**Scrutiny recommendation tracker 2016/17 – November 2016**

Total recommendations: 63

Agreed 45 72%

Agreed in part 7 11%

Not agreed 11 17%

**17 NOVEMBER 2016 CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD**

**Planning Annual Monitoring Report (AMR)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Recommendation*** | ***Agreed?*** | ***Comment*** |
| 1. That consideration is given to whether or not indicator 33: Traffic growth at inner and outer cordons should be included in future Annual Monitoring Reports, and that reasons are provided either way. | Y | Yes, as with all indicators in the AMR we will continue to review whether or not the data reported is useful. In this instance we believe that the inclusion of the inner and outer cordon point data is a useful and relevant piece of information for the Council to consider when it comes to its planning policies and when dealing with strategic planning issues that go beyond the city’s boundaries as part of fulfilling our ‘duty to co-operate’. For example, when evaluating sites to meet the City’s unmet housing need, this data is highly relevant. The traffic data leads the City Council to a preference for sites on the edge of the city with ample public transport, walking and cycling provision over sites further away and without such provision, such as the recently proposed Chalgrove Airfield site. |

**Digital Strategy**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Recommendation*** | ***Agreed?*** | ***Comment*** |
| 1. That the Council consults with disability groups on improving the accessibility of online council services. | Y | The involvement of representative groups, alongside using national best practice for digital accessibility, will be used to action the commitment in the Strategy and Action Plan |
| 2. That the Digital Strategy and Action Plan consider the needs of visitors to Oxford, in particular how the Council website could direct visitors to tourist providers. | Y | We will review the current provision on our website. Our mobile app already includes a ‘find my nearest’ function for visitors to Oxford. |
| 3. That the Council prioritises improving the ease of use of online planning services, and includes this longer-term aim in the Action Plan. | In Part | Planning is one of the most popular services accessed by the public through our website. In common with a significant number of other local authorities we use a national leading software system to achieve this.  Some action has already taken place to discuss potential improvements with our software supplier. In addition, we are actively talking to other local authorities that may have developed their own interface to this software, that we could work with.  It is suggested this recommendation is actioned instead as a separate feasibility project within the ICT work plan. |
| 4. That consideration is given to whether the Council’s website could be more accessible from community centres. | Y | We agree that a scoping exercise be commissioned to determine what publicly accessible computer services are available in different communities of the city (including in community facilities and remote accessibility); and work out where the gaps are. |
| 5. That consideration is given to whether the Digital Strategy could be combined with the Community Engagement Strategy in future. | N | While there are undoubtedly enhancements to engagement that can arise from using digital channels, there are a wide range of successful methodologies that do not (and should not) use such channels. For example, our successful Rose Hill Community Centre project demonstrated the impact of face-to-face engagement to involve the public in our work.  It is proposed that the two Strategies remain separate to ensure a focus on their intended areas is retained, but that both Strategies and Action Plans includes a commitment to using digital channels to improve and enhance citizen engagement. |