

**Scrutiny Reports
and
Minutes of meeting held on 03 October
for
Cabinet - Wednesday 9 October 2019**

7. Scrutiny Committee Reports (Pages 3 - 18)

13. Minutes (Pages 19 - 22)

This page is intentionally left blank

To: Cabinet
Date: 09 October 2019
Report of: Scrutiny Committee
Title of Report: Annual Air Quality Status Report 2018

Summary and recommendations	
Purpose of report:	To present Scrutiny Committee recommendations concerning the Annual Air Quality Status Report 2018
Key decision:	No
Scrutiny Lead Member:	Councillor Andrew Gant, Chair of the Scrutiny Committee
Cabinet Member:	Councillor Tom Hayes, Zero Carbon Oxford
Corporate Priority:	A Clean and Green Oxford
Policy Framework:	None
Recommendation: That the Cabinet states whether it agrees or disagrees with the recommendations in the body of this report.	

Appendices
None

Introduction and overview

1. At its meeting on 03 September 2019, the Scrutiny Committee considered the Annual Air Quality Status Report 2018.
2. The Panel would like to thank Councillor Hayes, Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford, for attending the meeting to answer questions. The Committee would also like to thank Mai Jarvis, Environmental Quality Team Manager for supporting the meeting and Pedro Abreu, Air Quality Officer, for compiling the report.

Summary and recommendation

3. The Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford, Councillor Tom Hayes, introduced the report, highlighting a number of key issues. Councillor Hayes located the impetus for addressing the issue in the link between poor air quality and reduced quality and duration of life. It was reported that progress was being made in improving air quality, with a 37% fall in nitrogen dioxide between 2008 and 2018, and a fall over the last five years in the number of sites exceeding the mean annual legal limit from 17 to 4. However, Councillor Hayes also reported that the rate of progress was starting to slow and in some areas had plateaued. In order to continue the level of reduction the Council would need to rely on the innovation and proactivity it had shown previously in the purchasing of electric delivery vehicles, the installation of EV charging points across the city and the development of an 'Energy Superhub' and to maximise the return on the considerable expertise the Council had developed.
4. In response to the report presented the Committee's particular areas of scrutiny focused on two key areas: identifying pertinent information on air quality outside the scope of the report and practical explorations of priority solutions.

Identifying Other Pertinent Information

5. The Committee raised a number of questions in relation to the location of monitoring equipment. Whilst it was noted that the criteria for locating monitoring equipment was set externally by DEFRA the Committee raised concern that the monitoring locations did not account for the health impacts of poverty.
6. The Committee considers this to be an important consideration when seeking to improve outcomes, a view which is backed up by DEFRA's own publications which state, 'Bad air quality affects everyone and it has a disproportionate impact on the young and old, the sick and the poor'.¹ Previous government reports such as the 2010 Marmot Review correlate with the concerns of the Committee, that individuals in deprived areas experience more adverse health effects at the same level of exposure compared to those from less deprived areas.
7. The Committee welcomes the additional flexibility in recording air quality at sites beyond the DEFRA-mandated spots afforded by the OxAir project and encourages the responsible officers to press for including wards falling within the bottom 20% on the indices of multiple deprivation as a criterion for developing their monitoring plans.
8. Whilst the mean levels of nitrogen dioxide are recorded as part of the report, the Committee noted the different impacts those levels could have on different transport users: those travelling by car, by bike and by foot. The intention of monitoring the impacts of air quality on those different modes as part of the OxAir project was welcomed.

¹ <https://laqm.defra.gov.uk/assets/63091defraairqualityguide9web.pdf> p.4

9. The Committee also expressed interest in future planning of transport issues. The Committee welcomed the news that the major developments in Oxford such as Oxford North and the Barton Park development have been included in the County Council's projections for future transport demand.

Priority Solutions

10. During discussion it was established following questions that the dispersal rates over distance of nitrogen dioxide, the most widely measured air pollutant, meant that homes close to railway engine idling points have not been found to be subject to levels above the proscribed limit. Nevertheless, the Committee retained a residual concern on the basis that particulate levels were not being monitored. It was noted that both trains and boats are not subject to the Clean Air Act, allowing for higher levels of air pollutant emissions. In relation to the emissions from canal boats the Committee discussed the importance of running generators to powering basic appliances for those living on canal boats.

Recommendation 1: Further consideration be given to measures to control emissions arising from the exemption of trains and canal boats from the Clean Air Act, particularly with regard to boats at non-permanent moorings close to residential areas.

11. The Committee discussed options around extending the coverage of the City Centre Low Emission Zone to HGVs and coaches and whether such extensions would be desirable. The general consensus was broadly sympathetic towards extension but the Committee was also mindful of the practical issues and consequences of any such decision. It was noted that the County Council as the Highways Authority would be the final decision-maker on such matters.
12. The Committee recognised the efforts made to reduce idling on St Giles but sought to explore the possibility of reducing idling in other areas, and particularly around schools. The Council's efforts to tackle idling around schools were praised and the national recognition it had received was noted. However, the Committee considers the risk to children, who are particularly vulnerable to poor air quality, through idling near schools to remain unacceptably high and that stronger action is required. It is noted that the Council is not responsible for implementation of parking exclusion zones.

Recommendation 2: The County Council be encouraged to consider implementing parking exclusion zones close to schools in the City

13. A further issue explored by the Committee around tackling idling concerned the challenges of enforcement. The framing of current legislation was explained to make enforcement almost impossible because it would rely on an idling vehicle driver refusing to turn off their engine. Whilst it was reported that current legislation, including around enforcement, was presently being reviewed by Central Government in its forthcoming Environment Act, it was not automatically the case that enforcement powers would vest with District and City Councils in two-tier areas. The Committee considers the retention of anti-idling enforcement powers to be crucial in tackling poor air quality.

Recommendation 3: The Council seeks in every way to ensure that it is empowered in the forthcoming Environment Act to take enforcement action against idling vehicles.

Further Consideration

14. The importance of scrutinising air quality, particularly due to its impacts on the length and quality of life of residents, is recognised by consideration of the Annual Air Quality Status Report as a standing item on the Committee’s agenda. The Committee affirms its commitment to annual consideration.

Report author	Tom Hudson
Job title	Scrutiny Officer
Service area or department	Law and Governance
Telephone	01865 252191
e-mail	thudson@oxford.gov.uk

Cabinet response to recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee made on 03/09/2019 concerning the Annual Air Quality Status Report 2018

Provided by the Board Member for Zero Carbon Oxford, Councillor Tom Hayes

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
1) Further consideration be given to measures to control emissions arising from the exemption of trains and canal boats from the Clean Air Act, particularly with regard to boats at non-permanent moorings close to residential areas.	Yes	Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford will continue to lobby central government on the need for comprehensive Clean Air legislation. As has been highlighted rail and waterways are currently exempt from any local authority ability to take action.
2) The County Council be encouraged to consider implementing parking exclusion zones close to schools in the city	Yes	This will be suggested to relevant colleagues and officers at County Council
3) The Council seeks in every way to ensure that it is empowered in the forthcoming Environment Act to take enforcement action against idling vehicles.	Yes	<p>Central Government recognise that current legislation is not working. As such, in June 2019, a bill to increase penalties for stationary vehicle idling offences; to grant local authorities increased powers to issue such penalties was submitted to the House of Commons.</p> <p>In July 2019, Transport Secretary Chris Grayling made the commitment to launch a public consultation in 2019, looking at increasing local authorities' powers and guidance to local authorities on their anti-idling powers, enabling them to enforce the law more effectively.</p>

Date of Cabinet Meeting: **09/10/2019**

		<p>Oxford City Council is waiting for the outcomes of the public consultation and for a future anti-idling bill to become an Act of Parliament. In addition, the Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford has met with DEFRA civil servants in a meeting organised by UK100 to explicitly lobby on this issue.</p>
--	--	---

To: Cabinet
Date: 09 October 2019
Report of: Scrutiny Committee
Title of Report: Performance Monitoring – Quarter 1

Summary and recommendations	
Purpose of report:	To present Scrutiny Committee recommendations concerning the Performance Monitoring 2019/20 Q1
Key decision:	No
Scrutiny Lead Member:	Councillor Andrew Gant, Chair of the Scrutiny Committee
Cabinet Member:	Councillor Susan Brown, Leader, Economic Development and Partnerships
Corporate Priority:	An Efficient and Effective Council
Policy Framework:	None
Recommendation: That the Cabinet states whether it agrees or disagrees with the recommendations in the body of this report.	

Appendices
None

Introduction and overview

1. At its meeting on 03 September 2019, the Scrutiny Committee considered the Performance Monitoring 2019/20 Q1 report. The report details Council performance against a set of indicators the Committee has chosen to track for the period 01 April 2019 to 30 June 2019.
2. The Committee would like to thank Rachel Heap, Corporate Governance Officer, for compiling the report.

Summary and recommendation

3. In considering the Performance Monitoring 2019/20 report the Committee have devised six recommendations as outlined below.
4. On an overall point, the Committee was appreciative of the efforts made by officers in responding to questions raised by Committee members prior to the meeting and with little notice. It was felt that notwithstanding the pressure on officers it was a valuable approach in providing more informed scrutiny. Whilst all efforts will be made to mitigate the short time-scales, the Committee wishes to flag the likelihood of repeating the approach in the future in order to enable planned accommodation by officers when it does.
5. Whilst clearly many of the indicators used to monitor performance relate to specific functions of the Council itself, a number of the indicators, such as BI001 (the percentage of spend with local business, CH001 (days lost to sickness), and CoS031 (effective delivery of the capital programme) are organisationally cross-cutting in nature. It was unclear to the Committee whether, and if so, how, these cross-cutting indicators included or did not include data from Oxford Direct Services or Oxford City Housing Limited. Determining this will help the Committee form a view on the sufficiency of current performance monitoring arrangements.

Recommendation 1: There should be clarification about which, if any, of the corporate performance indicators include data from Oxford Direct Services or Oxford City Housing Limited and the way in which these were used, particularly in reference to whether under measure BI001 (percentage of Council spend with local businesses) Oxford Direct Services is recorded as a recipient of Council spend, a contributor to Council spend or both?

6. The Committee queried ED002 (Implementation of measures to reduce the City Council's carbon footprint by 5% each year.) It was felt that the natural reading implied an absolute reduction, rather than a relative one. It was also felt that without information on the assumptions that lay behind the calculation of the notional carbon figure against which the Council's reduction target was to be measured against the usefulness of the measure was difficult to judge.

Recommendation 2: That the wording of measure ED002 (Implementation of measures to reduce the City Council's carbon footprint by 5% each year) should be reviewed and that information on the methodology for calculating the Council's anticipated carbon footprint be made available to members of the Scrutiny Committee.

7. In relation to the Council's monitoring of Fusion, measure LP220 (The number of people from the Council's target groups using its leisure facilities) was felt by the Committee to require additional monitoring. Whilst appreciating the impact of

concessions on the following measure, revenues is felt to be more a robust overall measure of performance. On the basis that cleanliness and maintenance are the biggest source of complaint, progress against maintenance targets is felt by the Committee to be the best indicator of customer satisfaction.

Recommendation 3: That indicator LP220 (The number of people from the Council's target groups using its leisure facilities) be supplemented with two further measures: i) revenue vs previous periods, and ii) progress against maintenance targets.

8. With regards to measure CoS031 (Effective delivery of the capital programme) the Committee commented on how it is currently unclear what the percentage measure actually refers to: milestones, total spend or projects.

Recommendation 4: That measure CoS031 (Effective delivery of the capital programme) be changed to either i) disbursements, or ii) contractual commitments as a percentage of budgetary targets.

9. In discussing the Council's performance against measure WR001 (Number of people moved into work by the Welfare Reform Programme) the Committee discussed feedback by the officers indicating the existence of seasonality within performance. Quarter 1 performance was considered in light of the challenges the Welfare Reform team were experiencing in regards to retention of staff. It is the feeling of the Committee that even with the positive season effects to come, the challenges faced by the team make it unlikely that they will achieve the target figure and that Council consider whether it wishes to maintain an unrealistic target.

Recommendation 5: That in light of the challenges facing the Welfare Reform team, WR001 (Number of people moved into work by the Welfare Reform Programme) is no longer realistic and that a revised target be agreed.

10. The Committee noted the comments made in the report in relation to indicator CS054 (Time taken to determine DHP applications) that 40% of applications were from Universal Credit claimants. Delays arising from the processing of Universal Credit, an externally performed function, made it impossible to meet the target. The fact that the Council is processing applications within the relevant timeframes when they are within its control is welcome, but it is felt by the Committee that the degree to which external factors distort the Council's own performance merits a reconsideration of the criterion.

Recommendation 6: That in light of the growth of Universal Credit and the increasing influence factors external to the Council have on the delivery of this criterion that Cabinet considers whether indicator CS054 (Time taken to determine DHP applications) remains fit for purpose.

11. The Committee also gave consideration to levels of long-term sickness amongst the service areas referenced as having a higher than target level of absence under measure CH001, the cost of enforcement action for Council Tax under indicator BV009, and the degree of the Council's liability following the breach of contract by the solar car port contractor at the Leys Pool under indicator ED002 but made no recommendation.

Further Consideration

12. Ongoing, regular scrutiny of the Council's performance forms a fundamental part of the Committee's function. The Committee affirms its commitment to continued quarterly consideration.

Report author	Tom Hudson
Job title	Scrutiny Officer
Service area or department	Law and Governance
Telephone	01865 252191
e-mail	thudson@oxford.gov.uk

Cabinet response to recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee made on 03/09/2019 concerning the Performance Monitoring Q1 report

Provided by the Cabinet Member for Finance and Asset Management, Councillor Ed Turner

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
1) There should be clarification about which, if any, of the corporate performance indicators include data from Oxford Direct Services or Oxford City Housing Limited and the way in which these were used, particularly in reference to whether under measure BI001 (percentage of Council spend with local businesses) Oxford Direct Services is recorded as a recipient of Council spend, a contributor to Council spend or both?	Yes	
2) That the wording of measure ED002 (Implementation of measures to reduce the City Council's carbon footprint by 5% each year) should be reviewed and that information on the methodology for calculating the Council's anticipated carbon footprint be made available to members of the Scrutiny Committee.	Yes	
3) That indicator LP220 (The number of people from the Council's target groups using its leisure facilities) be supplemented with two further measures: i) revenue vs previous periods, and ii) progress against maintenance targets.	Yes	
4) That measure CoS031 (Effective delivery of the capital programme) be changed to either i) disbursements, or ii) contractual commitments as a percentage of budgetary targets.	Yes	

<p>5) That in light of the challenges facing the Welfare Reform team, WR001 (Number of people moved into work by the Welfare Reform Programme) is no longer realistic and that a revised target be agreed.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>6) That in light of the growth of Universal Credit and the increasing influence factors external to the Council have on the delivery of this criterion that Cabinet considers whether indicator CS054 (Time taken to determine DHP applications) remains fit for purpose.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	

To: Cabinet
Date: 09 October 2019
Report of: Scrutiny Committee
Title of Report: Modernising Leisure Concessions

Summary and recommendations	
Purpose of report:	To present Scrutiny Committee recommendations concerning Modernising Leisure Concessions
Key decision:	Yes
Scrutiny Lead Member:	Councillor Andrew Gant, Chair of the Scrutiny Committee
Cabinet Member:	Councillor Linda Smith, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Leisure and Housing
Corporate Priority:	Strong Active Communities, Efficient Effective Council
Policy Framework:	Leisure and Wellbeing Strategy, 2015 - 2020
Recommendation: That the Cabinet states whether it agrees or disagrees with the recommendations in the body of this report.	

Appendices
None

Introduction and overview

1. At its meeting on 01 October 2019, the Scrutiny Committee considered the report on Modernising Leisure Concessions.
2. The Panel would like to thank Councillor Linda Smith, Cabinet Member for Leisure and Housing, for attending the meeting to answer questions. The Committee would also like to thank James Baughan, Performance and Impact Officer, for supporting the meeting, David Hunt, Commercial Manager, and Lucy Cherry, Leisure and Performance Manager, for compiling the report.

Summary and recommendation

3. The Cabinet Member for Leisure and Housing, Councillor Linda Smith, introduced the report. Recent changes to the benefits scheme necessitated a redesign of the concessions scheme, particularly in light of the retirement of some benefits and their replacement with others. A number of options had been considered to ensure that concessions were targeted within the benefits environment most accurately. Offering concessions to those in receipt of Universal Credit (UC) was deemed insufficiently focused, whereas using receipt of either the housing element of UC or entitlement to the Council Tax Reduction Scheme (CTRS) as criteria did afford more specific targeting. Changes were also being made to the older person's discount to reflect the changes in pension age, with eligibility rising from 60 to 65.
4. In response to the report presented the Committee's particular areas of scrutiny focused on a number of key areas:
 - Information on the scale and prospective mitigation for those potentially facing a cliff-edge by ceasing to be eligible for concessions, particularly around the proposed pensioner age increase
 - PIP usage and
 - Armed Forces
5. The Committee makes two recommendations.

Scale of and mitigations for current members facing losing existing concessions

6. Whilst sympathetic to the reasons for changing the eligibility for concessions and the proposed means to target those in need for future members, the Committee expressed concern over the impact changes could have on existing members ceasing to be eligible for concessions, particularly in light of the fact that concessionary rates are low cost, whilst the standard membership is relatively high in comparison to other providers, meaning a significant rise in fees.
7. Of particular concern was the proposal to increase the age at which over 60s become eligible for concessions to reflect the pension age, with moving the qualifying age up to 66 in October 2020. In discussion, it was noted that forming or maintaining exercise habits in an individual's 60s are particularly crucial determinants of future health and quality of life. As such, the desirability of enforcing an increase to this group was questioned. It was fed back to the Committee that the rise in fees would for example be £16 per month for a full Choice membership; £14.50 per month for a swim only membership; and that it was anticipated that most sixty year olds would either be working or have taken early retirement, indicating an ability to pay. For those who retired early without ability to pay alternative concessionary categories remained. The Council did need to look towards the sustainability of its service, and that entailed the most effective targeting of any subsidy. It was not anticipated that there would be a significant fall-off in demand.
8. Further discussion took place over how many current members were in the 60 – 65 age bracket. Officers were unable to provide the figures. It was considered that

understanding the number of people impacted would form an important part in balancing out the priorities of sustainability, fairness and public health.

9. It is the view of the Committee that the public health consideration of encouraging individuals in their 60s to continue exercise is highly important, and that although not an excessive absolute figure, the rise of approximately 50% would act as a disincentive to this. Further, if the number of people impacted is small, and thus the impact on the service's sustainability is also small, the benefits of making such a change may be outweighed by the negatives. If, on further consideration, this is not the case it is the view of the Committee that efforts to mitigate the disincentives should be made.

Recommendation 1: That Cabinet i) identify the precise number of current over 60 members who will be due to lose their existing discount by the proposed rise in age-related concessions and will not qualify for an alternative concession, ii) to give careful consideration to whether it wishes to implement this change, and if so, iii) to consider ways of mitigating the impact, such as phasing the increases or exploring whether Fusion would honour existing age-related concessions.

10. The Committee also commented on the fact that Appendix 2 of the report states that Employment and Support Allowance (ESA) be removed as an eligibility criterion because many of the claimants will claim CTRS, as well as the fact that it is in the process of being replaced by UC. At the meeting it was not known how many individuals would no longer qualify for a concession following the removal of ESA as a qualifying benefit or the anticipated length of time the transition to UC would take for the cohort impacted. Other benefits, such as Job Seeker's (JSA) and Income Support (IS) are similar.
11. It is recognised by the Committee that the decision to remove Working Tax Credit and Child Tax Credit is an explicit policy choice, but that ESA, JSA and IS are being replaced on the basis that many current recipients will qualify through alternative routes. Though the number of memberships held by individuals on ESA is unknown, the number on JSA and IS is low (60 and 19 respectively). Therefore, the anticipated number no longer qualifying under an alternative benefit is lower still. Further, it is recognised that due to the lack of information provided by Fusion with regards to the number of ESA claimants, it is possible that ESA claimants may be one the categories grouped with other similar ones (as referred to in paragraph 25 of the report). The impact of this would be that the pool of individuals who may be negatively impacted is a small subset of the known figure of 79 JSA and IS-based concessionary members. It is the view of the Committee that for these marginal cases it may be preferable that they retain their eligibility for concessionary membership, and should this not be possible, to consider a delay which would reduce the number of people impacted.

Recommendation 2: That Cabinet i) ascertain whether Employment Support Allowance is a category grouped by Fusion into another category, and if not, to identify the number by alternative means ii) estimate the number of current concessionary members on Employment Support Allowance, Job Seekers Allowance or Income Support who are liable to lose their eligibility for concessionary rates under the proposed changes, and iii) pending other factors, consider whether to remove these categories as eligibility criteria, or alternatively, to delay their removal so as to enable the transition to alternative qualifying benefits to be more advanced.

12. There are no further recommendations, but the following is included for context and information.

Personal Independence Payments

13. The Committee noted the low number of people in receipt of Personal Independence Payments (PIP) holding leisure memberships (7) and the importance of providing facilities for these people. Whilst Fusion were reported to be responsible for outreach and sports development as part of their contract, the Committee encouraged more to be done to promote the leisure centres and improve the take-up of gym memberships by those eligible under PIP and other benefits.

Armed Forces

14. The Committee addressed the proposal that UK military personnel and their families be provided a 10% discount on full memberships. However, it was noted that the discount formed part of Fusion's own nationwide corporate discount scheme, a scheme similarly open to members of private companies or the NHS and not discussed further.

Further Consideration

15. The Committee may, in the development of its future work plan, wish to seek an update on the impacts of the concessionary changes agreed. In the event that this does not happen, it is not anticipated that this topic will be revisited by the Committee.

Report author	Tom Hudson
Job title	Scrutiny Officer
Service area or department	Law and Governance
Telephone	01865 252191
e-mail	thudson@oxford.gov.uk

Minutes of a meeting of the CABINET on Thursday 3 October 2019

www.oxford.gov.uk



Committee members:

Councillor Turner (Vice-Chair, in the Chair)	Councillor Linda Smith (Deputy Leader)
Councillor Chapman	Councillor Clarkson
Councillor Hayes	Councillor Hollingsworth
Councillor Rowley	Councillor Upton

Officers:

Gordon Mitchell, Chief Executive
Caroline Green, Assistant Chief Executive
Anita Bradley, Monitoring Officer
Nigel Kennedy, Head of Financial Services
Stephen Clarke, Head of Housing Services / Director Housing Companies
Dave Scholes, Housing Strategy & Needs Manager (Affordable Housing Supply Lead)
Tom Hudson, Scrutiny Officer
Jennifer Thompson, Committee and Members Services Officer

Also present:

Councillor Andrew Gant

Apologies:

Councillors Brown and Tidball sent apologies.

In the absence of the Leader, Cllr Ed Turner took the Chair with the consent of the Cabinet.

61. Declarations of Interest

None.

62. Addresses and Questions by Members of the Public

None.

63. Councillor Addresses on any item for decision on the Board's agenda

None.

64. Councillor Addresses on Neighbourhood Issues

None.

65. Items raised by Board Members

None.

66. Scrutiny Committee Report

Councillor Gant, speaking in his capacity as Chair of the Scrutiny Committee, spoke to the Committee's report on the commissioning of services at Floyds Row.

Cllr Gant explained the reasons for the Committee's three recommendations to Cabinet, as set out in the committee report.

The Cabinet Member accepted all the recommendations. She commented that the Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government sought bids for disparate funding 'pots' on often unrealistically tight timescales. The council needed, and was preparing, to be ready to very quickly submit bids with more accurate project plans and costings.

67. Commissioning of services at Floyds Row

The Head of Housing had submitted a report to seek approval to increase the capital budget envelope for the Floyds Row project; to delegate authority to commission further capital works; and to commission the service contract to operate services from this new project.

Councillor Linda Smith, Cabinet Member for Leisure and Housing, introduced the report. She explained that although the costs had escalated as the scale of the necessary building works became clear the project still provided best value in terms of costs per bed, and the best option for service users and the council.

Dave Scholes, Housing Strategy and Needs Manager, outlined the proposed service provision and the proposed timescale for opening phase 1 and phase 2. The Council was seeking longer term funding from MHCLG but this was not assured. One- and two-year contributions to running costs from Oxfordshire's county and other district councils were secured.

Cabinet members discussed the build costs; the proposed services and controls on access; funding; and noted that this new model of provision was an addition to other existing services in the city. They supported the recommendations in the report and asked for update reports on the funding and operation of Floyds Row to be provided in spring 2020 and autumn 2020.

Cabinet resolved to:

1. **Recommend** that Council revise the capital budget for this project, to take the capital envelope of the project to £1,892,300, including contingencies, as outlined in Appendix 3 Option A, increasing the budget by £1,134k. Noting grant funding already secured of £275k capital funding from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG), and £100k from Public Health England, which will reduce the funding requirement from the Council's

2019/20 capital programme accordingly, and noting that additional external funding contributions are being progressed from a variety of sources, including the MHCLG; Oxfordshire District and County Councils; the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group and other charitable sources;

2. **Recommend** that Council make budget provision for the gross revenue costs of providing Floyds Row in the sum of £1.069 million in 2019-20 funded by grants and contributions;
3. **Delegate** authority to the Assistant Chief Executive, in consultation with the Head of Finance and Head of Law and Governance, to enter into contracts to complete the full capital works to convert the building (phases 1 and 2), on the basis that in the opinion of the Head of Finance, that this continues to represent best value;
4. **Delegate** authority to the Regeneration and Major Projects Service Manager, in consultation with the Heads of Housing and Finance, to enter into a lease of Floyds Row for a peppercorn rent, on the basis as summarised in this report;
5. **Delegate** authority to the Head of Housing, to enter into a Service Contract as set out in this report, for the delivery of services at Floyds Row from 1st April 2020 to 31st March 2021;
6. **Note** that the current Street Outreach Team contract with the Council will be varied to include the interim service arrangements (worth c.£400k) up to end March 2020 within existing budget and funding envelopes;
7. **Delegate** authority to the Head of Housing to undertake the re-procurement of the Street Outreach and Floyds Row commissioned services during 2020/21, noting a further report will be brought to Cabinet in late 2020, to recommend the award of contract; and the annual report on rough sleeping and single homelessness commissioning spend, will be brought to Cabinet in March 2020;
8. **Agree** to provide the grant funding proposed in this report in order to facilitate the initial trial period of operation of the Floyds Row assessment centre; and
9. **Note** the progress with the development of this venue and new services, as part of a wider transformation programme. Noting that interim Somewhere Safe to Stay and Winter Shelter services will commence from Simon House from late October 2019, with some services moving to Floyds Row in January 2020, with the current programme expecting the completion of Floyds Row by end March 2020.
10. **Request update reports** from the Head of Housing on the funding and operation of Floyds Row in spring 2020 and autumn 2020.

68. Minutes

Cabinet resolved to APPROVE the minutes of the meeting held on 11 September 2019 as a true and accurate record.

69. Dates of Future Meetings

Cabinet noted that meetings are scheduled for the following dates:

- 09 October 2019
- 13 November 2019
- 11 December 2019

All meetings start at 6pm.

The meeting started at 6.00 pm and ended at 6.35 pm

Chair

Date: Wednesday 9 October 2019