

Appendix 1 – Draft City Executive Board response to recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee made on 5 March 2019 concerning street art and graffiti

Draft response provided by the Board Member for Safer, Greener Oxford

<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Agree?</i>	<i>Comment</i>
<p>Recommendation 1: That the Council considers how best to define 'larger commercial ventures' when requiring such private land owners to pay for the removal of graffiti, to ensure the policy is applied consistently.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>Larger Commercial Ventures are any business that has more than one premises. For smaller businesses Oxford City Council would seek to remove graffiti of up to 4m².</p> <p>Any racist, obscene, homophobic or hate related graffiti in the public domain will be removed or obscured on all businesses (but only the graffiti that fall into one of the aforementioned categories). All remaining graffiti will be charged as above.</p>
<p>Recommendation 2: That the Council engages more widely with residents and other stakeholders (for example through an appreciative enquiry) concerning the use of Street Art in deterring graffiti in and around Meadow Lane.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>We currently satisfy this recommendation—the Council engages as widely as possible. We have officers who have strong relationships with community figures and manage street art projects inclusively, and this is an asset to the Council and one we should recognise.</p> <p>As with previous street art projects (for example, at the Murco site) Council officers will continue to engage widely and intensively with residents and all those with a direct interest in the proposal to have street art. So far City officers from the Community Response Team have met with Local Councillors for the Meadow Lane project along with the Chair of Iffley Fields Residents Association (IFRA). The Board Member has been in contact with Local Councillors and interested residents. Officers and Ward Councillors have scrutinised the proposed art project for the Meadow Lane site and an officer has met twice with the Sisters at the convent (they own the wall and have sought street art for it). An officer has met with the artist in residence at local primary school, St Mary and St John to discuss the community project; designed a consultation document approved by the Public Involvement Project Briefing; and is arranging to carry out the consultation. An officer is attending the IFRA AGM to speak to local residents and introduce the consultation document before carrying out consultation.</p>

7

<p>Recommendation 3: That the City Executive Board considers how the Council can be creative in deterring graffiti on the commercial security shutters of retail units owned by the Council, to improve the public realm. This could be achieved through the use of street art projects, for example.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>As we were referring to Council-owned properties within the meeting, I would welcome local Councillors identifying the premises that would benefit from street art. We would then seek funding for street artwork and link up with local street artists to arrange projects.</p> <p>Any significant intensification of the street art programme would require financial support and further support by all City Councillors. It would be welcome to the CRT to have this funding and support.</p>
<p>Recommendation 4: That the Council ensures that decision making processes relating to the delivery of services through Council-owned companies remain open to pre-decision scrutiny, where those matters are reserved for decision making within the Council.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>The City Executive Board supports the principle that any substantive change to Council policy, whether delivered directly through the Council or commissioned through its wholly-owned companies, remains open to pre-decision scrutiny.</p>