested executive response provided by the Board Member for Finance</b>	<b>Lead Member &amp; Officer</b>	<b>Implemented Y/N / due date</b>
<p>1. That the City Council welcomes the establishment of the Municipal Bonds Agency as a worthwhile social investment vehicle and source of capital financing.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Agreed. The City Council welcomes the establishment as an alternative source of financing to PWLB</p>	<p>Cllr Turner / Nigel Kennedy</p>	<p>10 Sept CEB</p>
<p>2. That the City Council doesn't make significant investments in the Municipal Bonds Agency or borrow from it at this stage but keeps a watching brief on the Agency and considers it as a future</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Agreed. There is still some uncertainty about the rate of return any investor would get from investing in the Municipal Bond Agency if indeed there would be any at all. There are no plans to undertake prudential borrowing in</p>	<p>Cllr Turner / Nigel Kennedy</p>	<p>10 Sept CEB</p>

source of prudential borrowing.		the immediate future to fund capital expenditure and given latest announcements from the Chancellors Budget in July the authority will be looking to reassess all its future spending plans. When and if the authority has a requirement to borrow then it will consider all sources of finance.		
3. That the Executive Member for Finance, in consultation with the Head of Financial Services, considers the case for the City Council making a £10k capital investment to become a minimum shareholder in the Municipal Bonds Agency before its first bond issuance, which is expected to take place in September 2015. This investment would be made with no guarantee of a return but it would secure preferential interest rates on any future Council borrowing.	In Part	<p>There still remains uncertainty as to the rationale behind investing in the MBA since the Council currently has no requirement to borrow in the immediate future. The preferential rate referred to (and mentioned at the Finance Panel by the representative of the MBA) is not referred to in any of the documentation submitted to the Council and therefore cannot be validated. Information obtained from the Council Treasury advisors, Capita suggest that there remains a number of unanswered questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early paperwork from the MBA referred to a 'new issue premium' in the first year or two, it is uncertain whether early joiner borrowing authorities would voluntarily pay a higher interest rate</li> <li>• There is a joint and several guarantee for investors, whilst this would presumably be in proportion to holding there may be a risk to the authority</li> <li>• How flexible can the agency be around bond maturities and how will it ensure that its meets the requirements of its customers in terms of size, duration and interest rate.</li> </ul>	Cllr Turner / Nigel Kennedy	29 Oct Finance Panel

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The MBA representative mentioned that the preferential rate for investors would be 2 or 3 basis points below the preferential bond rate for other investors (although this is by no means certain). Additionally rates move quickly and this differential could be wiped out quickly even before the overall costs of the bond are taken into consideration.</li> </ul> <p>Due to the level of uncertainties although a £10k 'hedge' may be seen as relatively small in the scale of the Council's overall finances there are a number of important questions which need to be answered before such funds should be committed. Officers will undertake to investigate answers to these questions and either commit £10k if the answers suggest investment would be in the interests of the Council, or report back to CEB and Scrutiny within the next three months with the outcome of the investigation.</p>		
4. That in considering whether to make a minimal investment (Recommendation 3), the Head of Financial Services speaks with one or more District Councils that have already signed up as shareholders in the Agency.	In part	The MBA advise that there are 10 authorities who have invested £10k with the fund although it is not known who they are. To some extent it is irrelevant as to the reason why other authorities have invested in the fund since it is a matter of judgement for the Section 151 Officer of this authority in consultation with the Finance and Asset Portfolio Holder to decide whether to invest.	Cllr Turner / Nigel Kennedy	N/A
<b>Integrated Performance Report for Quarter 4 2014/15 – Finance Panel 2 July</b>				
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Agreed</b>	<b>Executive response</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Implemented</b>

	Y/N		Member & Officer	Y/N / due date
1. The General Fund outturn position for 2014-15 - a favourable variance of £1.808m which is mainly due to increased income - is a very good outcome and we recommend that officers are congratulated on overachieving against income targets.	Y	The favourable variance has largely arisen from increased income arising from commercial property rents, engineering works and other income. As deputy leader, I quite agree that officers are to be congratulated.	Cllr Turner / Nigel Kennedy	Y
2. We support the transfer of £1.4m to a Dry Recyclate Reserve and recommend that the City Council urgently assesses options for significantly mitigating this serious budget pressure, including exploring the possibility of building and operating a waste transfer station and changing the Council's waste collection system.	Y	The Council is exploring a number of options to mitigate budgetary pressures around dry recyclate which have become apparent during negotiations for the renewal of the contract with the current waste transfer station provider. Due to changes in the market price for recyclate the current provider is seeking significant increases in gate fees in order to ensure the viability of the current operation.	Cllr Turner / Nigel Kennedy	Recycling Panel to monitor
3. We note that there are 4 red performance indicators against Meeting Housing Needs but only 3 are explained in the Corporate Summary. We recommend that this is corrected and that fuller explanations are given for the amber risks relating to Environmental Development (section 4.3 in the Community Services Directorate).	In part	The missing red performance indicator for Meeting Housing Needs relates to Tenant satisfaction with their Estates; this has been discussed in a previous report and there is no new data. Further explanation on the risks within Environmental Development are included in the attached appendix.	Cllr Turner / Nigel Kennedy	N/A
4. That the City Executive Board considers: a) Re-directing a relatively small portion of the under-spend towards addressing homelessness, where it could potentially go a long way; b) Other potential uses for part of the under-spend in improving performance against corporate targets, including investing in an additional HMO licensing officer.	N	The under-spends from 2014/15 has been transferred to earmarked reserves largely to mitigate future budgetary pressures. A small proportion has been transferred to the capital funding reserve which is considered prudent given the size of the council's capital programme. There is already a substantive reserve available for the area of homelessness and this can be used if needed. HMO licensing is currently being consulted on and it will be appropriate to consider whether the staffing resource is adequate as part of the response to that consultation.	Cllr Turner / Nigel Kennedy	N/A

5. That the City Council continues to embed and improve the capital gateway process to further reduce capital slippage.	Y	The overall slippage on the capital budget was around £15million in comparison to the original budget of £63million. This primarily related to three schemes, Rose Hill Community Centre, Affordable Homes Programme, and Vehicles. The average spend on capital over the last 9 years has been around £20million and the delivery of £48.7 million in 2014/15 is significantly above this. The Council will continue to embed and improve its monitoring through the Capital Gateway process	Cllr Turner / Nigel Kennedy	Finance Panel to monitor
<b>Debt Management Policy – Finance Panel 2 July</b>				
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Agreed Y/N</b>	<b>Executive response</b>	<b>Lead Member &amp; Officer</b>	<b>Implemented Y/N / due date</b>
1. That the City Executive Board approves the Debt Management Policy subject to a minor amendment to the timescales for recovering Miscellaneous Debts set out in the table on page 9 of the policy,	Y	There is an error on page 7 of the policy which will be corrected- this should say 10 days and not 7 days.	Cllr Turner / Tanya Bandekar	Y
2. We reaffirm recommendation 15d of the Inequality Panel about the Council moving towards having a single view of debt. It will still require considerable effort to make this a reality but we strongly endorse this direction of travel and the progress made to date, including the use of fraud detection software to identify individuals with multiple debts owed to the Council	Y	The project to implement this software which will allow us the single view of debt is underway, and will greatly assist in the management of all outstanding debts to the Council and allow us to operate in accordance with the Corporate Debt Policy.	Cllr Turner / Tanya Bandekar	June 2016
3. That consideration is given to restructuring relevant teams and resources around a single view of debt model as this initiative progresses.	Y	This is already underway as the team restructures take effect and the software is implemented. Most debt collection activities including revenues and housing rents are now under the Head of Financial Services.	Cllr Turner / Tanya Bandekar	June 2016