

# Agenda

www.oxford.gov.uk



## Scrutiny Committee

Date: **Thursday 7 September 2017**

---

Time: **6.00 pm**

---

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

---

For any further information please contact:

**John Mitchell, Committee Services Officer**

Telephone: (01865) 252217

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

---

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

# Scrutiny Committee

## Membership

<b>Chair</b>	Councillor Andrew Gant
<b>Vice Chair</b>	Councillor Nigel Chapman
	Councillor Mohammed Altaf-Khan
	Councillor Jamila Begum Azad
	Councillor Steven Curran
	Councillor James Fry
	Councillor David Henwood
	Councillor Mark Ladbrooke
	Councillor Ben Lloyd-Shogbesan
	Councillor Mark Lygo
	Councillor Jennifer Pegg
	Councillor David Thomas

The quorum for this Committee is four, substitutes are permitted.

### **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 and at the Westgate Library

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

## Pages

### 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

### 2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

### 3 MINUTES

Minutes from 4 July 2017

**Recommendation:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 4 July 2017 be APPROVED as a true and accurate record.

9 - 12

### 4 REPORT BACK ON RECOMMENDATIONS

Contact Officer: Andrew Brown, Scrutiny Officer,  
Tel 01865 252230, [abrown2@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:abrown2@oxford.gov.uk)

13 - 18

Background Information
Scrutiny is empowered to make recommendations to the City Executive Board and the Board is obliged to respond in writing.
Why is it on the agenda?
For the Committee to note and comment on recent executive responses to Scrutiny recommendations. Since the last meeting the Board has responded to recommendations on the following items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Local Authority Trading Company – Progress report</li><li>• Council Tax Reduction Scheme</li></ul>
Who has been invited to comment?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Andrew Brown, Scrutiny Officer</li></ul>

### 5 WORK PLAN AND FORWARD PLAN

19 - 34

Background Information
The Scrutiny Committee operates within a work plan which is agreed at the start of the Council year. The work plan is reviewed at every meeting so that it can be adjusted to reflect the wishes of the Committee and take account of any changes to the latest <a href="#">Forward Plan</a> (which outlines decisions to be taken by the City Executive Board or Council).
Why is it on the agenda?
The Committee is asked to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Note that a visit to the Recycling Team at the Cowley Marsh depot is planned for 21 September 2017.</li><li>2. Appoint a member to chair Housing Panel. The Panel met in July but was unable to elect a chair because the votes were tied. The following members were nominated and may wish to briefly</li></ol>

<p>explain why they would like to be chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Councillor David Henwood</li> <li>• Councillor David Thomas</li> </ul> <p>3. Review and note the Scrutiny Work Plan for the 2017/18 council year.</p> <p>4. Select Forward Plan items for pre-decision scrutiny based on the following criteria (max. 3 per meeting):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Is the issue controversial / of significant public interest?</i></li> <li>• <i>Is it an area of high expenditure?</i></li> <li>• <i>Is it an essential service / corporate priority?</i></li> <li>• <i>Can Scrutiny influence and add value?</i></li> </ul>
Who has been invited to comment?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Andrew Brown, Scrutiny Officer</li> </ul>

**6 ASSESSING DISABLED IMPACTS IN PLANNING**

**6.10 PM 40 MINS**

35 - 42

Background Information
The Scrutiny Committee commissioned a report from the Head of Planning, Sustainable Development and Regulatory Services on how the Council fulfils its duty to assess the impacts on disabled people of new developments and changes of use, including for businesses and private and social sector housing.
Why is it on the agenda?
The Committee is asked to note and comment on the report. The Committee may also wish to agree one or more recommendations to put to the City Executive Board in October.
Who has been invited to comment?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Councillor Alex Hollingsworth, Board Member for Planning &amp; Regulatory Services;</li> <li>• Patsy Dell, Head of Planning, Sustainable Development and Regulatory Services;</li> <li>• Ian Wright, Environmental Health Service Manager;</li> </ul>

**7 OXFORD DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

**6.50 PM 40 MINS**

43 - 50

Background Information
The Scrutiny Committee commissioned a report from the Head of Planning, Sustainable Development and Regulatory Services on the work of the Oxford Design Review Panel.
Why is it on the agenda?
The Committee is asked to note and comment on the report. The Committee may also wish to agree one or more recommendations to put to the City Executive Board in October.
Who has been invited to comment?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Councillor Alex Hollingsworth, Board Member for Planning &amp; Regulatory Services;</li> <li>• Patsy Dell, Head of Planning, Sustainable Development and Regulatory Services;</li> </ul>

**8 GRANT ALLOCATIONS 2016/17 MONITORING REPORT**  
**7.30 PM 30 MINS**

51 - 90

Background Information
The Scrutiny Committee has asked for this item to be included on the agenda for pre-decision scrutiny.
Why is it on the agenda?
The City Executive Board on 19 September 2017 will be asked to note the results of the grant monitoring and the positive impact the community and voluntary sector is making in the city. This is an opportunity for the Scrutiny Committee to make recommendations to the City Executive Board.
Who has been invited to comment?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Councillor Dee Sinclair, Board Member for Culture and Communities;</li> <li>• Julia Tomkins, Grant Officer.</li> </ul>

**9 OXFORD LIVING WAGE - REVIEW SCOPE**  
**8.00 PM 10 MINS**

91 - 94

Background Information
The Scrutiny Committee has appointed Cllr Ladbroke to lead a scrutiny review into "Implementing the Oxford Living Wage across Oxford". A scoping meeting was held on 1 August and a proposed scoping document is included.
Why is it on the agenda?
The Committee is asked to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Approve the scope of the review.</li> <li>2. Appoint Councillors Goff, Iley-Williamson, Lloyd-Shogbesan and Thomas to the review group.</li> </ol>
Who has been invited to comment?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cllr Mark Ladbroke, Chair of the Oxford Living Wage Review Group;</li> <li>• Andrew Brown, Scrutiny Officer</li> </ul>

**10 SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2016/17**  
**8.10 PM 5 MINS**

95 - 106

Background Information
The Scrutiny Committee's Annual Report 2016/17 will be presented to Council on 2 October 2017.
Why is it on the agenda?
The Committee is asked to approve the report subject to any stylistic and textual changes to be agreed by the Chair.
Who has been invited to comment?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Andrew Brown, Scrutiny Officer</li> </ul>

**11 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

**8.15 PM**

Meetings are scheduled as followed:

**Scrutiny Committee**

9 October 2017  
7 November 2017  
5 December 2017

All meetings start at 6.00 pm.

**Standing Panels**

Housing Standing Panel – 11 September 2017 & 12 October 2017  
Finance Standing Panel – 4 September 2017 & 7 December 2017  
Shareholder Standing Panel – 28 September 2017 (provisional)

## **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.

This page is intentionally left blank



## **Minutes of a meeting of the SCRUTINY COMMITTEE on Tuesday 4 July 2017**

www.oxford.gov.uk



### **Committee members:**

Councillor Gant (Chair)

Councillor Chapman (Vice-Chair)

Councillor Altaf-Khan

Councillor Azad

Councillor Curran

Councillor Fry

Councillor Henwood

Councillor Ladbrooke

Councillor Lloyd-Shogbesan

Councillor Pegg

Councillor Thomas

### **Officers:**

Tim Sadler, Executive Director Sustainable City

Vicki Galvin, Sports Development Manager

Andrew Brown, Scrutiny Officer

Sarah Claridge, Committee Services Officer

### **Also present:**

Mark Munday, Divisional Manager for Fusion Lifestyle

### **Apologies:**

Councillor Smith (Board Member for Leisure, Parks and Sports) sent her apologies

## **17. Declarations of interest**

There were no declarations of interest made.

## **18. Minutes**

The following amendment was made to Local Plan Preferred Option (minute 5):

“Car free residential would only be suitable in areas where a controlled parking zone (CPZ) could be enforced”

The Committee resolved to APPROVE the amended minutes of the meeting held on 12 June 2017 as a true and accurate record.

The Committee resolved to APPROVE the minutes of the meeting held on 14 June 2017 as a true and accurate record.

## **19. Report back on recommendations**

The Chair presented the report on recommendations. All recommendations from the meetings in May and June meetings were agreed or agreed in part.

The Committee NOTED the report.

## **20. Fusion Lifestyle's Performance Report - 2016/17**

The Director for Sustainable City presented the Annual report. He highlighted that:

- Participation levels had fallen
- Free swimming sessions for the under 17 had been well attended
- Customer satisfaction levels were high
- Introduction of healthier alternatives were to be offered in the vending machines.

The Divisional Manager for Fusion Lifestyle said that in the last year, participation levels for bonus card holder had reduced. This was due to a combination of leisure centres being renovated and the opening of several low cost gyms in Oxford which are offering cheaper prices for gym users than Fusion. Fusion's business plan is not to match them on price but to focus on value. By providing good quality facilities, continuing to staff the centres and offering a wide range of activities which are attractive to the whole family.

The steeper decline in participation levels of bonus users in deprived areas has led to Fusion offering a cheaper offer for users of the Leys Leisure Centre. There is a higher rate of casual users in deprived areas. This data is not captured by Fusion.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

The Committee requested a breakdown of the participation rate, activity and ethnicity per leisure centre.

Given the market has changed and participation levels are falling, is the current Council contract with Fusion still working? The Director for Sustainable City said that the impact on falling participation rates is more of a financial concern for Fusion than the Council. There are no financial implications for the Council as the Council no longer

pays Fusion an infrastructure grant or user subsidy. If the trend continues, Fusion might get worried about their business model.

The Committee asked to see participation figures for all council funded leisure activities. The Sports Development Manager said that data was available and she will make sure it is sent to the committee.

Both Fusion and the Council will be running marketing campaigns to promote Fusion's range of activities.

GP referrals are still happening and Fusion has trained more staff so that more GP referrals can be accepted. It is a perennial struggle to maintain GP referrals and encourage surgeries to refer people. It was suggested the GP referral form was too cumbersome to fill out. Officer to review this and report feedback to GPs.

Fusion has the same target as the Council to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions each year by 5%. We are getting to a stage where more expensive schemes are needed to meet this target. This year LCD lighting has been installed at Ferry Leisure Centre and a pool cover for Hinksey is being considered.

Concern was raised about BME usage at leisure centres particularly the women's only pool session being staffed by men which has discouraged users. The Divisional Manager for Fusion Lifestyle said that it was Fusion's intention for female staff to run female only sessions however, occasionally it can't be due to sickness etc.

The Committee asked whether Fusion could make the pool private during women only sessions to encourage participation. Fusion would need to look at the participation levels for these specific sessions before committing resources.

The Divisional Manager for Fusion Lifestyle said Fusion needed to do more to promote family membership. He said Fusion could do a postcode analysis targeting BME families' participation in leisure centres.

The Committee asked whether the bonus concession membership include children who are carers. The Divisional Manager for Fusion Lifestyle said he would have to check and would discuss including them if they are not already covered.

The Committee NOTED the report

## **21. Work Plan and Forward Plan**

The Chair presented the report.

### **Work Plan**

The Committee reviewed and noted its work plan for the 2017/18 council year. The Scrutiny Officer said that the Housing Panel will now meet on 5 September to discuss the four CEB housing reports scheduled for September.

Cllr Henwood asked that the Committee add Air Quality to the list of potential review topics. The Committee discussed the merits of each of the 6 suggested review topics.

The Committee agreed to review the topic “Implementing the Oxford Living Wage across Oxford”, Cllr Ladbrook was appointed Chair.

The Scrutiny Officer said he would meet with the chair and a scoped review would come to the Committee in September.

**Forward Plan**

Members of the Finance Panel requested that Item 16 – Additional funding for feasibility studies for investment property development opportunities be looked at by the Finance Panel in September.

The Committee asked if there was a report on tower blocks and fire safety going to CEB in the near future and stressed the importance of Scrutiny considering this issue. The Scrutiny Officer said that the Housing Panel was expecting a briefing at their meeting on July 27 (which had been moved from 10 July, the date listed in the paperwork).

**22. Dates of future meetings**

The Committee agreed to cancel the provisional meeting scheduled for 31 July 2017.

The next meeting is scheduled for 7 September 2017

**The meeting started at 6.03 pm and ended at 7.45 pm**

**Chair .....**

**Date: Thursday 7 September 2017**

## Scrutiny recommendation tracker 2017/18 – August 2017

Total recommendations (year to date):	6	
Agreed	3	50%
Agreed in part	2	33%
Not agreed	1	17%

### 18 JULY 2017 CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD

#### Local Authority Trading Company – Progress report

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Agree?</b>	<b>Comment</b>
That the Council ensures that the very positive potential benefits the trading companies can generate for the Council and the wider community are communicated effectively to the public, elected members and other Council employees, as well as to Direct Services staff, through a robust communications plan.	Yes	

#### Council Tax Reduction Scheme

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Agreed?</b>	<b>Comment</b>
1. That the Council consults on option 1 and perhaps makes it clear that this is a 'preferred option', giving reasons.	Yes	Option 1 will allow the Council to make efficiency savings as Universal Credit is more widely rolled out. It also provides greater flexibility to amend the support provided in the future.
2. That the Council consults on options 2-7 & 9 as options that could form part of a package of measures to simplify the administration of the scheme and/or reduce costs.	Partly	The paper shows the full range of options that were available to the council to consult upon. However, I would propose that when it comes to the consultation, we consult on options 1, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 9 and do not include options 2, 4, 8 and 10-12. For instance, option 2 could discriminate against people with larger families, who may already be affected by other benefit changes such as the Benefit Cap.
3. That the Council does not consult on Option 8.	Yes	As with option 2, option 8 discriminates against larger families.
4. That the Council consults on Option 10, 11 and 12 making it clear that these are not the Council's preferred options, giving reasons.	Not agreed	My preference would be to not include these in the consultation as these are not options that I would support.

**15 JUNE 2017 CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD**

**Local Plan Preferred Options**

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Agree?</b>	<b>Comment</b>
That consideration is given to the possibility and desirability of using planning policy to protect and control shopping frontages in smaller shopping areas that are not classified as local centres.	In part	<p>Local centres are considered in the Local Plan Preferred Options document as part of the hierarchy of centres for town centres uses. Town centres are where town centre uses should be directed. The definition of Town centres in the NPPF explicitly excludes neighbourhood centres.</p> <p>An option to include a lower tier of centres (below Local Centres) has not been put forward in the Plan, as this is not therefore considered to be compliant with the NPPF which sets out that small parades of shops are not classed as 'centres'. The proposed Local Centres are listed in the Options document, and if consultees consider further areas should to be identified as centres, they can be put forward during the consultation, and if it's considered that they do meet the NPPF definition then they can be included in the draft plan.</p>

14

**27 JULY 2017 HOUSING PANEL**

**Detailed response to Housing Panel recommendations on university housing needs**

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Agree?</b>	<b>Comment</b>
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:	Y	<p>April 2017 - I welcome the constructive and open dialogue with the two Universities about their accommodation needs, which have been held between officers, members and the two institutions over a prolonged period, and will continue to be held.</p> <p>I recognise the positive contribution that the Universities make to the city in terms of economic growth, vitality, and employment, and the City Council wants to continue to support them. This kind of engagement is exactly what this stage of the Local Plan is all about, as we work towards publishing the Preferred Options in June 2017.</p> <p>At present detailed evidence, technical work, consultation responses from last summer, and sustainability appraisal are all being considered, and will inform the direction of policies to be published in the Preferred Options. The evidence given by</p>

	<p>the Universities to the Scrutiny Committee, and the Scrutiny Committee's recommendations, will be included in that consideration.</p> <p>While that work is still ongoing it would not be appropriate to respond in detail at this stage to the precise proposals, other than to confirm that they are all being considered alongside all other proposals. That being said, there are a number of very useful and interesting proposals within the report which are being given very careful consideration as to whether they could be included in the Preferred Options document.</p> <p>Given that it is not possible at this stage to pre-empt the proposals that will be included in the Preferred Options document, but being aware of the detailed work that the Scrutiny Panel have done on this issue, I propose that a full and detailed response to each proposal in the Scrutiny Panel report is sent back to the Panel once the Preferred Options document has been published.</p>
a) Encouraging the University of Oxford to present proposals for accommodating postdocs in the city; (para. 4)	<p>July 2017 – Officers have had a series of meetings with the University to discuss a range of issues relating to their operations in the city including how to address accommodation needs beyond undergraduates, such as post-docs and staff accommodation needs.</p>
b) Allocating specific sites for new student accommodation for the two universities; (paras. 8a &16)	<p>July 2017 – Various sites are proposed to be explored further as potentially suitable for site allocations for student accommodation for the two universities. Some are existing allocations being rolled forward, and some are new sites which the landowner has promoted through the call for sites for the Local Plan. For example sites 006, 010, 012, 017, 021, 023, 027, 031, 044, 050, 054 and others. See Table 5 in Preferred Options document for the full list.</p>
c) Limiting the amount of student accommodation allowed within any given geographical area; (para. 17)	<p>July 2017 – Opt 21: <i>New student accommodation</i> The options considered include limiting the concentration of student accommodation in certain areas or relaxing policies to allow student accommodation in all areas. The Council's Preferred Option is to focus new purpose built student accommodation in areas close to the academic and other facilities such as public transport.</p>
d) Encouraging the universities to provide accessible accommodation as part of any proposed new developments of student accommodation; para 18)	<p>July 2017 – Opt 21: <i>New student accommodation</i> The Council's Preferred Option is to focus new student accommodation developments in accessible areas, close to facilities and public transport.</p>

<p>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 &amp; 19)</p>		<p>July 2017 – OPT 20 <i>Linking the delivery of new University academic facilities to the delivery of University provided residential accommodation</i>  The options considered include reviewing the 3,000 target. The Council's Preferred Option is to adjust the figure to reflect the 2016 baseline, which would mean a new target of 1,500 University of Oxford full-time undergraduate and taught course post-graduate students, and 3,500 Oxford Brookes full-time undergraduate and taught course post-graduate degree students. These figures exclude students studying and working on placements, such as teaching and nursing students, and post-graduates on research-based courses.</p>
<p>f) Extending the targets for students living outside of provided accommodation to other large educational institutions based in the city; (para. 20)</p>		<p>July 2017 – Opt 7: <i>New academic floorspace for private colleges/language schools;</i> and Opt 21: <i>New student accommodation</i>  The Preferred Options propose to restrict new purpose built student accommodation to the two universities, thereby limiting the provision of new purpose-built accommodation available to other large educational institutions based in Oxford. Those students will still be able to study in Oxford, but using homestays and existing accommodation of those institutions. This is combined with Preferred Options to limit the amount of new academic floorspace for those institutions. As such, there is no target for those institutions.</p>
<p>g) Limiting the use of new student accommodation to the two universities; (para. 21)</p>		<p>July 2017 – Opt 21: <i>New student accommodation</i>  The options considered include restricting the occupiers of new student accommodation. The Council's Preferred Option is to tie new speculatively-built student accommodation to students of the University of Oxford and/or Oxford Brookes University only. This is a shift from the current policy position which seeks to restrict new accommodation only in terms of linking it to those students on courses of a year or more, which means that other institutions are still eligible.</p>
<p>h) Whether university students housed in non-university provided student housing should count towards the 3,000 target figure; (para. 22)</p>		<p>July 2017 – OPT 20 <i>Linking the delivery of new University academic facilities to the delivery of University provided residential accommodation</i>  The options considered include reviewing the 3,000 target and how it is defined.</p>
<p>i) Encouraging private developers of student accommodation to work closely with the universities; (para. 23)</p>		<p>July 2017 – Opt 21: <i>New student accommodation</i>  The options considered include restricting the occupiers of new student accommodation, to tie new speculatively-built student accommodation to students of</p>



		the University of Oxford and/or Oxford Brookes University only. This would require private developers to work closely with the universities if they wish to bring forward development of student accommodation in Oxford.
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)		<p>July 2017 – Opt 12: <i>Meeting intermediate housing or employment sector specific needs based on local affordability approaches</i></p> <p>The Preferred Options review the definition of key worker, and the City Council's Preferred Option is to have a specific local affordability policy, pegged to local incomes and house prices, rather than to specific occupations or employment sectors. This would be fairer and clearer, and help to target those in greatest need. The Option to continue having 'key worker' as a specific sub-category of intermediate housing is rejected and not proposed to be taken forward.</p>
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)		<p>July 2017 – Opt 12: <i>Meeting intermediate housing or employment sector specific needs based on local affordability approaches</i></p> <p>The Preferred Options propose that on specified sites, to allow schemes that are up to 100% intermediate housing, with reduced or no element of social rent homes. It is suggested that this could apply to University and Hospital Trust sites, to support key staff (as well as school campus sites or other staff accommodation schemes).</p>
l) Providing additional flexibility in the balance of dwellings policy specifically for key worker housing schemes. (para. 26)		<p>July 2017 – Opt 16: <i>Mix of dwelling sizes to maintain and deliver balanced communities ('balance of dwellings')</i></p> <p>Opt 17: <i>Thresholds for mix of dwelling sizes ('balance of dwellings')</i></p> <p>As set out in Opt 12 it is not proposed to carry forward 'key worker' as a specific category, but rather to define affordability based on income and house prices. Nonetheless the Preferred Options considers the balance of dwellings policy across all schemes, not just key worker, in terms of how the policy should be applied and which size sites it should apply to. The Council's Preferred Option is to raise the threshold at which the policy applies, so that a mix is only specified for larger strategic-scale developments (eg 25+ units), which is a shift from the current policy where the threshold is 10 units in the city and district centres, and 4 units in other areas. For those larger sites where the policy is triggered, then the Preferred Option is to continue to specify a dwelling size mix and to prioritise larger (3+ bed) units in key areas.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

## SCRUTINY WORK PLAN August 2017 – May 2018

Published on: 23/08/17

The Scrutiny Committee agrees a work plan every year detailing selected issues that affect Oxford or its people. Time is allowed within this plan to consider topical issues as they arise throughout the year as well as decisions to be taken by the City Executive Board. This document represents the work of scrutiny for the remainder of the 2017-18 council year and will be reviewed at each meeting of the Scrutiny Committee.

The work plan is based on suggestions received from all elected members and senior officers. Members of the public can also contribute topics for inclusion in the scrutiny work plan by completing and submitting our [suggestion form](#). See our [get involved webpage](#) for further details of how you can participate in the work of scrutiny.

The following criteria will be used by the Scrutiny Committee to evaluate and prioritise suggested topics:

- *Is the issue controversial / of significant public interest?*
- *Is it an area of high expenditure?*
- *Is it an essential service / corporate priority?*
- *Can Scrutiny influence and add value?*

Some topics will be considered at Scrutiny Committee meetings and others will be delegated to standing panels. Items for more detailed review will be considered by time-limited review groups.

The Committee will review the Council's [Forward Plan](#) at each meeting and decide which executive decisions it wishes to comment on before the decision is made. The Council also has a "call in" process which allows decisions made by the City Executive Board to be reviewed by the Scrutiny Committee before they are implemented.

### Scrutiny Committee and Standing Panel responsibility and membership

Committee / Panel	Remit	Nominated councillors
Scrutiny Committee	Overall management of the Council's scrutiny function.	Cllrs Altaf-Khan, Azad, Chapman, Curran, Fry, Gant (chair), Henwood, Ladbrooke, Lloyd-Shogbesan, Lygo, Pegg & Thomas.
Finance Panel	Finance and budgetary issues and decisions	Cllrs Fry, (chair) Landell Mills, Simmons & Taylor.
Housing Panel	Strategic housing and landlord issues and decisions	Cllrs Goff, Henwood, Pegg, Sanders, Thomas & Wade.
Scrutiny Shareholder Panel	Shareholder and executive decisions relating to Council companies.	Cllrs Chapman, Fry (chair), Gant, Henwood & Simmons.

### Current and planned review groups

Topic	Scope	Nominated councillors
Budget review 2018/19	To review the Council's draft budget for 2018/19 and medium term financial strategy.	Finance Panel members.
Oxford Living Wage	To consider how the Council can promote the implementation of the Oxford Living Wage across Oxford.	Cllrs Goff, Ladbrooke (chair), Illy-Williamson, Lloyd-Shogbesan & Thomas.

### Indicative timings for 2017/18 review work

Scrutiny Review	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March	April
Oxford Living Wage	Scoping		Evidence gathering		Reporting					
Budget review 2018/19		Scoping				Evidence gathering		Reporting		

	Scoping
	Evidence gathering
	Reporting

## SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

### 7 SEPTEMBER 2017 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Assessing disabled impacts in planning	No	To consider how the Council fulfils its duty to assess the impacts on disabled people of new developments and changes of use, including for businesses and private and social sector housing.	Planning and Regulatory Services	Patsy Dell, Head of Planning, Sustainable Development & Regulatory Services
Oxford Design Review Panel	No	To consider the work and effectiveness of the Oxford Design Review Panel.	Planning and Regulatory Services	Patsy Dell, Head of Planning, Sustainable Development & Regulatory Services
Monitoring Grants Allocated to Community & Voluntary Orgs 2016/17	Yes	To monitor progress and report achievements resulting from those grant allocated to Community and Voluntary Organisations 2016/17	Culture and Communities, Customer and Corporate Services	Julia Tomkins, Grants & External Funding Officer

21

### 9 OCTOBER 2017 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
East Oxford Community Centre - Improvement Scheme	Yes	To present an improvement scheme for the East Oxford Community Centre following public consultation.	Culture and Communities	Vicky Trietline, Development Project Management Surveyor
Annual Monitoring Report 2016-17	Yes	Monitors the performance of policies in Oxford's Local Plan and the implementation of the Local Development Scheme.	Planning and Regulatory Services	Rebekah Knight, Planner
Review of Discretionary Housing Payment Policy	Yes	To propose changes to the Discretionary Housing Payment Policy	Customer and Corporate Services	Paul Wilding, Programme Manager Revenue & Benefits
Review of Financial Inclusion Strategy 2017	Yes	To update the Financial Inclusion Strategy 2014-2017	Customer and Corporate Services	Paul Wilding, Programme Manager Revenue & Benefits

Review of Community Grants Programme and Commissioned Advice Strategy 2018-2021.	Yes	To request approval for an approach to expand our 'offer' to the three year Community and Voluntary Sector grant programme from April 2018; and to update the Board on the progress made in developing a new Commissioned Advice Strategy during 2017/18	Customer and Corporate Services	Paul Wilding, Programme Manager Revenue & Benefits
--	-----	--	---------------------------------	--

#### 7 NOVEMBER 2017 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Sustainability Strategy 2017	Yes	The report will provide the revised Oxford Sustainability Strategy, which will set out the vision for Oxford's sustainable future and steps we are required to take to deliver it. The report will recommend approval of the draft strategy for public consultation.	A Clean and Green Oxford	Mai Jarvis, Environmental Quality Team Manager

#### 5 DECEMBER 2017 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Equality and Diversity	No	To consider an update following the recommendations of the Equality and Diversity Review Group.	Customer and Corporate Services	Chris Harvey, Organisational Development and Learning Manager
Update of the Corporate Plan 2018	Yes	Update report on the Corporate Plan	Corporate Strategy and Economic Development	Caroline Green, Assistant Chief Executive

#### 15 JANUARY 2018 - PROVISIONAL MEETING

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Air quality	No	To consider the annual status report for 2016, progress in addressing poor air quality and partnership working	A Clean and Green Oxford	Jo Colwell, Service Manager Environmental Sustainability
City Centre Strategy	Yes	To approve the City Centre Strategy which aims to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• create and promote a strong investment proposition</li> <li>• facilitate ongoing dialogue with those involved in the management and future of the city centre</li> </ul>	Planning & Regulatory Services, Corporate Strategy	Fiona Piercy, Interim Assistant Chief Executive, Regeneration and Economy

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provide a framework for collaboration and action</li> <li>• assist in the allocation of resources</li> </ul>	& Economic Development	
--	--	---	------------------------	--

#### 6 FEBRUARY 2018 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Impacts of the Westgate Shopping Centre	No	To consider the impacts of the reopening of the Westgate Shopping Centre including on public transport, parking and city centre management.	Corporate Strategy and Economic Development	Fiona Piercy, Interim Assistant Chief Executive, Regeneration and Economy
Grant Allocations to Community and Voluntary Organisations 2018/19	Yes	This report is for the City Executive Board to make decisions on the allocation of grants to the community and voluntary organisations for 2018/2019.	Culture and Communities	Julia Tomkins, Grants & External Funding Officer

#### 6 MARCH 2018 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Devolution plans for Oxfordshire	No	To consider a progress update following the recommendations of the Devolution Review Group in January 2017.	Corporate Strategy and Economic Development	Caroline Green, Assistant Chief Executive
Health inequalities	No	To consider a progress update following the recommendations of the Health Inequalities Panel.	Finance, Asset Management	Val Johnson, Policy and Partnerships Team Leader

#### 5 APRIL 2018 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Graffiti prevention and removal	No	To consider the appreciative inquiry and focus group around graffiti and other initiatives to solve the issues long term.	Climate Change and Cleaner Greener Oxford	Liz Jones, Interim ASBIT Team Leader
Guest houses	No	To reprioritise the recommendations of the Guest Houses Review Group and consider a progress update.	Community Safety	Richard Adams, Community Safety Service Manager

**17 MAY 2018 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS**

<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>CEB Portfolio</b>	<b>Report Contact</b>
Addressing anti-social behaviour on Oxford's waterways	No	To consider a progress report on plans to address instances of ASB at four identified hot spots on the Oxford waterways.	Community Safety	Richard Adams, Community Safety Service Manager
Public Spaces Protection Orders	No	To monitor the impacts of PSPOs the city, including the numbers and types of early interventions and enforcement actions.	Community Safety	Richard Adams, Community Safety Service Manager
Oxford Town Hall	No	To consider how to improve the profile and accessibility of the Town Hall.	Finance, Asset Management	Ian Brooke, Head of Community Services
Fusion Lifestyle's 2018/19 Annual Service Plan	Yes	To endorse Fusion Lifestyle's 2018/19 Annual Service Plan for the continuous development, management and operation of leisure services in Oxford	Leisure, Parks and Sport	Lucy Cherry, Leisure and Performance Manager

**SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - TO BE SCHEDULED**

<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>CEB Portfolio</b>	<b>Report Contact</b>
Recycling rates	No	To consider annual recycling rates data and incentives aimed at increasing recycling, including any proposals for continued funding of incentive schemes.	A Clean and Green Oxford	Stuart Pohler, Recycling & Waste Operations Manager
Streetscene services	No	To consider the performance of Streetscene services, including the issue of dog fouling.	A Clean and Green Oxford	Doug Loveridge, Streetscene Services Manager
Restorative justice	No	To consider the use of restorative justice to resolve low level cases of antisocial behaviour and the option of training and coordinating volunteers.	Community Safety	Richard Adams, Community Safety Service Manager
Isolation in older people	No	To consider the issue of loneliness and social isolation among older people in Oxford and how the Council can provide support and add value.	Culture and Communities	Ian Brooke, Head of Community Services
Planning enforcement	No	To consider how planning compliance is monitored, what enforcement action is taken and whether this is relayed to the appropriate Planning Committee.	Planning, Transport and Regulatory Services	Patsy Dell, Head of Planning, Sustainable Development & Regulatory Services



## FINANCE PANEL

### 4 SEPTEMBER 2017 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Budget monitoring - quarter 1	No	To monitor the Council's finances at the end of quarter 1 (June 2016).	Finance, Asset Management	Nigel Kennedy, Head of Financial Services
Local impacts of Brexit	No	To monitor the impacts of Brexit on the Council and the local economy.	Finance, Asset Management	Nigel Kennedy, Head of Financial Services
Treasury Management: Annual Report & Performance 2016/17	Yes	The Treasury Management Performance Report 2016/17 is submitted twice a year: Sept 2017 – the position at 31 March 2017 (Full Year)	Finance, Asset Management	Bill Lewis, Financial Accounting Manager
Investment in existing property portfolio	Yes	To update CEB on feasibility studies in relation to the investment property development opportunities and seek additional funding for development opportunities.	Finance, Asset Management	Nick Twigg, Major Projects & Development Manager

### 7 DECEMBER 2017 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Budget monitoring - quarter 2	No	To monitor the Council's finances at the end of quarter 2 2016-17 (September).	Finance, Asset Management	Nigel Kennedy, Head of Financial Services
Budget Review 2017/18 - recommendations update	No	To agree recommendations following the annual scrutiny budget review.	Finance, Asset Management	Nigel Kennedy, Head of Financial Services
Budget 2018/2019	Yes	A briefing on the new Budget for the period 2018/2019.	Finance, Asset Management	Section 151 Officer
Treasury Management Performance: Annual Report and Performance 2017/18	Yes	The Treasury Management Performance Report 2017/18 is submitted twice a year: December 2017 – the position at the 30 September 2017 (Half Year)	Finance, Asset Management	Bill Lewis, Financial Accounting Manager

Council Tax Reduction Scheme for 2019/20	Yes	To review the Council Tax Reduction Scheme	Customer and Corporate Services	Paul Wilding, Programme Manager Revenue & Benefits
--	-----	--	---------------------------------	--

### 31 JANUARY 2018 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Capital Strategy 2018/19	Yes	To consider the Capital Strategy 2018/19	Finance, Asset Management	Anna Winship, Management Accountancy Manager
Treasury Management Strategy 2018/19	Yes	To present the Council's Treasury Management Strategy for 2018/19 together with the Prudential Indicators for 2019/19 to 2020/21.	Finance, Asset Management	Bill Lewis, Financial Accounting Manager

### 14 MARCH 2018 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Budget monitoring - quarter 3	No	To monitor spend against budgets and projected outturn on a quarterly basis.	Finance, Asset Management	Nigel Kennedy, Head of Financial Services
Fundamental service reviews	No	To consider the outcomes of comprehensive reviews of a number of service area budgets undertaken as part of this year's budget setting process.	Finance, Asset Management	Nigel Kennedy, Head of Financial Services
Monitoring social value	No	To consider the case and opportunities for monitoring social value through integrated financial, social and environmental accounting.	Finance, Asset Management	Nigel Kennedy, Head of Financial Services

### FINANCE PANEL - TO BE SCHEDULED

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Impacts of changes to IR35 (intermediaries legislation)	No	To consider the possible impacts of changes to intermediaries legislation on the Council's wage bill.	Finance, Asset Management	Nigel Kennedy, Head of Financial Services

## HOUSING PANEL

### 5 SEPTEMBER 2017 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Draft Housing and Homelessness Strategy 2018 - 2021	Yes	To request CEB approval to go out to public consultation on the draft Housing and Homelessness Strategy 2018-21 which incorporates the strategy for bringing empty properties back into use.	Housing	Frances Evans, Strategy & Service Development Manager
The Use of Empty Buildings as Temporary Accommodation for Homeless People	Yes	To discuss the processes and procedures that could be used to make empty buildings available for use as temporary homeless shelters.	Housing	Nerys Parry, Rough Sleeping and Single Homelessness Manager
Options paper on Additional Homelessness Provision for the City	Yes	An options paper on additional homelessness provision for the City to meet needs following the closure of Simon House, and the authority to commission services accordingly	Housing	Nerys Parry, Rough Sleeping and Single Homelessness Manager

27

### 12 OCTOBER 2017 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Housing performance - quarter 1	No	To consider Council performance against a set of housing service measures chosen by the Panel.	Housing	Stephen Clarke, Head of Housing Services
Tower block refurbishment project	No	For the Panel to receive regular updates on the tower block refurbishment project, including any developments with building regulations and the Council's representations to Government.	Housing	Stephen Clarke, Head of Housing Services
Tenant Involvement	No	Joint session with the Tenant Scrutiny Panel to consider how tenants are involved in decisions that affect them.	Housing	Simon Warde, Tenant Involvement Manager
Regulating the Private Rented Sector	Yes	The Council is committed to improving the conditions and management of the private rented sector in Oxford and this report sets out the various options that	Planning and Regulatory Services	Ian Wright, Service Manager Environmental Health

		are available to achieve this aim.		
Oxford City Council's Tenancy Strategy & Policy Statement 2018	Yes	To request CEB approval to go out to public consultation on the draft Tenancy Strategy	Housing	Frances Evans, Strategy & Service Development Manager

### 13 NOVEMBER 2017- PROVISIONAL REPORTS

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Housing performance - quarter 2	No	To consider mid-year Council performance against a set of housing service measures chosen by the Panel.	Housing	Stephen Clarke, Head of Housing Services
Void property management	No	To consider tenancy management functions including the management of void properties and changes to the management of issues in sheltered housing schemes.	Housing	Bill Graves, Landlord Services Manager
Rent performance	No	To monitor the Council's rents performance including current and former tenant arrears.	Housing	Tanya Bandekar, Service Manager Revenue & Benefits
Impact of the Homelessness Reduction Act 2017	Yes	To set out the implications of the new Homelessness Reduction Act 2017 and any changes required to current service delivery or any potential impact on the Council's Medium Term Financial Plan.	Housing	Dave Scholes, Housing Strategy & Needs Manager

### 8 MARCH 2018 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Housing performance - quarter 3	No	To consider a report on Council performance against a set of housing service measures chosen by the Panel.	Housing	Stephen Clarke, Head of Housing Services
Allocation of Homelessness Prevention Funds in 2018/19	Yes	To agree the allocation of the homelessness prevention funds with the purpose of meeting the objectives of the homelessness strategy. Funding is recommended to services/projects working to prevent and/or tackle homelessness and rough sleeping.	Housing	Nerys Parry, Rough Sleeping and Single Homelessness Manager

## 9 APRIL 2018 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Great Estates update	No	To receive an update on progress made in developing masterplans for estates and working up and delivering a rolling programme of priority improvement schemes.	Housing	Stephen Clarke, Head of Housing Services
Empty garages and former garage sites	No	To receive an update on how the Council is dealing with empty garages and former garage sites.	Housing	Martin Shaw, Property Services Manager

## HOUSING PANEL - TO BE SCHEDULED

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Tenant satisfaction	No	To monitor tenant satisfaction survey results.	Housing	Bill Graves, Landlord Services Manager
Leaseholder relationships	No	To consider Council relationships with leaseholders including the views of individual leaseholders.	Housing	Stephen Clarke, Head of Housing Services
Building the housing for the future	No	To consider the need to build homes fit for the future and the need to provide accommodation for the increasing older population with compound needs including dementia.	Housing	Frances Evans, Strategy & Service Development Manager
Impacts of absent owners on housing availability	No	To consider the impacts of foreign investors and other absent owners on housing availability in the city.	Housing	Stephen Clarke, Head of Housing Services
Flexible tenancies	Yes	To pre-scrutinise any decisions on the local implementation of government plans to prevent local authorities in England from offering secure tenancies for life to new council tenants in most circumstances.	Housing	Bill Graves, Landlord Services Manager

## SHAREHOLDER PANEL

### 28 SEPTEMBER 2017 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Direct Services Trading Company - progress report	Yes	Scheduled update to the business case for the creation of Oxford Direct Services local authority trading company.	Finance, Asset Management, A Clean and Green Oxford, Customer & Corporate Services	Simon Howick, Service Transformation Manager

### SHAREHOLDER PANEL - TO BE SCHEDULED

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Oxford Housing Company Business Plan	No	To consider a 'sensitivity analysis' of Oxford City Housing Limited's business plan.	Housing	David Edwards
Companies review	No	To consider an internal audit report on whether the objectives set out in establishing new companies have been achieved with regards to financial and quality measures.	Finance, Asset Management	Nigel Kennedy, Head of Financial Services

## CEB Forward Plan (extract)

**CEB 16 OCTOBER 2017**

<b>ITEM 18: ID: I016124</b>	<b>DIRECT SERVICES TRADING COMPANY - PROGRESS REPORT</b>  <b>Report Status: Provisional: Decision needs further consideration or information</b>
<p>Scheduled update to the business case for the creation of Oxford Direct Services local authority trading company. To consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A date (“the Transfer Date”), on which all service delivery currently carried out by the Council’s Direct Services will be transferred to the two new LATCo companies. :</li> <li>• In regard to the Teckal Company, the terms of the Council’s entry into an appropriate agreement with the company (“the Service Contract”) under which the Teckal Company would undertake from the Transfer Date all relevant Council statutory functions and related work, as currently undertaken by Direct Services;</li> <li>• The arrangements to transfer all Direct Services staff engaged in service delivery immediately prior to the Transfer Date to the Teckal Company, such transfer being subject to the TUPE regulations;</li> <li>• The arrangements to ensure that all transferring staff will continue to have access to the Local Government Pension Scheme;</li> <li>• The terms of the contract between the two LATCo companies and the Council (“the Support Contract”) under which the Council would provide support services to both companies;</li> <li>• The terms under which the Council would enter into leases or licences with the two LATCO companies covering their occupation of relevant Council premises and use of Council resources;</li> <li>• The arrangements made to transfer to the Trading Company of all contracts with third parties in existence on the Transfer Date</li> <li>• The terms of the Shareholder’s Agreement to be made between the companies and the Council (acting though its Shareholder Group)</li> <li>• The provisions of an initial Business Plan (or Plans) for the Companies.</li> <li>• An aspiration that the project’s aim is to go live on 01 November 2017.</li> </ul>	
<b>ITEM 19: ID: I011611</b>	<b>NORTH OXFORD VICTORIAN SUBURB CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL- FINAL</b>  <b>Report Status: Provisional: Awaiting further information, advice or input</b>
<p>To approve the North Oxford Victorian Suburb Conservation Area Appraisal following public consultation.</p>	

<b>ITEM 20:</b> <b>ID: I016584</b>	<b>OXFORD CITY COUNCIL'S TENANCY STRATEGY &amp; POLICY STATEMENT 2018</b>  <b>Report Status: Provisional: Awaiting further information, advice or input.</b>
To request CEB approval to go out to public consultation on the draft Tenancy Strategy	
<b>ITEM 21:</b> <b>ID: I016722</b>	<b>REVIEW OF DISCRETIONARY HOUSING PAYMENT POLICY</b>  <b>Report Status: Provisional: Decision reliant on another action or process</b>
To propose changes to the Discretionary Housing Payment Policy	
<b>ITEM 22:</b> <b>ID: I016723</b>	<b>REVIEW OF FINANCIAL INCLUSION STRATEGY 2017</b>  <b>Report Status: Confirmed</b>
To update the Financial Inclusion Strategy 2014-2017	
<b>ITEM 23:</b> <b>ID: I015324</b>	<b>REVIEW OF COMMUNITY GRANTS PROGRAMME AND COMMISSIONED ADVICE STRATEGY 2018-2021.</b>  <b>Report Status: Provisional: Awaiting further information, advice or input.</b>
<p>This report is a merge of two proposed reports from the July Forward Plan: the Review of Community Grants Programme and progress on the Commissioned Advice Strategy 2018-2021.</p> <p>To review and request approval for an approach to expand our 'offer' to the three year Community and Voluntary Sector grant programme from April 2018; and to update the Board on the progress made in developing a new Commissioned Advice Strategy during 2017/18</p>	
<b>ITEM 24:</b> <b>ID: I015521</b>	<b>ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT 2016-17</b>  <b>Report Status: Provisional: Decision needs further consideration or information</b>
Monitors the performance of policies in Oxford's Local Plan and the implementation of the Local Development Scheme.	
<b>ITEM 25:</b> <b>ID: I016513</b>	<b>APPROVAL OF INCREASES IN PLANNING APPLICATION FEES AND RING FENCING OF ADDITIONAL INCOME GENERATED TO DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS</b>  <b>Report Status: Confirmed</b>
This report deals with the recent announcement that to planning application fees can be increased in line with new provisions from Government where the additional income raised is ring-fenced for investment in the Development Management (DM) function. The report seeks authority to increase fees and invest the income in the DM service	



<b>ITEM 26: ID: I015275</b>	<b>EAST OXFORD COMMUNITY CENTRE - IMPROVEMENT SCHEME</b>  <b>Report Status: Provisional : Decision needs further consideration or information</b>
To present an improvement scheme for the East Oxford Community Centre following public consultation.	

### CEB 21 NOVEMBER 2017

<b>ITEM 27: ID: I013443</b>	<b>MUSEUM OF OXFORD HIDDEN HISTORIES REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT</b>  <b>Report Status: Provisional: Awaiting further information, advice or input</b>
To update Members on the Museum of Oxford Hidden Histories Redevelopment Project; - To request approval to the revised project budget; - To request approval to the underwriting of fundraising income in the event of the fundraising target not being met.	

<b>ITEM 28: ID: I015077</b>	<b>SUSTAINABILITY STRATEGY 2017</b>  <b>Report Status: CEB: Provisional: Decision needs further consideration or information</b>
The report will provide the revised Oxford Sustainability Strategy, which will set out the vision for Oxford's sustainable future and steps we are required to take to deliver it. The report will recommend approval of the draft strategy for public consultation.	

### CEB 20 DECEMBER 2017

<b>ITEM 29: ID: I015522</b>	<b>BUDGET 2018/2019</b>  <b>Report Status: Confirmed</b>
A new Budget for the period 2018/2019. · The pre-consultation draft report will be submitted to CEB in December 2017. The post-consultation draft report will be submitted to CEB in February 2018 · The Budget will be submitted to Council for adoption in February 2018.	

<b>ITEM 30: ID: I016720</b>	<b>COUNCIL TAX REDUCTION SCHEME FOR 2018/19</b>  <b>Report Status: Confirmed</b>
CEB Dec 2017: To recommend that Full Council adopt a new Council Tax Reduction Scheme from 2018/19  Council Jan 2017: To adopt a new Council Tax Reduction Scheme from 2018/19	

<b>ITEM 31: ID: I015525</b>	<b>TREASURY MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE: ANNUAL REPORT AND PERFORMANCE 2017/18</b>  <b>Report Status: Confirmed</b>
The Treasury Management Performance Report 2017/18 is submitted twice a year: · December 2017 – the position at the 30 September 2017 (Half Year) · September 2018 – the position at 31 March 2018 (Full Year)	

<b>ITEM 32: ID: I015325</b>	<b>REVIEW OF HOME CHOICE PILOT</b>  <b>Report Status: Provisional: Awaiting further information, advice or input.</b>
To update CEB on the 1st year's operation of the Home Choice Pilot.	

<b>ITEM 33: ID: I015952</b>	<b>UPDATE OF THE CORPORATE PLAN 2018</b>  <b>Report Status: Provisional: Awaiting further information, advice or input.</b>
Update report on the Corporate Plan	

**To:** Scrutiny Committee

**Date:** 7<sup>th</sup> September 2017

**Report of:** Head of Planning, Sustainable Development and Regulatory Services

**Title of Report:** How the Council fulfils its duty to assess the impacts on disabled people of new developments and changes of use, including for businesses and private and social sector housing

## Summary and Recommendations

**Purpose of report:** This is a report from the Head of Service on how the Planning and Building Control Services use the regulatory framework to improve accessibility to the built environment for the disabled.

**Key decision:** No

**Executive lead member:** Cllr Alex Hollingsworth

**Policy Framework:** Meeting Housing Needs and Strong and Active Communities

**Recommendations:** Members are recommended to note the contents of the report.

## Introduction

1. In 2011 the Census found that around 11.5 million people in the UK (18 per cent of the population) had a long-term health problem or disability that limited their day-to-day activities either a lot or a little. In England and Wales four per cent of people aged 0 to 15, nine per cent of people aged 16 to 49, 24 per cent of people aged 50 to 64 and 54 per cent of people aged 65 or over had a long-term health problem or disability that limited their day-to-day activities either a lot or a little.
2. Healthy life expectancy is not keeping pace with life expectancy; this means that more of us will need to manage long term conditions as we age, as well as care for others. Age UK have produced figures estimating that, without intervention in age-related disease, there will be over 6.25 million older people with a long-term limiting illness or disability by 2030.

3. The Government has put in place a framework of legislative levers to achieve a more accessible and inclusive built environment.

### **The legislative framework**

4. Broadly speaking, accessibility of the built environment is governed by three main areas of law.
5. Firstly, national planning policy and guidance, set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), is clear that planning should promote access and inclusion and that good design can help to create buildings and places that are for everyone. The NPPF states that Local Plan policies developed by local planning authorities should “take into account the need to design inclusive developments”, including what a local authority needs to do if it wishes to apply the ‘optional’ housing standards in the Building Regulations, for example to require a proportion of new homes to be built to one of those standards. Local planning authorities are then expected to take decisions on individual planning applications in line with these policies.
6. Secondly, Part M of the Building Regulations provides that “reasonable provision” should be made for people to gain access to and use a building and its facilities. For dwellings, the Regulations also set out two ‘optional’ standards: the first of which (M4(2) or ‘category 2’) adds a requirement for provision to meet the needs of “some older or disabled people” and be adaptable to meet future needs; and a second (M4(3) or ‘category 3’), that, if applied, requires a dwelling to be able to be used by, or be adapted for use by, wheelchair users. The Regulations apply to new buildings and some, but not all, changes of use, although the optional housing standards only apply where a local authority takes the necessary steps to introduce planning policy requirements as per Planning Practice Guidance.
7. Finally, the Equality Act 2010 imposes a range of duties relevant not only to the planning and building control processes, but also to those who use the buildings as employers and service providers. These include duties on public authorities, individual employers, and service providers not to discriminate—including by making reasonable adjustments so that disabled people are not placed at a substantial disadvantage.

### **Designing inclusive developments**

8. The NPPF was introduced in 2012 as a key part of the Government’s reforms to make the planning system less complex and easier to understand. The NPPF sets out the Government’s planning policies for England, and how these are expected to be applied.

9. The NPPF defines 'inclusive design' as "designing the built environment, including buildings and their surrounding spaces, to ensure that they can be accessed and used by everyone." The principle of inclusive design applies to all forms of housing regardless of tenure. There are Planning Practice Guidance documents which sit under the NPPF that set this out in more detail.
10. The most effective way to maximise accessibility for everyone is to consider inclusive design from the outset of the process. This is particularly important when considering historic buildings and conservation, and highways. Inclusive design should not only be specific to the building, but also include the setting of the building in the wider built environment, for example, the location of the building on the plot; the gradient of the plot; the relationship of adjoining buildings; and the transport infrastructure. Issues that are taken into account by Planning Officers when considering all applications include:
  - proximity and links to public transport;
  - parking spaces and setting down points in proximity to entrances;
  - the positioning and visual contrast of street furniture and the design of approach routes to meet the needs of wheelchair users and people with visual impairments; and
  - whether entrances to buildings are clearly identified, can be reached by a level or gently sloping approach and are well lit.
11. A Design and Access Statement is required for major developments and listed building consent applications and in certain cases in conservation areas. The statement is used to ensure applicants can demonstrate an integrated approach that delivers inclusive design and addresses the full range of access requirements throughout the design process.
12. A good example of an inclusive development is Barton Park. As an NHS Healthy New Town, Barton Park aims to ensure that all residents will have an equal opportunity to good physical and mental health and good health outcomes.

### **Local Plan policies**

13. The Sites and Housing Plan 2011-2026 (SHP), which was adopted in February 2013 includes Policy HP2 which sets out the Council's approach to Accessible and Adaptable Homes. Policy HP2 defines two requirements that have to be met by all new homes. Firstly, all new homes should be built to the Lifetime Homes standard, which was considered to be the national benchmark for accessibility when the plan was adopted. Secondly, on sites of 4 or more dwellings (gross), at least 5% of all new dwellings (or at least 1 dwelling for sites below 20 units) are either fully wheelchair accessible, or

easily adapted for full wheelchair use. In addition, 50% of these must be provided as open market dwellings.

14. The policy to build all new homes to the Lifetime Homes Standard went well beyond the Building Regulations in 2013, which only required that new developments have a minimum standard of accessibility into the entrance level of a building. The Building Regulations only provided an opportunity for disabled people to visit new homes and provided limited benefits for independent domestic living.
15. Whilst the Lifetime Homes Standard goes some way to assisting wheelchair users' day-to-day needs, it does not provide the opportunity to adapt homes to include all the features needed by a wheelchair user. The second part of the HP2 policy requirement to provide a percentage of new homes designed for easy adaptation to full wheelchair housing standards set the bar even higher. The policy seeks to ensure that 5% of all new dwellings should be designed as wheelchair accessible, or easily adaptable to wheelchair use. Future occupants should be able to adapt their home to full wheelchair accessible standard without enlarging or structurally modifying their home. The Council has calculated that 5% of all new homes will need to be wheelchair accessible to meet both the existing backlog of need, and newly arising need. Sites of 3 or less homes were exempted for practicality reasons because they are generally infill development or the conversion of houses into flats.
16. Policy HP2 provides the framework for planning conditions to be attached to permissions to ensure that all new homes are built so that they are accessible to disabled people. It is clear that Oxford has set a higher standard than most other local authorities. In 2012/13 DCLG reported that only 42% of local authorities had a policy requiring compliance of all or some of new housing development with the Lifetime Homes Standards. Not all of these policies had a 100% target such as that which applies in Oxford. Since the policy was adopted in 2013 a total of 930 new homes have been built and the development of nearly 800 homes at Barton Park will be built to Lifetime Homes standards.
17. The Local Plan is currently being renewed which provides an opportunity to review and renew the policies relating to accessibility. The Planning Inspectorate will not approve Local Plans without evidence that they address access for disabled people in terms of housing, public spaces and the wider built environment.

### **Part M of the Building Regulations**

18. Part M of the Building Regulations deals with access for disabled people in the built environment and Approved Document M sets out ways in which builders and developers can comply with the Regulations. The 1999 version

of Approved Document M was entitled “Access and facilities for disabled people”, but in 2004 this was changed to “Access to and use of buildings”. They apply to new buildings and, since 2004, can apply to some material alterations of and extensions to non-domestic buildings and to some material changes of use. They do not require work to be undertaken to upgrade existing buildings.

19. The Building Regulations were amended in October 2015 as a result of a review into how technical housing standards are applied on new dwellings by the planning system with a view to simplifying them and incorporating them within the building regulations. The new Approved Document M now includes two new optional technical standards which build upon the existing standard for visitable dwellings:

Category M4(1)	‘Visitable dwellings’ standard, the basic minimum requirement that all newly built dwellings must meet
Category M4(2)	Accessible and adaptable dwellings standard, broadly equivalent to Lifetime Homes
Category M4(3)	Wheelchair user dwellings standard (which can be applied either to make a dwelling fully wheelchair accessible, or alternatively to make it easily adaptable for wheelchair use)

20. The intention is for local planning authorities to choose whether to impose the optional requirements on developments as a planning condition in line with their planning policies. Where there is no optional requirement imposed by the local planning authority, dwellings need only meet the requirements of M4(1).
21. These amendments to Part M Building Regulations have not yet been transposed into the new local plan. The Development Management service is applying an appropriate condition to impose the higher optional standards on permissions granted. The wording of the condition is currently being refined so it complies with the test of a reasonable condition. This means that every relevant application for Building Regulation approval is assessed against the Part M4(1) requirements by the Building Control Service or an Approved Inspector.
22. The accessibility of buildings other than dwellings, including commercial buildings and workplaces, is also governed by Part M of the Building Regulations. These provide that reasonable provision must be made for people to access and use the building and its facilities and applies to new-buildings and some, but not all, material changes of use. Approved Document M sets out, for example, requirements for accessible entrances, doors, reception areas, corridors and passageways, for passenger lifts, wheelchair

spaces and the provision of toilets and other sanitary facilities. All Building Control applications for buildings other than dwellings are therefore assessed for compliance with Part M by the Building Control Service or an Approved Inspector.

## **Equality Act 2010**

23. The Equality Act 2010 imposes a duty on service providers and employers to make reasonable adjustment to any physical feature which might put a disabled person at a substantial disadvantage compared to a non-disabled person. Failure to comply with this duty is a form of discrimination and the enforcement mechanism for the Equality Act 2010 relies on a disabled person pursuing an individual claim for discrimination.
24. Although the guidance in Approved Document M demonstrates compliance with Part M of the Building Regulations, this does not necessarily equate to compliance with the obligations and duties set out in the Equality Act. This is because in some instances this will include designing features and making reasonable adjustments to features which are outside the scope of Approved Document M. It remains for the persons undertaking building works to consider if further provision, beyond that described in Approved Document M, is appropriate.
25. The Equality Act 2010 contains an exemption whereby if a particular feature of a building complies with the standards laid down in Part M, then—for the next ten years—it is exempt from the requirement under the reasonable adjustment duties to remove or alter that physical feature. This means that physical features constructed today in compliance with the current building regulations are likely to remain at the same standard until 2027.
26. Building Control officers and Approved Inspectors, when assessing compliance with Part M of the Building Regulations, should ideally be going further and looking at new designs and new buildings from the point of view of compliance with the Equality Act. Previously local authority Building Control inspectors were assisted by expert access officers, but this is a resource that has now been mainstreamed.

## **Conclusion**

27. The Council has planning policies that have set higher standards for accessibility in new build properties than many other local authorities. With the development of the Local Plan 2036 underway there is an opportunity to further embed accessibility and inclusion into the planning process.



28. The Building Control Service are checking all relevant applications against Part M of the Building Regulations which will ensure all new build dwellings and buildings are compliant with accessibility requirements.

### **Recommendations**

29. Members are recommended to note the report.

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

Name: Ian Wright

Job title: Environmental Health Service Manager

Service Area: Planning , Sustainable Development & Regulatory Services

Version 2.0

This page is intentionally left blank

**To:** Scrutiny Committee

**Date:** 7th September 2017

**Report of:** Head of Planning, Sustainable Development & Regulatory Services

**Title of Report:** Update on the operation of the Oxford Design Review Panel (ODRP)

## Summary

**Purpose of report:** To update the Scrutiny Committee on the current operation of the Oxford Design Review Panel (ODRP)

**Key Decision:** No

**Executive lead member:** Cllr Hollingsworth

**Report author:** Patsy Dell

**Policy Framework:** Strong, Active Communities; Vibrant, Sustainable Economy; Cleaner, Greener Oxford City Council.

NPPF – paras. 9; 17; 28; section 7 (in particular paras 58 and **62**); section 12 (in particular paras. 126 and 137).

Appendices to report – *none*

## Background

- 1 The Scrutiny Committee requested a report to update them on the operation of the Oxford Design Review Panel (ODRP). Design review has been operating formally through the Oxford Design Review Panel in association with Design Council CaBE (DC & Commission for Excellence in the Built Environment) since 2014.

## What is Design Review?

- 2 Design Review works within the application of national and local planning policy but is an independent and impartial evaluation process in which a panel of built environment experts assesses the design of a proposal. The projects that go to Design Review are usually of public significance and have a high degree of public significance. Design in the context of the Panel's remit is broader than simply architecture and encompasses all aspects of urban design and planning, looking at places as well as buildings.
- 3 Design review looks at place-making, making the built-environment of our towns and cities work better. Design Review encourages responsibly designed developments that help to create better places for people to live, work and enjoy thus avoiding the huge costs of poor design. There has been extensive, published research that provides an insight into the correlation between poorly designed places and reduced well-being, quality of life and educational attainment in addition to the visual consequences of poor placemaking.
- 4 The nationally published guidance on design review makes some key points about the benefits of the process and how it:
  - gives decision makers confidence that they have had the best possible independent advice on design quality
  - offers support and encouragement for good design
  - identifies weak and inappropriate schemes early on, enabling design changes to be made with relatively little waste of time and effort
  - can bring a breadth and depth of experience wider than that of the project team or planning authority
  - offers expert views on complex issues such as low carbon design and sustainable transport options
  - can constructively question the design brief or site assumptions
  - offers opportunities to those observing design reviews for continued learning, particularly on how to assess schemes for good design.

## The Principles of Design Review

- 5 National guidance on design review identifies ten core principles for the operation of an effective design review process:
  - *Expert*: the review is undertaken by leading designers who have an acknowledged standing and expertise.
  - *Multidisciplinary*: the panel combines the different perspectives of architects, urban designers, planners, landscape architects, engineers, and other specialist experts to provide a complete, rounded assessment.
  - *Accountable*: the panel and its advice must be clearly seen to work for the benefit of the public. The panel reports will be published and publicly available where the scheme is the subject of a planning application.

- *Transparent*: the panel's remit, membership, governance processes and funding are in the public domain.
- *Proportionate*: Design Review will be used for major projects and projects whose significance warrants the investment needed to provide the service.
- *Timely*: it should take place as early as possible in the design process, because this can avoid wasted time. It also costs less to make changes at an early stage.
- *Advisory*: the panel does not take planning decisions, but it offers impartial advice for the Local Planning Authority, which does.
- *Objective*: the panel appraises schemes according to reasoned, objective criteria rather than the stylistic tastes of individual panel members.
- *Accessible*: the findings and advice are clearly expressed in terms that design teams, decision makers and clients can all understand and make use of.

### **National Planning Policy objectives for the delivery of good quality design in new development**

- 6 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) places a strong emphasis on good design. The aspirations are set out in the Ministerial forward which includes the statements;

“Our standards of design can be so much higher”, and;

“Planning must be a creative exercise in finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which we live our lives”

The body of the document sets out further objectives including;

“Always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity...” Core Principles, paragraph 17

“Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development is indivisible from good planning and should contribute positively to making places better for people.” Section 7, paragraph 56

“Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions” Section 7, paragraph 64  
And

“Local planning authorities should have local design review arrangements in place to provide assessment and support to ensure high standards of design.” Section 7, paragraph 62.

- 7 Local policies that promote the delivery of good design are present in current and emerging planning policy documents.

## **What is the Oxford Design Review Panel (ODRP)?**

- 8 The ODRP was set up in 2014 with Design Council CaBE (DC & Commission for Excellence in the Built Environment) to provide design review feedback and advice on substantial, important and sensitive schemes within Oxford. Guidance about how the ODRP operates and previous annual reports can be found on the council's website.

[https://www.oxford.gov.uk/downloads/file/3412/odrp\\_guide\\_10\\_2017](https://www.oxford.gov.uk/downloads/file/3412/odrp_guide_10_2017)

- 9 The Design Review service continues to be provided by DCC and operates on a twice-monthly cycle of reviews to which new development schemes are targeted both at pre-application and submission stages of consideration by the council.
- 10 The panel has consistency through a body of accumulated experience retaining its two original chairs, Keith Bradley and Joanna Van Heyningen supported by specific panellists who bring a range of skills and are drawn from DCC's national list of Built Environment Experts (BEE's). On occasion, where considered appropriate, these national experts are supported by local BEE's from Oxford/Oxfordshire.
- 11 Developers submit schemes for panel consideration and a fee is paid by the developer for the design review service. As the design of schemes is often an iterative process, most of the eligible schemes will be reviewed by the ODRP a number of times throughout their development. The panel's letter of advice remains confidential at pre-application stage but after a planning application is submitted the panel's advice is made public as part of the officer's report to the planning committee.
- 12 The council's original contract with DCC has been reviewed and is about to be re-let. A new review panel report covering the period 2015 to 2017 will be produced following completion of the new contract. The cost of the reviews will be increased to reflect changes that have occurred in the cost of providing the service contract since it was originally let. These changes include covering the Council's costs of facilitating the design review process which are not included in the fees paid for planning applications. A number of improvements to the administration and operation of the ODRP process have been implemented as a result of the contract review process.
- 13 Design review is now a mainstream and familiar part of the development management process operated by Oxford City Council. The benefits of independent design advice in supporting the delivery of high quality new development in the city are valued by both members and officers. This process is now seen as a normal step in the process of bringing forward high quality new development in Oxford.

## Some of the typical schemes reviewed by the ODRP 2016/2017

Session type	Scheme name
Design Workshop	Littlemore Park
Design Review	Barton Park Primary School
Design Review	St Catherine's College
Design Workshop	Oxpens masterplan
Design Workshop	JR Hospital
Design Workshop	Wadham College
Design Workshop	Jack Straws Lane
Design Review Returning	St Hilda's College II
Design Review Returning	Northern Gateway ii
Design Review Returning	Northern Gateway ii
Design Workshop	Dragon School
Design Workshop	Northgate house, Jesus College
Design Workshop	The Girls' Day School Trust - Oxford High School
Design Workshop	25 Wellington Square
Design Review	Wadham College II

- 14 It is not always possible to quantify the value of design review or to specifically identify the panel's contribution to improving design quality or speeding the process. However there are many examples where it can be seen that design review has helped to improve the design of schemes to a point where both planning officers and the planning committee are satisfied that a sufficiently high quality of design has been reached. In this respect, engagement in the process can also be seen as a form of de-risking some aspects of the development for applicants.
- 15 One scheme, the development of new speculative student accommodation at Manor Place on land owned by Merton College has been through the ODRP process a number of times but did not reach the standards of design quality that the Council expects and was recommended for refusal by officers and ultimately refused by the West Area Planning Committee. The refusal has been the subject of an appeal and is currently in recess from a public inquiry process. This has been the only case since the panel was set up where the views of the panel and the local planning authority have fundamentally diverged.
- 16 In Planning Advisory Service (PAS) commissioned research on the value of design review panels, evidence was put forward that indicated that: "The panel's views are taken seriously by planning committees and aid decision-making about particular schemes. The panel may also have an indirect influence on the quality of applications...*The fact that a panel exists sends a signal to the development community. This is at least an important role as a review of the detail of a scheme.*"

## Design challenges for Oxford now and in future

- 17 The panel is overseeing a range of schemes coming forward under the policies of the current development plan but there a number of strategic and local design Issues that will be highly relevant to Oxford over coming years. The Council will need to plan for and consider these issues, supported by the design review process where appropriate:
- Planning for growth in the city that respects its heritage but facilitates and enables quality new development and innovation to enable the city's needs to be met
  - The challenges that new higher density development in the city might pose and the need to respond appropriately to these and the related consideration of taller buildings
  - Ensuring there are good connections between new development and neighbouring communities in the new growth being planned around the expanding city
  - Managing the demands/needs of cars, bins and bikes with imagination and sensitivity in new development
  - Accommodation of the car in a changing world of SMART technologies and good designs for parking; this extends to understanding the impact of broadband and 'the internet of things'
  - The need to reduce energy demand and meeting rising standards and the likelihood of future over-heating, anticipating the need for adaptation as the temperature rises, requires differing designs according to the actual development orientation
  - Outdoor and Indoor air quality is a rapidly growing issue nationally
  - The difficult question of defining and delivering local character and designing to respond well to it
  - The temptation of the development industry to cheapen the details and materials following planning permission. Holding on to the hard won high quality design through the implementation stages of development.
  - Long-term stewardship of strategic sites by the site developer/College or institution through ambitious masterplanning. The absence of an ambitious masterplan can make delivery and securing design quality and coherence over time very difficult. Recognising and encouraging owners to recognise the importance and value of imaginative and robust masterplans and importantly of adherence to the ambitions set out in these documents.
  - The need for new public spaces and enhanced public realm in Oxford city centre to help accommodate local population and visitor growth



## **How are we preparing for these future Design challenges?**

- 18 The new local plan has provided an opportunity to review the development plan policy context and to see how our planning policies can support how we address the key challenges around securing high quality growth and appropriate new development in the city.
- 19 We continue to use and value a design review service and recent revisions to the ODRP contract have included formally planning, design and heritage officers' observations on scheme designs in the briefing of the panel thus providing opportunity for consideration of the city's key design challenges up-front as part of the panel's review of schemes. Other changes will be introduced as part of the contract review process.
- 20 Increased urban design resources in-house is enabling more effective participation and contribution to development and strategic planning initiatives across the council and allow the identified challenges to be given appropriate weight in these projects.
- 20 Urban design training is planned this autumn and will support member development in dealing with the above challenges and of the tools available to respond to these. Urban design skills improvements for officers are dealt with in-house through close working with the urban design specialists.

### **Next steps**

- 21 The report has set out to given an update on how the ODRP process is currently working. The Committee is asked to note the report and provide any feedback.

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

Name: Patsy Dell

Job title: Head of Planning, Sustainable Development & Regulatory Services  
Service Area / Department: Planning, Sustainable Development & Regulatory Services

Tel: 01865 252356 e-mail: [pdell@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:pdell@oxford.gov.uk)

List of background papers: none , Version number 3

This page is intentionally left blank

**To:** City Executive Board  
**Date:** 19 September 2017  
**Report of:** Head of Service for Community Services  
**Title of Report:** Monitoring the Community Grants Programme – Report for 2016/17

<b>Summary and recommendations</b>	
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	To inform members of the monitoring findings of the 2016/17 grants programme.
<b>Key decision:</b>	No
<b>Executive Board Member:</b>	Councillor Dee Sinclair, Culture and Communities
<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Strong, Active Communities.
<b>Policy Framework:</b>	Corporate Plan and Community Centre Strategy
<b>Recommendation: That the City Executive Board resolves to:</b>	
1. Note the results of the grant monitoring and the positive impact the community and voluntary sector is making in the city.	

<b>Appendices</b>	
Appendix 1	List of community and voluntary organisations awarded a grant through the open bidding, commissioning and Youth Ambition grant programmes.
Appendix 2	Case Studies.
Appendix 3	Risk Register.
Appendix 4	Examples of monitoring returned for projects funded through the small grants and open bidding programmes

## Introduction and background

- 1 Effective monitoring ensures that grant funding awarded is spent for the purpose it was given and helps the Council assess the impact of the funded work. It provides an opportunity to find out if there are any external factors affecting the voluntary sector and how organisations are weathering these circumstances.

- 2 Community Services ran the following programmes, shown in Table 1, in the last year. The three programmes to which eligible community and voluntary organisations could apply were:
- Community Grants Programme
  - Youth Ambition Grants Programme
  - Holiday Activities Grant Programme (monitoring feedback for this programme is reported separately)
- 3 Table 1 below shows the amount spent by each programme.

**Table 1**

	<b>Amount spent</b>
<b>Grant programme</b>	
Advice & Money Management	£518,359
Homelessness	£442,279
Inclusive Arts & Culture	£235,262
Community Safety	£61,082
Community & Voluntary Sector Infrastructure	£43,736
Inclusive Play & Leisure for Disabled Children & Young People	£15,000
Annual Open Bidding Grant Programme	£110,000
Small Grant Programme	£6,140
Youth Ambition Grant Programme	£60,000
*Overpayment of Rent – internal adjustment being made	£5,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>£1,496,848</b>

\*For a number of years rent for Emmaus has been deducted from their grant, this is an internal transaction, they moved into alternative premises not owned by the Council but the transaction still took place.

### **Key Findings**

- 4 It continues to be a challenging time for the city’s community and voluntary organisations and Oxford City Council funding is considered vital by the many it supports.
- 5 Our investment of £1,496,848 has helped local community and voluntary organisations secure an additional £7,963,060 to benefit local people, £5.33 for every £1 we have invested.
- 6 However this does show a decrease of 22% on the amount of reported secured income from last year. Arts and culture and youth programmes show the biggest decreases in income, this is because of an increase in competition when applying to other sources of funding.
- 7 Through monitoring we have discovered that well established organisations are increasingly seeking support with funding issues, advice on governing structures, how they can use their resources more effectively and how to maximise income.
- 8 With less funding available many organisations are finding themselves competing against each other and for smaller pots of funding. More positively, groups have

risen to the challenges and are now working more collaboratively sharing skills and in some cases jointly applying for funding.

### **Addressing Council Priorities**

- 9 Whether as part of the commissioning programme or through open bidding, small grants or the youth ambition programme, funding to community and voluntary organisations supports the Council in meeting its corporate plan objectives and also helps improve the quality of life for many Oxford residents.

### **Social Impact**

- 10 Areas where our funding is making a significant impact include:
- Our funding enables groups to develop and expand volunteer delivery for a wide range of key community services. This includes befriending isolated older people, teaching English to asylum seekers and refugees, children's activities in deprived areas and ensuring residents in regeneration areas access information and news in their locality as well as finding out about cultural and family events.
  - Making a real difference to local communities, improving the quality of people's lives and their life chances by funding advice centres to support people out of debt, look at ways to increase their income and support many to stay in their homes.
  - Funding organisations working with homeless people and rough sleepers to help them make life changing choices, improve their accommodation, learn new skills and get into employment.

### **Process of Gathering Monitoring Information**

- 11 One of the conditions for funding is that organisations agree to provide qualitative and quantitative reporting on the grant they have received. In most instances this is received via a completed monitoring form. In other cases a site visit by officer(s) takes place, or a combination of both dependent on scale or perceived risk of grant.
- 12 The City Executive Board agreed for organisations that fail to return monitoring information that they will need to return any funding paid to them and they will not be eligible to apply for funding for one year. This is reiterated in award letters.
- 13 This has proved to be very successful and all organisations returned their monitoring during the year.

### **Monitoring Information**

- 14 Appendices 1 and 2 provide the following information:
- Name of organisation / group
  - Amount of grant awarded
  - Description of project / activity
  - Number of beneficiaries
  - Brief description of what was achieved

- Total amount of matched funding or funding levered in as a result of Oxford City Council funding
- Case studies from a variety of organisations

15 Table 2 below summarises the information listed in Appendix 1 for grants awarded through the 2016/17 open bidding grants programme.

**Table 2 – Annual Open Bidding Summary – Grants Up To £10,000**

<b>Number of projects awarded a grant</b>	<b>Total amount of grant awarded</b>	<b>Total of other funding matched or levered in</b>	<b>Number of beneficiaries from these projects</b>	<b>Some of the things the funding paid for</b>
21	£110,000	£384,766	19,577 plus 20,000 households receive community newspapers	Training, community events, work with asylum seekers and refugees, work targeting people suffering from loneliness/isolation

For each £1 invested in the annual open bidding grants programme, the equivalent of £3.49 in additional funding was matched or levered into Oxford.

16 Table 3 below summarises the information in Appendix 1 for grants awarded through the small grants programme during 2016/17

**Table 3 – Open Bidding – Small Grants Up To £1,000**

<b>Number of projects awarded a grant</b>	<b>Total amount of grant awarded</b>	<b>Total of other funding matched or levered in</b>	<b>Number of beneficiaries from these projects</b>	<b>Some of the things the funding paid for</b>
9	£6,130	£10,707	6,293	Community events, dance for children and young people, puppet performance at the Story Museum

For each £1 invested in the annual open bidding grants programme, the equivalent of £1.74, in additional funding was matched or levered into Oxford.

17 Table 4 below summarises the information listed in Appendix 1 for grants awarded through the 2016/17 Youth Ambition grants programme.

**Table 4 – Open bidding – Summary from Youth Ambition Grants Programme Grants Up To £10,000**

<b>Number of projects awarded a grant</b>	<b>Total amount of grant awarded</b>	<b>Total of other funding matched or levered in</b>	<b>Number of beneficiaries from these projects</b>	<b>Some of the things the funding paid for</b>
11	£60,000	£47,946	223	FGM, 1:1 support, raising awareness about staying safe, youth volunteering

For each £1 invested in the youth ambition grants programme, the equivalent of £0.79, in additional funding was matched or levered into Oxford.

18 Tables 5 & 6 below summarise the information listed in Appendix 1 for grants awarded through the 2016/17 commissioning programme.

**Table 5 – Commissioned Grants Summary**

<b>Commissioned theme</b>	<b>Number of groups funded</b>	<b>Total amount of grant awarded</b>	<b>Total of other funding matched or levered in</b>	<b>Number of beneficiaries from these projects</b>	<b>Some of the things the funding paid for</b>
Arts & culture	12	£235,262	£771,204	44,950	Training in film & digital media, twinning events, work experience in the theatre
For every £1 invested in the arts and culture commissioning theme the equivalent of £3.27 in additional funding was matched or levered into Oxford.					
Homelessness	12	£442,279	£5,316,869	1156	Day centres, life skills, specialist workers

For every £1 invested in the homelessness commissioning theme the equivalent of £12.02 in additional funding was matched or levered into Oxford.					
Community safety	4	£61,082	£231,135	451	Domestic violence outreach, helpline service for victims of sexual violence
For every £1 invested in the community safety commissioning theme the equivalent of £3.78 in additional funding was matched or levered into Oxford.					
Community & voluntary organisations infrastructure	1	£43,736	£258,302	996 Oxford based community & voluntary groups	Providing information, support and advice to the voluntary sector
For every £1 invested in the community & voluntary organisations infrastructure commissioning theme the equivalent of £5.90 in additional funding was matched or levered in.					
Play & leisure for disabled children and young people	1	£15,000	£194,971	212	Supporting disabled children and young people to participate in inclusive mainstream play
For every £1 invested in the play & leisure for disabled children and young people commissioning theme the equivalent of £12.99 in additional funding was matched or levered into Oxford for this work.					
<b>Totals</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>£797,359</b>	<b>£6,772,481</b>	<b>72,862 plus</b>	<b>996 voluntary groups</b>

**Table 6 – summary from commissioned advice centres**

<b>Number of organisations funded</b>	<b>Total amount of grant awarded</b>	<b>Number of beneficiaries from these projects</b>	<b>Total of other funding matched or levered in</b>	<b>Total benefit (in monetary value) take up</b>	<b>Total amount of debt written off</b>
4	£518,379	9502	£747,160	£4,835,087	£792,636



### **Financial implications**

- 19 The report demonstrates the value of the Council's grant programmes.
- 20 For clarification the amount of funding matched or levered in is collected through monitoring reports returned by all funded organisations and groups. The information they give us is taken on trust but if necessary financial information can be clarified when accounts have been independently assessed or audited. Some examples of monitoring information returned is attached in Appendix 4.

### **Legal issues**

- 21 There are no legal implications.

### **Level of risk**

- 22 Please see Appendix 3 for risk.

### **Equalities impact**

- 23 Grant funding awarded to community and voluntary organisations has a significant and positive impact on equalities and promotes community cohesion. Grants actively supported the achievements of equality by otherwise marginalised groups, such as funding supplied to Oxford Friend, to Oxford Sexual Abuse and Rape Crisis Centre for the domestic violent case worker and to the Parasol Project that provides inclusive play and leisure activities for disabled children and young people. In addition 59% of the council's funding benefitted people in localities facing multiple deprivation or inequalities.

<b>Report author</b>	Julia Tomkins
Job title	Grant Officer
Service area or department	Community Services
Telephone	01865 252685
e-mail	<a href="mailto:jtomkins@oxford.gov.uk">jtomkins@oxford.gov.uk</a>

This page is intentionally left blank

## APPENDIX 1

## Grants to Community and Voluntary Organisations

## Annual Open Bidding Grants Programme 2016/2017

Organisation	grant awarded	Description of project	number of people benefiting	achievements / outcome	other funding received for this project
Archway Foundation	£7,500	Through a variety of activities the Archway Foundation supports people suffering from loneliness. Our funding contributes towards core costs that enables them to deliver social events and sessions.	146	300 Individuals held on data base, they have recorded 146 people accessing social sessions and events, they are also befriended by volunteers who listen and explore ways to offer further support. Users also have opportunities to meet other people in similar situations and engage in organised events.	£49,058
Asylum Welcome	£10,000	Asylum Welcome works to help reduce the poverty, suffering and social isolation of asylum seekers and refugees in Oxfordshire. Our funding contributes towards their core costs to support asylum seekers and refugees living in Oxford.	182	143 Individual service users have received support through their information and signposting service. 45 Individual service users have been supported through their education team, They also run a food bank and 257 visit were recorded (this is store cupboard food not fresh food)	£183,867
Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT)	£2,000	<b>BBOWT is a voluntary organisation concerned with all aspects of nature conservation. One of the ways the promote this is through events. Our funding contributed towards the promotion and infrastructure for their wildlife fair which was part of the 2016 Oxford Festival of Nature</b>	7,500	The Wild Fair event was a great success with 7,500 visitors, up from 4,500 in 2015. Visitors included a wide range of adults of all ages and families from Oxford and further afield. All of the events were open to all, made accessible to all wherever possible	£14,728
Blackbird Leys Adventure Playground (BLAP)	£7,500	BLAP runs an after school club for children and young people aged 8-13 years old. They have a large inside facility as well as land to the front and back and access to a school field that is adjacent to their adventure playground. Our funding contributes towards their core costs to run the club.	177	The after school club is open Monday - Friday from 3pm to 5.30pm except during school holidays. 71% of children attending are from BME communities. A variety of activities are available for them to take part in that includes among other things art and craft, cooking, growing vegetables, being active on the equipment, 77% of the children learnt how to grow and cook vegetables	£13,950
Community Emergency Foodbank	£5,000	The Community Emergency Foodbank runs from St Francis Church in Holloway and is open every Tuesday and Friday from 12 noon to 2pm. Our funding was awarded to contribute towards the core costs in running this service.	1,022	During the year 1022 people were recorded attending the food bank and received food parcels. Information collected from users of the service show that benefit sanctions and late benefit payment are the main reason people rely on food banks	£7,550

Cotteslowe Community Association	£4,450	The Cotteslowe Community Association organise and deliver a 3 week summer holiday play scheme for children aged 5-11 years old. Our funding contributed towards the delivery of this scheme.	49	49 children registered with the scheme and had opportunities to take part in a variety of activities to broaden their horizons, improve their social and communication skills, build confidence and strengthen friendships.	£9,000
Cotteslowe Seniors group	£1,000	A lively supportive group for the over 50's living in the Cotteslowe area. Our funding contributed towards adapted transport costs to enable people to attend social sessions and events	31	The funding has enabled the group to encourage participation in the fortnightly programme of activities and by promoting the wellbeing of the older members of Cotteslowe the principle outcome of reducing isolation has been achieved.	£0
Donnington Doorstep family centre	£7,000	Donnington Doorstep provides a variety of activities for children and young people living in the local area. Our funding contributes to the core costs of providing a free drop in facility for young people aged 8-18 years old and aims to improve the knowledge of those attending with a better understanding of what it means to be healthy, enjoy and stay safe.	62	During the year 62 children and young people used the drop in facility of which 36 Received 1:1 support.	£5,000
9 Dovecote Voluntary Parent Committee	£2,500	The Dovecote project offer after school activities for children aged 5-13 years old living on Greater Leys. Our funding was awarded to contribute towards core costs to deliver centre based activities during summer	59	59 children had access to low cost summer activities which supports early intervention aims providing young people with the social and emotional support to help them fulfil their potential and break the cycles of underachievement. It also supports the development of young people's social and emotional capabilities which in turn will lessen the chance of them adopting antisocial or negative behaviour throughout life.	£20,500
Headington Action	£500	Headington Action is a voluntary group that aim to benefit the community of Headington. Our funding contributed to the insurance charges for the group to organise and run the annual Headington Festival.	6,000	The weekend event took place on 4-5 June 2016. it attracted over 6000 local people from Headington and the surrounding areas.	£2,565
Innovista - Thrive Project	£8,000	The Thrive project runs in Barton and targets young people classified as NEET aged 12 - 18 years old. Our funding contributed towards the core costs to deliver a young leaders programme working with 8 young people living on Barton.	10	10 young people participated in the programme. The Young Leaders learnt new skills and gained confidence. They played a crucial role in the delivery of holiday activities. For example, they planned and delivered sports, healthy eating and craft activities during the Easter half term and they hosted a successful Family Fun Day in the Summer	£3,500

JACARI	£2,000	Jacari is a student charity providing home tutoring for disadvantaged children aged 6-16 who don't speak English as their first language. They spend an hour a week helping a child with their English language. The project also runs classes for the Mothers of children they are helping with English. Our funding contributed towards core costs of running this project	228	210 young people and 18 Mothers of these young people have benefited from English lessons. This has been proven to result in improved performance at school and an increase in the child's confidence outside the classroom.	£11,276
Leys CDI - The Clockhouse project	£7,000	The Clockhouse project organises activities for the over 50's living on and near the Leys. Our funding contributed towards the core costs that enabled activities to take place plus outreach to encourage new people to take part, it also enabled them to offer low cost activities	160	160 local residents used the facilities of these 83% were over 65 and 43% has a physical disability and/or mental health condition. All activities offered the stimulation of learning something new, whether through quiz questions, perfecting a dance routine or experimenting with watercolour techniques.	£13,742
Leys News	£7,000	Leys News is part of the Community Media Group. The organisation provides professional editorial advice to local groups producing community newspapers. All of the newspapers are owned and operated by local residents and the content is created by community journalists. Our funding contributes towards core costs to support 7 community newspapers across Oxford and provides them with reduced production and printing costs.	50	50 local people have been trained in community journalism. The newspapers provide access to information and opportunities for many people. 80% of all advertisement income is passed back to individual newspapers to help with sustainability	£11,100
Open Door	£2,966	Open Door provides a weekly drop in for refugees and asylum seekers in Oxford. They also provide a hot meal and sign posting to services. Our funding contributed towards the core costs to deliver this service.	80	80 refugees or asylum seekers have used the weekly drop in service with an average weekly attendance of 42. Each week they get a hot meal and support with issues affecting their lives which can include help with completing online forms, housing issues or visit to the GP.	£0
Oxford City of Sanctuary (now known as Sanctuary Hosting)	£5,000	This is a scheme whereby local people offer a bedroom in their homes on a temporary basis to an asylum seeker or refugee who would otherwise be homeless. Our funding contributed to the core costs to administer this service.	26	1850 nights of accommodation was provided the refugees and/or asylum seekers. Working in partnership with the Red Cross and Oxford CAB a bid to the Big Lottery was successful	£8,827
Oxfordshire Play Association	£2,500	Among other things the Oxfordshire Play Association organise and deliver play days across the County. Our funding enabled them to deliver a free to access play day at Cutteslowe	650	650 local children young people and families enjoyed a day of free activities that promoted healthy active lives	£1,257

Restore - Elder Stubbs Festival	£3,099	Restore support the Elder Stubbs Allotment project to organise and delivery the Elder Stubbs Festival where they promote awareness of mental health. Our funding contributed to the infrastructure costs such as hire of toilets and volunteers expenses and refreshments	2,500	Over 2500 local people attended the event in August 2016, 80 service users were involved with the organisation, preparation and many other aspects of the event.	£1,405
Rose Hill Junior youth club	£7,500	Rose Hill Junior Youth Club provides weekly sessions for children aged 6-11 years old. Our funding contributed towards the core costs of running this club primarily room hire and staffing	180	180 children records as attending weekly sessions on a regular basis. 28% of those attending have some form of ADHD,, Autism or social and emotional issues. 3000 visits were recorded.	£10,671
South Oxford Adventure Playground (SOAP)	£8,000	SOPA is a facility offering play and recreation opportunities for children and young people aged 5-15 years old. Our funding contributed towards the delivery of Easter and Summer school holiday supervised provision	362	362 children and young people accessed the facility with 2798 visits being recorded. A grant from the Postcode Lottery enabled them to renovate equipment and it supported a volunteer scheme for young people wishing to get more involved.	£16,038
Workers Education Association,, Oxford Branch (WEA)	£2,485	The WEA runs courses aimed at reducing social exclusion. Classes are delivered in the heart of local communities, using safe and familiar venues and outreach recruitment methodology. Our funding contributed to a community art project in Wood Farm	33	A diverse group of local residents got involved with 6 focus groups and participated in the making of a mosaic. All learning new skills and meeting new people. The completed mosaic was erected at the shops	£0
Wood Farm youth centre	£7,000	Funding was awarded to contribute towards the delivery of Wednesday night youth sessions	70	over the year 70 children and young people have been recorded attending with an average of 17 attending each week	£732
<b>Total amount awarded</b>	<b>£110,000</b>	<b>Total number of beneficiaries</b>	<b>19,577</b>	<b>Total other funding levered in</b>	<b>£384,766</b>

## APPENDIX 1

**Grants to Community and Voluntary Organisations**

Small grant programme 2016/17

Organisation	grant awarded	Description of project	number of people benefiting	achievements / outcome	other funding received for this project
Oxford Polish Association	£800	A local group based in Blackbird Leys that actively promotes community cohesion through events and projects. Funding was awarded to contribute towards a family day of activities celebrating Fathers Day in June 2016.	900	An event that attracted 900 people from across the city of which 70% were from the Polish community and 30% from other cultures.	£2,150
West Oxford Community Association	£500	Funding was awarded to contribute towards the West Oxford fun day that took place on 09th July 2016	500	500 local people attended the fun day, there were 35 stalls promoting local groups and charities and 55 volunteers that helped with the organisation s and running of the events	£2,007
Oxford Hindu Temple and Community Centre Project	£1,000	Funding was awarded to contribute towards the Oxford Summer Mela that took place on 21st May 2016	1200	1200 people from across the city attended this event including 40 stall holders representing a variety of local groups and charities.	£3,500
Oxfordshire Play Association	£1,000	Funding was awarded to contribute to the delivery of a play and activity day on 11th June 2016	500	500 people from Barton and the surrounding area enjoyed a day of activities that were free to access	£300
Young Peoples Puppet Theatre	£500	The Young Peoples Puppet Theatre works in partnership with schools and delivers projects where young people learn about and make puppets. Our funding was awarded to enable students from Orchard Meadow School in Blackbird Leys to perform a play with their puppets at the Story Museum and for a short film to be made of their performance	76	26 students from Orchard Meadow participated in performances at the Story Museum and 50 people attended the performances.	£0
Churches together in Headington	£135	Funding was awarded to promote the Summer fun day in Barton and Wood Farm	2000	Promotion of the fun day was carried out by distributing flyers and they estimated that 2000 local people attended the event	£1,850

Barton Community Association	£750	Funding was awarded to contribute towards Barton Bash that took place in November 2016	800	800 local people attended and as a result of the event several groups have now been established at the Neighbourhood Centre including the Somali group who have started their own keep fit classes.	£0
L'il Tapz	£655	A locally run dance group for children living on Rose Hill. Our funding contributed towards room hire and costs for a celebration event	222	72 children attend dance classes and 150 local people attended the celebration event held at Rose Hill community centre	£0
Ark T Centre	£800	Funding was awarded to contribute towards a festival targeting disabled young people in Oxford. Our funding was awarded to contribute towards outreach and promoting the event plus any transport needs of disabled families from deprived areas of the city	95	130 people from across Oxfordshire attended the festival, 95 were from the City. Feedback from those attending said they enjoyed the variety of things to do and that everyone was brought together in a cohesive and accessible way.	£900
<b>Total amount awarded</b>	<b>£6,140</b>	<b>Total number of beneficiaries</b>	<b>6,293</b>	<b>Total levered in</b>	<b>£10,707</b>



APPENDIX 1

Commissioned Art Organisations in 2016 / 2017 through the Inclusive Arts and Culture commissioning grant programme

Organisation	grant awarded	Description of project	number of people benefiting	achievements / outcome	other funding received for this project
Fusion Arts	£28,128	This organisation fosters and promotes the improvement and development of artistic knowledge, understanding and appreciation of the arts for the benefit of the public and in particular community group, young people, older people and people with special needs. They aim to delivery inclusive projects with outcomes that bring people together in established cultural venues and events.	11,508	Fusion Arts delivered a broad range of projects, classes and artistic activities for marginalised and disadvantaged groups, Regular one off room hire and regular user groups are continuing to book at the centre. The regular users include: Life Drawing classes, Young Women's Music Project, NCS, Yoga classes, Modelling Change, Woodcraft Folk, African Drumming, Awkward Actors Theatre Group and two Age UK Movement classes for Over 50s. Increased Fusion visibility developed on previous pop-up gigs they hosted numerous arts and music events, talks and exhibitions. The majority of which have been not-for-profit or free entry. Developed a model to allow for a number of these events to accommodate under 18s (a massively under resourced area). Benefitting local communities and promoting art and artists. Fusion is now a venue for OXJAM acting as main Hub for the 350 strong crowd. Held numerous gigs drawing new audiences to Fusion and opening up the network of support that Fusion can provide.	£122,800
Modern Art Oxford	£70,000	This organisation , located in Pembroke Street, was established to promote modern visual arts to the public. Working with artists they deliver a community and education programme aiming to increase the enjoyment and understanding contemporary art. Funding awarded to this organisation pays their rent charges to Oxford City Council.	117,352	Over the year MAO have delivered many events, gigs, live performances and talks that included a free programme of cultural activity for young people. They also provided 6 weeks of work experience for two young people from low income families and a tour of the museum for young people with behavioural challenges. Tours and talks with groups, school, colleges and universities for over 1850 children and young people.	£230,139

Oxford Contemporary Music	£10,000	A project working with artists and musicians to promote high quality new music to the public through the delivery of community focused projects. Core funded by the Arts Council.	n/a	Partnering with the Oxford Playhouse and Oxford Festival of the Arts a show was presented in Oxford that was seen by 2078 people. They gave 26 local artists the opportunity to work in unusual places of which one was the Ashmolean Museum, there were over 1700 visitors to the museum that evening. They worked with Larkmead School to develop a series of activities to ignite interest in music amongst pre GCSE students.	£270,470
Film Oxford	£25,000	A project making film and digital media more accessible, delivering training to increase opportunities for individuals into their industry. Funding was used to deliver this work. £5000 was deducted to pay for rent due to the Council	1,313	313 people benefited from subsidised training last year on 45 courses. 35 places were free to those on benefits. 51 people were from a minority group, 54 people classified themselves as having a disability and 38 people were over 55. They engaged with 18 young refugees over a 3 month period and produced two short films. Over 1000 local people watched films in the parks over the Summer	£153,672
Ark T Centre	£5,000	The Ark T Centre delivers art exhibitions, creative workshops, dance and music. There is a recording studio for young musicians, rehearsal space for theatre and dance, a performance and concert area and studios for a group of resident artists.	165	50 volunteers gave 200 hours working on the garden in the play space, they have repainted the outside of the building, the inside of the cafe, and new art project room. In October 2016, Ark T launched Oxford's first youth arts disability festival which was attended by 109 people. 11 partner organisations from the disability sector and arts sector joined forces with performances by Anjali and workshops led by inclusive theatre company BLINK.	£114,500
Oxford Playhouse	£24,000	An organisation aiming to raise public awareness and appreciation of the arts through theatre, dance and music. They deliver a range of participatory opportunities for the community including youth theatre, access performances for people who are hard of hearing, deaf, blind and partially sighted and support for local artists and family friendly initiatives.	50,273	Regularly working with 8-15 young people aged 12-16 each week during term in Littlemore. These young people will be performing as a part of their Young Players Festival. Up to 20 young people attend workshops during school holidays, they have hosted 64 work experience placements for Secondary students aged 14-18yrs in this financial year. 796 free tickets and 422 discounted tickets were issued during the year.	£758,474
Experience Oxfordshire	£2,000	A Visitor Information Service for Oxford and Oxfordshire to help people get the most out of their visit. Our funding focuses on supporting marketing of cultural organisations and key city events to a tourist audience.	n/k	The organisation played an active role in planning and promoting Christmas light night and all other city events,	n/k

Arts at the Old Fire Station	£32,134	Launched in 2011, Arts at the Old Fire Station is a charity and social enterprise offering support for emerging artists and a gallery with a wide range of exhibitions, a theatre offering music and drama and a studio for all kinds of dance and workshops for artists	340	7 Oxford artists occupy 6 studios (1 is shared), over 80 makers selling work in the shop, 80% of artists responding to a survey reported that engaging with AOFS has led to more professional and paid work, 42 emerging artists showcase/exhibited in the gallery #, . cafe or there corridor, 37 regular weekly dance and wellbeing classes held by 18 different teachers. 113 complementary tickets were taken up by homeless people	£432,841
Pegasus Theatre	£25,000	An organisation promoting the appreciation of the arts in particular for the benefit of children and young people. The organisation boasts a strong reputation, good partnership working and good track record delivering high quality accessible arts and delivers projects with children and young people targeting those who are socially excluded	1,213	10 young people had a week long work experience placements, 570 young people took part in 37 participatory arts project, 36 bursaries and 101 reduced rate placed were given on weekly courses, 48 bursaries and 32 reduced rate places given, 100 young people from 6 primary schools achieved a discover award. Outreach summer sessions were held at Dovecote, Northway youth club, Rosehill youth club & Donnington Doorstep, 18 young people have been involved on the youth board with two members sitting on the Pegasus Board as trustees.	£231,313
OVADA	£5,000	OVADA provide opportunities for artists to create new work, support the transfer of skills, knowledge & experience, encourage collaborations between artists, develops partnerships, exhibits work and builds new audiences for contemporary art.	34,807	A strong series of 22 public artists talks, networking and professional development events were held this year, during Christmas light night visitor figures were extremely high with 31,870 people coming to see exhibited work over the 3 day period. A total of 4 participatory workshops were held with City of Oxford College and Cheney School	£72,290
Oxford International Links	£6,000	An umbrella organisation co-ordinating twinning links and events throughout the year, providing good partnership working and bringing a lot into the city in both funding and culture.	4,010	The Bonn link is collaborating with Oxford Studio Orchestra and volunteer singers, the Leidonlink celebrated its 70th anniversary with many inclusive events including playing to a crowd of over 4000 and to many people at West Oxford Community fun day, 10 young people from diverse backgrounds were supported to attend a drama festival in Grenoble and Oxford University brass band represented Oxford in both Leiden and Bonn in a summer tour.	£29,760

Oxford Philharmonic	£3,000	Funding specifically to enable Oxford Philharmonic to increase the number of free family concerts they deliver from 2 to 3 each year, to continue to offer discounted tickets for young people for concerts (with at least 100 free tickets per year to be distributed through the Communities team), continue to deliver work in hospitals and primary schools, and contribute at least one event / activity to the city's Light Festival in November each year.	4,580	During the year 100 free tickets were distributed to the local community for 3 concerts of which two targeted 4-8 year olds and one targeted 8-12 year olds. They held a three day festival of strings where 230 children from 7 local schools ( that included Bayards Hill & Blackbird Leys Academy Trust), enjoyed the music. Subsidised tickets are available for students and children	£5,000
<b>Total amount awarded</b>	<b>£235,262</b>	<b>total number of beneficiaries</b>	<b>44,950</b>	<b>total amount of funding levered in</b>	<b>£771,204</b>

APPENDIX 1

Commissioned Organisations in 2016 / 2017 through the Community Safety commissioning grant programme

Organisation	grant awarded	Description of project	number of people benefiting	achievements / outcome	other funding received for this project
A2 Dominion - Domestic Abuse Outreach Worker	£35,082	a project providing practical and emotional support for females and males experiencing domestic abuse, The work is to improve their quality of life by working in a holistic approach to support them and the family. The funding was awarded to cover the cost of a FTE outreach worker plus any support costs for the post	72	72 adults (111 children) were supported last year by the outreach worker, all received 1:1 support, advocacy and/or signposting. 9 were supported to obtain legal services and advice, 4 supported with court attendances	n/k
Donnington Doorstep Family Centre	£8,000	Funding was awarded to develop resources on healthy relationships and consent for children and young people who are at risk or victims of Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) and deliver 1-2-1 sessions with children who are at risk of or victims of CSE) supporting them to build resilience.	32	32 young people at risk of sexual exploitation were supported through this project with 420 hours of 1:1 support and helped to make informed choices	£69,917
Oxford Sexual Abuse and Rape Crisis Centre	£15,000	a telephone helpline service which is run by a team of trained volunteers, enabling victims of sexual violence to deal with the effects of these crimes, improve access to information. The helpline is open 4 times a week and is the only agency providing specialist services for survivors of sexual abuse and rape,	204	The organisation supported 204 individuals last year through either the support group, helpline, counselling, advocacy or emails. All of this support has seen an increase on the previous year numbers with the biggest increase for counselling which rose by 36% closely followed by calls to the helpline that increased by 35%.	£159,268
Oxford Friend	£3,000	A confidential telephone helpline that provides advice, support and counselling to Oxford's lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender community plus their family and friends.	143	the helpline continues to open three evenings each week, they sign posted 63 to other services . They have given a talk to a group of students at Oxford Brookes	£1,950
<b>total amount of funding awarded</b>	<b>£61,082</b>	<b>Total number of beneficiaries</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>Total amount of other funding</b>	<b>£231,135</b>

**ADVICE CENTRE MONITORING**

		Rose Hill & Donnington Advice Centre	Agnes Smith / BBL Neighbourhood Support Service	Oxford Community Work Agency	Oxford CAB
Oxford City Council Funding		£90,478	£85,270	£142,611	£200,000
Other funding (eg fundraising, donations, grants)		£33,179	£126,836	£156,526	£430,619
<b>Number of clients :</b>					
	New	170	1437	281	4737
	On-going with new or existing issue	343	178	161	1765
	<b>Total</b>	513	1615	442	6502
<b>Total number of contacts</b>	includes telephone, face to face, casework, appointment, signposting and consultancy (clients counted more than once)	1269	2010	1976	10694
<b>Gender:</b>	Male	187	494	174	3004
	Female	326	930	268	3557
	did not want to state	0	13	0	112
<b>Age:</b>	under 16	5	4	28	8
	17-24	31	80	22	430
	25-34	87	247	49	1381
	35-49	182	428	138	2117
	50-64	143	387	183	1663
	65+	59	146	22	815
	not recorded	6	145	0	258
<b>Disability or life-limiting long term illness:</b>					
	Physical	72	139	130	223
	Mental	85	169	170	366
	Sensory	4	1	1	82
	Long term illness	113	276	0	1872
	Other	36	89	0	0
<b>Ethnicity:</b>	African	48	0	9	396
	Any other Asian background	12	24	7	254
	Any other Black background	6	43	10	61
	Any other ethnic group	10	30	6	320
	Any other Mixed background	5	4	3	108
	Bangladeshi	19	18	5	68
	Caribbean	14	79	22	159
	Chinese	0	3	1	67

	Indian	13	31	1	154
	Pakistani	53	27	18	220
	Roma, Gypsy, Traveller	2	2	0	0
	White British	279	781	288	3215
	White Irish	15	40	13	54
	White Other	26	89	21	1104
	White and Asian	1	3	5	81
	White and Black African	2	5	5	70
	White and Black Caribbean	2	28	11	56
	Not Answered / other	6	103	17	273
<b>Type of visit:</b>	In-house	2173	1625	411	6403
	Outreach	10	379	1	0
	Home visit	13	7	3	99
	Court visit	9	0	49	0
<b>Issues / categories: presented by client</b>					
<b>Benefits</b>	Jobseekers Allowance	29	31	31	169
	Income Support	40	24	28	81
	Employment and Support Allowance	145	135	340	788
	Tax Credits	107	99	82	508
	Disability Living Allowance/AA/PIP	277	238	481	1454
	Carer's Allowance	20	32	29	113
	Housing Benefit	120	142	166	628
	Council Tax Rebate	86	103	33	264
	State Pension	4	10	5	56
	Pension Credit	16	28	28	185
	Social Fund: funeral payments, maternity grants, and budgeting loans	15	95	8	12
	Social Fund: Oxfordshire Support Fund	0	0	3	7
	Winter Fuel Payments	0	0	3	3
	Maternity benefits (SMP, Maternity Allowance)	0	2	2	40
	Discretionary Housing Payment	0	12	11	66
	Mandatory Revision	0	48	120	0
	Benefit Appeals	31	38	307	204
	Benefit Fraud	3	3	38	56
	Child benefit	42	16	0	0
	Other	41	125	35	449
<b>Debt</b>					
<b>Priority debt</b>	Mortgage/secured loan arrears	0	6	4	80
	Rent arrears	19	70	49	409
	Council tax	46	104	38	399
	Gas/electric arrears (current address)	17	18	28	168
	Fines	8	16	7	79
	Maintenance, child support arrears	0	2	1	1
<b>Non Priority</b>	Credit Card /store card	17	45	25	280
	Catalogue/mail order	20	41	17	81
	Unsecured loans	12	34	16	178
	Overdraft	12	17	6	66
	Payday loans	5	9	5	21
	Benefit and Tax credit overpayment	37	64	18	311





<b>Improve Access to Online Services</b>	Clients directly supported to access online services	0	25	0	0
	Formal training provided on accessing digital services	0	0	0	0
	Clients referred to courses in online capability	0	0	0	0
<b>Accommodation/Reduce Homelessness</b>	Homelessness Preventions	0	8	8	95
	Support to help client remain at home	0	44	18	95
<b>Welfare Benefits and Tax Credits</b>	New benefit claims	31	222	118	550
	Increases in benefit	0	70	38	n/k
	Court Representations - number of clients	0	0	0	0
	Court Representations - success rate %	n/a	0	0	0
	Tribunal Appeals Representation - number of clients	9	21	76	36
	Tribunal Appeals Representation - success rate %	57%	93%	88%	80%
	Mandatory revisions - number of clients	6	68	116	0
	Mandatory revisions - success rate %	33%	72%	62%	0
	Referral for DHP application	0	1	6	0
<b>Money Gained</b>					
	Benefit take-up (projected for current period)	£273,577	£1,074,398	£1,108,551	£2,478,561
	Debt write off	£124,063	£587,396	£81,177	n/k
	One off payments (charity grants, compensation awarded)	£23,912	£56,208	£1,883	£62,732





APPENDIX 1

Commissioned Organisations in 2016 / 2017 through the Homelessness commissioning grant programme

Organisation	grant awarded	Description of project	number of people benefiting	achievements / outcome	other funding received for this project
Oxford Street Population Outreach Team	£152,360	The Oxford Street Population Outreach Team works with rough sleepers in the City. They work early morning as well as late nights in order to find rough sleepers where they are bedded down. The team respond to referrals made from partners, members of the public or rough sleepers themselves and aim to locate and verify the person is rough sleeping within 48 hours. The team then work with the individual in order to access suitable accommodation and support. This may be in the city, or in an area where the individual can access this support.	209	The total number of rough sleepers seen was 209, of those 106 were rough sleeping for the first time, 81 rough sleepers were assisted into accommodation or returned to their home area.	n/k
76 Julian Housing (Housing First project)	£47,850	The Housing First project offers an alternative accommodation option to individuals who have been rough sleeping for long periods of time and who would not be able to live in the normal hostel accommodation. Intensive and personalised support is offered to maximise wellbeing and improve tenancy sustainment. The project consists of 5 units of accommodation, offered to individuals for a period of 2 years. Our funding pays for a support worker and a peer support worker	8	a total of 8 clients have been supported through this project, with 3 successfully moving on to independent tenancies, All 8 clients successfully maintained their tenancies.	n/k
O'Hanlon House (sit up service)	£41,177	The Sit-up Service provides up to 10 spaces for rough sleepers to come in off the streets as a temporary measure whilst other, longer term options are identified. with the increase in rough sleeping this service provides additional capacity and operates 7 days a week	43	This service has been used to full capacity throughout the year	£3,182,393
Elmore Community Services	£26,722	Our funding provides a Tenancy Sustainment Officer who provides practical help, emotional support, advocacy and outreach for individuals who have complex needs and who are not receiving, or is not eligible for support from other services available. The Officer works jointly with the Council to provide floating support to an average of 18 clients on an outreach or appointment basis for single clients over the age of 16 with complex needs within the City. The overall aim of the service is to allow individuals to successfully sustain their tenancies and therefore prevent eviction .	18	Throughout the year 17 clients were supported avoiding homelessness, of those supported no one abandoned their property or were evicted and 7 client cases were closed because they were no longer under threat of losing their tenancy	£760,231

Connection Floating Support	£12,000	Connection Floating Support delivers a pre-tenancy training scheme to individuals as part of a preparation for individuals to live independently and sustain tenancies. The course is personalised and can be completed in the individual's home. It covers elements such as understanding the rights and responsibilities of tenants, how to prepare to view a property, how to manage money, pay bills and other costs. The aim of this is to provide individuals with the skills in order to sustain secure tenancies in the Private Rented Sector.	110	A total of 110 referrals were made to the course during the year, 49 people completed it	n/k
The Gatehouse	£2,790	The Gatehouse provides an open access drop-in centre based in St Giles Parish Rooms for homeless and socially excluded persons over 25 years of age. Gatehouse provides sandwiches, cakes and soups, as well as hot and cold drinks, as appropriate, and fruit where possible. They also offer art and literature nights sandwiches, cakes and soups, as well as hot and cold drinks, as appropriate, and fruit where possible. They also offer art and literature nights	54	Based on a snap shot the number of people attending over a week was 54. The average 46% of visitors were rough sleepers	£107,584
The Porch Steppin' Stones Centre	£42,167	Steppin' Stone is a Day centre for single homeless and socially excluded individuals over the age of 18 and being a resident of Oxford. The centre is open six days per week and offers a number of different activities including: allotment scheme, access to computers, outings, complementary medicine, sports, arts and crafts, books and quizzes. The centre also offers laundry and shower facilities, a clothing store and counselling. Lunch and dinner is offered at a small cost. Workshops and training in life-skills are also offered and Steppin' Stone sign-post clients to other agencies, such as Aspire and Crisis, in order for clients to access employment and training opportunities	158	158 people regularly used the centre last year, 17 people support obtained full or part time work throughout the year	£161,832
Aspire	£59,175	Aspire is a Social Enterprise with charitable status. It primarily works to facilitate the transition for individuals from homelessness into independent living. This is achieved by working with people in supported accommodation to access paid employment or unpaid work programmes/volunteering. Aspire liaises directly with referring organisations such as the City's hostels and day centres to ensure that housing and employment opportunities proceed in tandem and at an appropriate pace for disadvantaged individuals.	429	429 people were referred to Aspire last year which is an increase of 61% on previous year numbers. The supported 38 people to secure full time work and off all out of work benefits. 15 people improved their housing situation	£761,692

Emmaus - Furniture Store	£20,000	Emmaus Oxford is an independent charity and provides accommodation and work for formerly homeless individuals. They also run a social enterprise which recycles donated furniture and other household goods. Individuals living at Emmaus are called Companions; they work 35 hours per week, usually at the store, and receive an allowance from Emmaus. All essential bills and food is covered by Emmaus. Companions cannot be in receipt of work related benefits (Job Seeker's Allowance/Income Support)	32	32 people were resident during the year of which 16 were new during the financial year. The average length of stay was 35 weeks, 4 people left the facility in a planned way	£343,137
The Big Issue Foundation - Service Broker	£9,375	The Service Broker within the Big Issue Foundation supports people selling the Big Issue to maximise their opportunities and get support with relevant needs in order to move to an independent life away from homelessness. This contract is 100% 'payment by result' and Service Broker works to support these vendor who are homeless/recently homeless/at risk of homelessness and who have a connection to Oxford City.	29	29 vendors were supported of which 10 improved their housing situation and they all engaged with health and wellbeing services	n/k
Luther Street Medical Centre	£25,000	Our funding pays for a Mental Health Practitioner attached to Luther Street medical centre. The role supports the city's outreach team to work effectively with rough sleepers who may have mental health difficulties	66	66 clients supported and the average number of contacts with these clients during any one quarter last year was 256	n/k
Oxford Chain	£3,663	OxfordCHAIN – Oxford Combined Homelessness and Information Network is a database for the use of designated homelessness services in Oxford City. The data base is an important monitoring tool for the outreach service, as well as providing key data and trends in order for commissioners and service to understand rough sleeping in the city.	0	n/a	0
<b>Total amount awarded</b>	<b>£442,279</b>	<b>Total number of beneficiaries</b>	<b>1,156</b>	<b>Total amount of other funding</b>	<b>£5,316,869</b>

Please note: Due to the nature of these services and client group its likely that clients are using more than one service and will have been counted twice.

Appendix 1

Commissioning CVO Infrastructure 2016/2017

Organisation	Grant awarded	Total amount of other funding
Oxfordshire Community & Voluntary Action (OCVA)	£43,736	£258,302

Supporting the development of community and voluntary organisations

996 community and voluntary groups based in Oxford and registered with OCVA receive regular updates and contact  
 365 community and voluntary groups based in Oxford are members of OCVA

2016 / 17 targets	Achievements
1:1 support for 20 community & voluntary groups across the city. Support includes funding advice, business planning, constitutions and structure, policies and good practice	28 groups from our priority areas received support and advice
£150,000 raised by community and voluntary groups in Oxford as a result of support from OCVA	£458,000 was raised by community and voluntary groups supported by OCVA last year
Organise and deliver an Oxford funding fair	Over 80 people attended the funding fair in March 2017
During the year 15 training workshops were delivered on a variety of subjects that included training for groups on subjects that included trustees and their roles, chairing effective meetings recruiting and retaining volunteers	110 individuals from Oxford based groups were recorded attending
OCVA worked with Oxfordshire Community Foundation to set up a triage process for struggling groups	Triage fully set up and running, since the service was launched on average 1 group per week have been supported. Main issues are lack of long term planning and funding difficulties

69

Appendix 1  
Commissioning Specialist Play 2016/17

Organisation	grant awarded	Description of project	other funding received for this project
Parasol Project	£15,000	Parasol Project provide inclusive play, social and recreational opportunities for disabled children and young people. Supporting them to access mainstream play and leisure activities with their non disabled peers.	£194,971

2016/17 targets	Achievements
Work with at least 30 disabled children aged 5-12 years old over the year	in the year Parasol supported 100 children aged 5-12 years old, of which 48 were disabled, from across the city
Work with at least 60 disabled teenagers 13-19 years old over the year	in the year Parasol supported 112 young people aged 13-19 years old, of which 61 were disabled, from across the city
To provide specialist support to play providers in Oxford City to enable disabled and young people to take part in activities over the course of the year	They supported children at Tower Playbase in Northway, Cutteslowe play scheme and SOAP in South Oxford

∞ Parasol employed 51 'Enablers' (support workers) over the year, they received training in safeguarding, disability equality, seizure awareness, first aid and gastro feeding



## APPENDIX 1

## Grants to Community and Voluntary Organisations

## Youth Ambition Grants Programme 2016/2017

Organisation	grant awarded	Description of project	number of people benefiting	achievements / outcome	other funding received for this project
Donnington Doorstep family centre	£10,000	Funding was awarded to contribute towards a programme that supports children and young people at risk of child sexual exploitation	52	61 young people have been supported through this programme of which 52 are from the target age range, 13 of the young people received 1:1 support. This involved working with them on increasing their self esteem, helping them to take stock and focus on what they like and what's stopping them from doing the things they like.	£0
81 Leys CDI	£5,000	Funding has been awarded to contribute towards youth sessions targeting girls and young women on Blackbird Leys	16	37 girls and young women have engaged with this project of which 36 are the target age range for this grant programme. Over the year some of the issues they have addressed has been around consent and negotiating relationships, achieving a voice and active citizenship.	£1,000
Oxford Against Cutting	£5,000	Funding was awarded to contribute towards raising awareness of Female Genital Mutilation among young people in Oxford.	2	12 children and young people engaged with this programme of which 2 were from the target age range for this grant programme. 11 workshops were delivered and they supported 2 young people to attend a high profile Home Office event and supported one young person to present a film on FGM to a conference run by Integrate UK.	£1,000
Oxfordshire Youth	£6,282	Funding was awarded to contribute towards a bespoke programme of workshops being delivered at Cheney School working with young girls to look at and discuss issues around healthy, safe relationships and empower the young women to believe in their value.	20	21 workshops took place with 20 young people at Cheney School to discuss among other things safe relationships and empowerment	£0
Parasol Project	£5,000	Funding has been awarded to contribute towards a volunteering project for disabled children and young people	36	41 young people recruited onto their volunteering programme of which 36 were from the target age range of this grant programme. 19 from target age group had a disability, they all attended training about what it means to be a volunteer.	£9,026

TRAX	£4,740	Funding has been awarded to contribute towards providing literacy and 'moving on' sessions for 10 young people from Oxford City	10	of the 10 young people they have worked with 2 students have secured college placements to continue their mechanics training, three have completed their course and are moving into work, one student has applied to join the Army to continue mechanics and a female student is exploring work in care.	£7,620
Viva Network	£7,500	Funding was awarded to contribute towards engaging with 15 vulnerable young people from Oxford to give them the opportunity to achieve accredited training and 1:1 support	11	although 17 children and young people signed up with this project only 11 from target age range. 10 of the young people have received 1:1 coaching, basic literacy and maths sessions	£10,000
Wolvercote Young Peoples project (1)	£2,748	Funding was awarded to contribute towards providing youth sessions for young people on Cutteslowe	8	32 children and young people attend these weekly sessions at Cutteslowe community centre but only 8 were from the target age group for this programme	£0
Wolvercote Young Peoples project (2)	£4,490	Funding was awarded to contribute towards providing youth sessions for girls and young women on Barton	34	34 young women have attended over the year, participating in a variety of activities that includes sport, art, cooking and healthy living.	£0
Wood Farm Youth Centre	£2,500	Funding was awarded to provide youth sessions targeting girls and young women on Wood Farm	9	9 young women, aged between 15-17 attend regular weekly sessions that include topics of discussion such as positive body image, what is health eating, and how to keep yourself safe.	£800
Yellow Submarine	£6,740	Funding was awarded for a weekly social evening for disabled young people to help them build social skills and independence that will ultimately improve their employability	25	25 young people with disabilities attend these weekly sessions that take place each Monday during term time. The project worker has witnessed that some members confidence and independence has grown that they are now socialising more independently.	£18,500
<b>Total amount awarded</b>	<b>£60,000</b>	<b>Total number of beneficiaries</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>Total other funding levered in</b>	<b>£47,946</b>

## Appendix 2

### **A sample of case studies received from organisations funded during 2016/2017**

**Oxford City Councils funding contributes to life changing situations like those described below.**

#### **Case Study from the Thrive Project – a mentoring programme operating in Barton**

A is a very active participant in our young leaders programme and has just finished year 11 but did not find school very easy to engage with and struggled to behave there. As a result, A was always in trouble and had been moved onto a reduced timetable which meant that A was excluded from school completely on Wednesdays.

We found out that no alternative activity had been arranged and consequently A spent the day hanging around not doing much. We therefore offered A the chance to do work experience with us on Wednesdays instead. A was very keen to do this and his school and mum readily agreed, pleased that A had a productive alternative.

We discussed behaviour expectations and set objectives with A. This person behaved impeccably and met their objectives, carrying out some excellent work – including helping to prepare some of the young leader’s sessions - whilst also bringing a lovely atmosphere to the team. During their time with us A discovered that they actually quite liked the world of work but told us they hadn’t thought at all about what they would do after school and finished their GCSE’s. We therefore encouraged A to think about this and with encouragement and some practical help from us with things like a CV and talked about what A was interested in. A wanted to look at accounting apprenticeships. A passed their first stage interview for this and not content with just this, A also found two jobs for the summer period; and will be working in a B&B and a restaurant.

#### **Case Study from Leys CDI Clock House Project –a project providing activities for older people living on Blackbird & Greater Leys.**

B lives alone on The Leys and started going to the Clockhouse project 18 months ago and said “I started to come to bingo and quiz nights due to the organiser who lives close by. Then a friend mentioned about yoga and from yoga I progressed to tai chi.”

B has severe osteoarthritis of the lower spine and has found that both yoga and tai chi have help with this problem. Both forms of exercise have improved B’s balance and strength.

Our grant subsidises these activities which makes them affordable for older people to attend.

B has made friends with a lot of the other users and the project has given B a new lease of life.

### **Case study from Barton Advice Centre**

Our client was caught up in the well-publicised issues with HMRC and Concentrix. She had been accused by them of living with someone and her Child Tax Credits had been stopped.

Client was a widow with two children. Child Tax Credit represented about half of her income which meant she was left in severe financial difficulties for approximately three months.

She had not received the original enquiry letter from Concentrix about the allegation (failure to issue letters was a recurrent issue with Concentrix).

Client had not been issued with a legally valid decision notice by HMRC and, therefore had been denied her right to appeal. In the absence of a decision notice it was not possible to identify the legal basis for the decision under the Tax Credits legislation.

Concentrix had advised our client they had evidence she was living with someone who was actually a neighbour who lived a few doors along. The decision to stop her tax credits had been solely because the wrong address for that couple had been recorded on a credit reference agency record that Concentrix had used to justify the decision to stop her tax credits.

We issued a legal challenge against HMRC / Concentrix for a failure to issue a legally valid decision notice and apply any of the relevant legislation. As a result her Child Tax Credits were re-instated within two weeks.

APPENDIX 3

**CEB Report Risk Register**

Risk Score Impact Score: 1=Insignificant; 2=Minor; 3=Moderate; 4= Major; 5=Catastrophic      Probability Score: 1=Rare; 2=Unlikely; 3=Possible; 4=Likely; 5=Almost Certain

No.	Risk Description Link to Corporate Obj.	Gross Risk		Cause of Risk	Mitigation	Net Risk		Further Management of Risk: Transfer/Accept/Reduce/Avoid		Current Risk	
		I	P			I	P			I	P
1	Monitoring information not returned  (strong, active communities)	1	3	Lack of resources / trustees / skilled volunteers / staff to complete monitoring form or forgot about it	Mitigating Control: Build relationships with funded groups and visits.  Level of Effectiveness: Medium because information may not be returned & visits may not take place	1	2	Action: Reduce  Action Owner: Julia Tomkins  Mitigating Control: Keep check list and close monitoring, build relationships with groups  Control Owner: Julia Tomkins	Outcome Required:  All monitoring forms returned & monitoring visits made  Milestone Date: on going	1	2

This page is intentionally left blank

**2016 / 2017**  
**Grants Monitoring Form**

Organisation	West Oxford Community Association
Contact Name	Keith Birnie
Address	West Oxford Community Centre Botley Road Oxford OX2 0BT
Contact Number	01865 245761
<b>Purpose for which the grant was given:</b> £500 has been awarded to contribute towards the organising and running of the West Oxford fun day planned to take place on 9 <sup>th</sup> July 2016	

If you would like any help or support to complete this form you can contact OCVA on 01865 251946.

**Please return your completed form on or before the 17<sup>th</sup> August 2016 to:-**

Grants Officer  
Communities Team  
Oxford City Council  
Direct Services Depot  
Horspath Road,  
Oxford, OX4 2RH

Telephone 01865 252685  
Email grants@oxford.gov.uk

## Section 1

### How have you spend the funding?

#### 1.1. Please give a break down of expenditure for the funding awarded to WOCA for the fun day

Item of expenditure (ie stationery, training or service purchased)	£
Jubilee Brass Band (awaiting invoice)	100
Drumming Workshop (invoice attached)	70
Eclipse Arts Circus Skills (invoice attached)	300
Poster and Flyer Printing (receipt attached)	32.60
<b>Total</b>	<b>502.60</b>

Continue on separate sheet if more space if required.

Please send copies of receipts/invoices when returning your form.

#### 1.2. Do you have any grant left?

**No**

#### 1.3. If yes, this may need to be refunded, please tell us how it will be spent and when?

n/a

## Section 2

### What have you achieved?

#### 2.1 How many people have benefited from your project activity or event to date?

Attendees: more than 600<sup>1</sup>

Participants: at least 105<sup>2</sup>

Volunteers: 70<sup>3</sup>

Local Performers and Artists: 114<sup>4</sup>

#### 2.2 How did you collect this information, was it by headcount, feedback forms or registers held etc?

<sup>1</sup>Attendees – measured using clickers and takings on gate. Clickers recorded 615, with gate receipts of £429, at £1 per adult, and with children entry being free.

<sup>2</sup>Participants – We had 35 Stalls, average at least 3 people per stall = 105

<sup>3</sup>Volunteers – We had 55 planning/running events; 15 helping with publicity.

<sup>4</sup>Local Performers and Artists – based on a head count involved on the stages and displays in the centre. Many other people performed informally.



### 2.3 What targets have you achieved with the grant? Please tell us

Agreed targets	Were they achieved?
Organise and deliver the West Oxford fun day on the 9 <sup>th</sup> July 2016	Yes. The feedback on the event was overwhelmingly positive
70 volunteers help out with the planning of the fun day and on the day	Yes. About the same number as last year.
500 people attend fun day on 9 <sup>th</sup> July 2016	Yes. Again, numbers were about the same as last year.

Please continue on a separate sheet if required.

### 2.4 Please tell us what outcomes (if any) have been achieved.

- Bringing People Together and Celebrating and Developing the Community of West Oxford

We had as many local representatives as possible that people could access to discuss any issues. Examples of people available for such interaction included both our local city councillors; representatives from the Oxford City Council Local plan consultation the local Community Police Team; the Fire Service; campaigning groups such as Cyclox, and of course WOCA trustees.

- Developing activities at West Oxford Community Centre that focus on local needs in imaginative and sustainable ways

This year we designed a quick-to-complete feedback card for people to fill in, with the incentive of a free raffle ticket for people's ideas. This proved quite popular and will feed in to WOCA's strategy review.

- Encouraging diverse groups to engage with WOCA

Many centre groups were able to publicise their activities and services at the event, whether by running stalls or demonstrating their activities and achievements. We were particularly pleased with the diversity of ethnic groups involved this year. Our 'Chinese Happy Place' support group were much more involved, and there was also representation from local African and Asian community groups. There was a lot to appeal to all age groups too.

### 2.5 Please enclose examples of your publicity displaying Oxford City Council support logo.

Copies of poster and programme are attached.

### Section 3 Other Funding

#### 3.1 What fund raising have you undertaken since receiving your grant? Please give details, how much has been raised?

We recruited volunteers to canvas local businesses for sponsorship and raffle prizes for the event. This raised £418. Raffle takings were down this year because the stall was not in a prominent enough position: we will rectify this next year.


We publicised the event to numerous external groups, who were invited to attend, and asked for donations to WOCA to help with the cost of the event. This raised £197, with around another £50 still to be collected.

We recruited volunteers to run numerous attractions and stalls at the event, fundraising for WOCA. This raised £1342.60: up on last year.

We approached other local grant-making bodies to help ensure a broad mix of attractions that would raise awareness of various issues as well as being attractive and engaging. Details listed under section 3.2 below.

#### 3.2 Since receiving your grant have you received funding from other organisations for your project? Please give details / how much has been raise this way?

Grant funding from Low Carbon West Oxford (for renewable energy activity):  
£180

DECLARATION I believe the information provided is an accurate account of how our grant has been spent.	
Signed	
Date	12/08/16

## Scrutiny Project Scope – Oxford Living Wage

<b>Review Topic</b>	Implementing the Oxford Living Wage across Oxford
<b>Lead Member</b>	Councillor Mark Ladbrooke
<b>Other nominated Members</b>	Councillor Angie Goff Councillor Dan Iley-Williamson Councillor Ben Lloyd-Shogbesan Councillor David Thomas
<b>Officer Support and allocate hours</b>	Scrutiny Officer support – approx. 2-4 days per month for up to 4 months (Mid-August – Mid-Dec). Additional support from other Council officers as required.
<b>Background</b>	<p>Oxford is a dynamic and successful city with relatively low long term unemployment. However, the cost of living is higher than almost anywhere else in the UK, and the minimum wage is not enough for an individual or family to avoid living in poverty with all the ill effects that has.</p> <p>The Council is committed to supporting social inclusion and ensuring that workers and their families can live free from poverty by paying the Oxford Living Wage (set at 95% of the London Living Wage) as a minimum to all at Council staff. Contractors and subcontractors are also encouraged to pay the Oxford Living Wage.</p>
<b>Rationale</b>	<p>The Scrutiny Committee prioritised a review focusing on promoting the Oxford Living Wage when agreeing their work plan for 2017/18.</p> <p>Members are concerned that significant parts of the local economy continue to pay low wages that do not reflect the particularly high costs of living in Oxford. It is hoped that a scrutiny review can help to drive forward work on promoting the Oxford Living Wage more widely, making it an effective local employment standard.</p>
<b>Purpose of Review / Objective</b>	<p>To consider how the Council can promote the implementation of the Oxford Living Wage (OLW) across Oxford. Key lines of inquiry are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>What more can the Council do internally to promote the OLW? Are there opportunities to strengthen encouragement to contractors, offer incentives to employers who pay the OLW, publicise the OLW in Your Oxford, etc.?</i></li> <li>- <i>What more can the Council do to promote the OLW and make it unacceptable for employers in the city to not pay a living wage? Would a Kitemarking system be workable?</i></li> </ul>

<b>Indicators of Success</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Wide and constructive engagement with stakeholders and experts that delivers a range of opinion.</li> <li>- The production of evidence-based report with agreed conclusions.</li> <li>- Interim findings are timed to coincide with Living Wage Week (5-11 November).</li> <li>- The majority of any recommendations are agreed and implemented.</li> <li>- Positive feedback from members, officers and witnesses.</li> <li>- Stimulation of a broader discussion about low pay in the city.</li> <li>- A heightened awareness of the human impacts of low pay and how employees can raise concerns and access support services.</li> <li>- Council reaffirms its commitment to work with partners to make Oxford a 'Living Wage City' where every worker is paid a living wage.</li> <li>- The production of a list of employers in the city who pay the OLW.</li> <li>- An uptake in the number of employers who pay a living wage.</li> <li>- A portfolio / member responsibility for promoting the OLW.</li> </ul>
<b>Out of scope</b>	<p>Issues around the availability and affordability of housing in the city and issues related to pay inequality (e.g. gender pay gap), while relevant, will not be central to the review.</p>
<b>Methodology/ Approach</b>	<p>Evidence gathering could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inviting written evidence from low paid workers and members of the public via email and / or an open access online consultation;</li> <li>- Inviting written and / or verbal evidence from Council officers, key stakeholders and expert witnesses;</li> <li>- Considering what can be learnt from other local authorities;</li> <li>- Desk research / literature review.</li> </ul>
<b>Specify Witnesses / Experts</b>	<p>The following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Matthew Peachey, Economic Development Manager;</li> <li>- Amanda Durnan, Strategic Procurement and Payment Manager;</li> <li>- Bruce Thompson, Building Ops Manager;</li> <li>- TBC, Business Rates;</li> <li>- TBC, Communications Team;</li> <li>- Low paid workers earning below the Oxford Living Wage;</li> <li>- Workers who have benefited from being paid the OLW;</li> <li>- Representatives of the following groups based in the city: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The Living Wage Foundation;</li> <li>o Low paid workers e.g. Unite the Union, USDAW;</li> <li>o Blackbird Leys Credit Union;</li> <li>o Anti-poverty campaign groups;</li> <li>o Business e.g. Oxfordshire Chamber of Commerce;</li> <li>o Large employers e.g. Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust;</li> <li>o Small employers e.g. Covered Market traders;</li> <li>o Benefits advice agencies e.g. CAB;</li> <li>o Oxford University Students' Union (Living Wage Campaign);</li> <li>o Faith groups;</li> <li>o Community Associations;</li> <li>o Academics e.g. Prof. Danny Dorling or Mark Fransham.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<b>Specify Evidence Sources for documents</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ONS employment data.</li> <li>- Literature on low paid and the living wage.</li> <li>- Council documents e.g. motion to Council in November 2007, Report to CEB in May 2009.</li> <li>- Written submissions from members of the public and others</li> <li>- Press articles.</li> </ul>		
<b>Site Visits</b>	TBC		
<b>Projected start date</b>	11 July 17	<b>Draft Report Deadline</b>	24 Nov 17
<b>Meeting Frequency</b>	Monthly	<b>Projected completion date</b>	19 Dec 17

### Draft outline of meetings

<b>Meeting one – 1 August 2017</b>
Scoping meeting to agree key lines of inquiry, witnesses and methods of engagement.
<b>Meeting two – 12 September, 5pm</b>
Evidence session 1
<b>Meeting three – 3 October, 5pm (provisional)</b>
Evidence session 2
<b>Meeting four – 17 October, 2pm (provisional)</b>
Evidence session 3
<b>Meeting five – 1 November, 5pm (provisional)</b>
Meeting to reflect on evidence gathered and consider recommendations.
<b>Meeting six – 15 November (provisional)</b>
Meeting to consider and approve a draft report for submission to the Scrutiny Committee and City Executive Board in December. The Panel may wish to do this via email.

This page is intentionally left blank



## **2016/17 Annual Report of Oxford City Council's Scrutiny Committee**

## Chair and Vice-Chair's Foreword

*To follow*

### Summary of scrutiny activity during 2016/17

#### Member engagement

47% of non-executive members participated in the scrutiny process

#### Meetings

34 meetings in total:

- 11 Scrutiny Committee meetings
- 5 Housing Panel meetings
- 5 Finance Panel meetings
- 5 Devolution Review Group meetings
- 5 Budget Review Group meetings
- 1 Shareholder Panel meeting
- 1 Recycling Panel meeting
- 1 Health Inequalities Panel meeting

#### Items

75 items considered:

- 25 City Executive Board decisions
- 50 Other issues prioritised by Scrutiny

#### Reports

35 reports presented to the City Executive Board including major reports on:

- Equality and diversity
- Devolution plans for Oxfordshire
- Health inequalities
- University housing needs
- The Council's budget for 2017/18

#### Recommendations

146 recommendations

- 123 (84%) Agreed
- 10 (7%) Agreed in part
- 13 (9%) Not agreed



## About Scrutiny

Most major City Council decisions are taken by the City Executive Board, which is made up of ten elected councillors from the controlling political group. In operating this form of decision-making arrangement the Council is required by law to have a Scrutiny Committee made up of elected councillors who are not on the Board.

Scrutiny acts as a counterweight to the City Executive Board, empowering 'backbench' councillors to hold the Board to account and contribute to council decision-making. Scrutiny can also investigate any issue that affects the city or its inhabitants, whether or not it is the direct responsibility of the City Executive Board.

The work of Scrutiny helps to promote wider engagement in Council decision-making and provide assurance that the Council is performing well, delivering value for money and taking the best decisions it can to improve public services and the quality of life for the residents of Oxford.

### Scrutiny at Oxford City Council

The Council's scrutiny function is managed by the 12-member Scrutiny Committee, which has cross-party membership. The Committee is chaired by an opposition councillor who is elected at the first committee meeting of the Council year.

Committee meetings are held in public and are timed to enable the councillors to consider and make recommendations on selected decisions before they are taken by the City Executive Board.

The Committee agrees a work plan at the start of each year which sets out the various topics and issues that councillors have chosen to focus on. Some of these issues are delegated to themed standing panels, which meet approximately five times per year, and to review groups for more detailed scrutiny over a series of meetings.

### Call in

Call in is a statutory function that enables councillors to challenge decisions that have been taken before they are implemented. If a call in request from any 4 councillors or the Chair of Scrutiny is deemed valid then the Scrutiny Committee will hear both sides of the argument and decide whether or not to refer the decision back to the City Executive Board, with reasons why the decision should be re-considered.

### Get involved

There are many opportunities for members of the public and representatives of organisations to get involved in the work of Scrutiny. You can:

- Attend meetings of the Scrutiny Committee, standing panels and review groups, except in instances where confidential information is to be discussed. Details of these meetings are displayed in the Town Hall and on our [website](#).
- Speak at a meeting on any agenda item with the prior agreement of the chair. Please email [democraticservices@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:democraticservices@oxford.gov.uk) and give at least 24 hours' notice. The chair will decide how long you can speak for.
- Suggest a topic for Scrutiny to consider by completing and submitting our [Suggestion Form](#).

- Raise issues with your local City Councillor and request that Scrutiny considers this as part of a Councillor Call for Action.
- Watch out for consultations, surveys and requests for evidence by registering at <http://www.oxford.gov.uk/consultation>.

## **Scrutiny Committee**

### Membership:

Councillor Andrew Gant (Chair)  
 Councillor Tom Hayes (Vice-Chair)  
 Councillor Jamila Azad  
 Councillor Nigel Chapman  
 Councillor Van Coulter (to March)  
 Councillor James Fry  
 Councillor David Henwood  
 Councillor Jennifer Pegg  
 Councillor Sian Taylor  
 Councillor Marie Tidball  
 Councillor Craig Simmons  
 Councillor Ruth Wilkinson

The Scrutiny Committee is responsible for the overall management of the Council's scrutiny function. It decides which topics, issues and decisions will be considered by Scrutiny and how. These items are all listed in an annual work plan which is agreed each summer and reviewed regularly during the year to take account of any emerging issues and upcoming City Executive Board decisions.

The Committee also sets the remits and membership of two standing panels, which are themed sub-committees that consider all issues and decisions within their given remits. The Committee has agreed to continue with the Finance Panel and Housing Panel, which have been running for a number of years and are well established.

A small number of issues prioritised by the Committee are delegated to review groups for more detailed scrutiny. Review groups actively engage with partner organisations and expert witnesses before producing substantial evidence-based reports with recommendations. This year a review group was set up to look at devolution plans for Oxfordshire and the Finance Panel conducted a detailed review of the Council's budget proposals. The Committee also established one-off panels to consider recycling rates, health inequalities and the business plan of the Council's new housing company.

Approximately half of all the items Scrutiny has looked at this year were considered at meetings of the Scrutiny Committee. These included topical issues prioritised by councillors such as safeguarding language school students under the age of 18 living in private accommodation, educational attainment, graffiti prevention and removal, the use of Public Spaces Protection Orders (PSPOs), air quality and the development of proposals for a workplace parking levy and congestion charging scheme in the city. The Committee was grateful to County Council officers for attending discussions on the latter two items.

Various City Executive Board decisions were also considered by the Committee, including annual decisions on the Council's Corporate Plan, Discretionary Housing Payments Policy, safeguarding assessment, grant allocations to community and voluntary organisations, and the annual service plan for Fusion Lifestyle, which runs the Council's leisure centres. Other notable decisions considered by the Committee included the Council's Commissioned Advice Strategy, Digital Strategy, Carbon Management Plan and proposals to address anti-social behaviour on the city's waterways. The Committee had previously recommended that proposals for a PSPO covering all of the city's main waterways should be revised and welcomed the new approach of using a range of interventions to tackle anti-social behaviour in specific problem areas.

The Panel also monitors Council performance on a quarterly basis and as well as holding the organisation to account for performance where required, has been proactive in suggesting improvements to how the Council monitors its own performance.

The Committee would like to thank everyone who has played a part in the scrutiny process this year including scrutiny councillors, members of the City Executive Board, council officers, partners and the public.

### **Tribute to Van Coulter**

Councillor Van Coulter sadly passed away unexpectedly in March 2017, having served on the Scrutiny Committee for several years. He was a very engaged scrutiny councillor who always remained focused on making real improvements to peoples' lives. Van chaired a number of high profile scrutiny reviews with distinction, including a major wide-ranging review of inequality in 2014/15, a more recent health inequality panel, and a sensitive review of safeguarding practices in city guest houses. An impeccably observed minute's silence was held at the Scrutiny Committee meeting on 27 March 2017. He will be sorely missed.

***“Van was a first class scrutiny councillor. His interventions were always meticulously prepared, scrupulously backed up by evidence, and always seeking to make things work better for real people, not just score points. He was patient and courteous in committee, and an efficient and businesslike chair. The place I got to know and admire his skills was as a member of the Inequalities Panel, which he chaired. It was a master class. That report continues to resonate. This committee will miss him, but we are certainly better for having known him as a colleague”.*** – Councillor Andrew Gant, Chair, Scrutiny Committee

### **Devolution Plans for Oxfordshire**

Membership:

Councillor Marie Tidball (Chair)

Councillor Van Coulter

Councillor Andrew Gant

Councillor Tom Hayes  
Councillor Craig Simmons

***“Our city and the wider county have international significance as a result of our high concentration of human capital, knowledge and innovation. These factors drive economic growth in our region. However, this growth must be matched by public services, housing and infrastructure that meet our population’s needs and aspirations. Devolution would bring substantial financial benefits to Oxfordshire and provide the opportunity to bring governance closer to the people, ensuring that high-quality services better reflect the local needs of the places where our constituents live and work”*** –  
Councillor Marie Tidball, Chair, Devolution Review Group

The Scrutiny Committee prioritised the issue of devolution on the basis that it was one of the biggest issues facing the City Council and local government in Oxfordshire at the time. The Government had actively offered areas in England the chance to have additional funding and devolved powers in exchange for elected mayors or streamlined governance structures. All Councils in Oxfordshire had agreed a joint proposal to put to Government back in February 2016 aimed at unlocking £1bn of funding for infrastructure to realise the local growth potential. In response, Government advised that a deal hinged on strengthening the governance arrangements. However, there was no consensus amongst the six Oxfordshire councils about how the governance arrangements should be strengthened.

The Devolution Review Group was led by Councillor Marie Tidball and set out to examine which governance structures could meet the government’s requirements and provide for high quality public services in the county. This included looking at different models of unitary government that could replace the current ‘county and district’ model, as well as the option of having a directly elected mayor for Oxfordshire.

The Review Group considered two independent reports commissioned to examine unitary options for Oxfordshire. The Review Group also heard evidence from a number of key witnesses including the Leaders, Chief Executives and Senior Officers from Oxfordshire County Council and Oxford City Council, the chairman of Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership (a partnership between local authorities and businesses), a representative of Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group, consultants from PwC and a consultant who had a leading role in securing a devolution deal for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough.

The Review Group drew on all this evidence in producing an independent assessment of the pros and cons of the different governance options. Their report also highlighted key priorities for Oxfordshire that any future governance structure would need to support and enable over the longer term.

The Review Group concluded that there was a strong economic case to be made for Oxfordshire to be granted new powers and devolved funding in order to maximise the growth potential of the local economy. Scrutiny councillors also highlighted a potential window of opportunity in which to secure a deal with Government in light of

its emerging industrial strategy, the priority being given to a new Oxford to Cambridge 'expressway', and the UK's decision to leave the European Union.

The Review Group found there was an emerging consensus on the option of a directly elected mayor for Oxfordshire and an absence of consensus around a preferred model of unitary government. The Review Group concluded that an elected mayor and combined authority (which brings together council leaders and key partners) represented the best basis on which to move forwards with an updated devolution proposal to present to Government. Their report explores the types of powers that an elected mayor and combined authority for Oxfordshire could have and how they could be held to account effectively.

Key agreed recommendations called for:

- The prioritisation of a devolution deal for Oxfordshire that secures new powers and devolved budgets for transport infrastructure, housing (including social and affordable housing), planning and skills.
- An elected mayor and combined authority for Oxfordshire to exercise these devolved powers.
- Continued joint working between the Oxfordshire councils aimed at unlocking efficiency savings.
- A new relationship with Government to ensure that Oxfordshire is forefront in government thinking in terms of trade and inward investment post-Brexit.

## Shareholder Panel

Membership:

Councillor James Fry (Chair)

Councillor Andrew Gant

Councillor David Henwood

Councillor Craig Simmons

***“The creation of the two new wholly Council-owned companies is an important element of the City Council’s response to cuts in budgetary support by Central Government and restrictions on the Council’s development of Council housing. The formation of the Housing Company is already having tangible benefits in terms of the provision of extra affordable housing. The trading company plans to build upon the commercial success of Direct Services by growing external revenues and returning value to the Council. The Panel is awaiting further details of the business plans of the two companies during the course of its scrutiny role in the 2017/18 Council year.”*** – Councillor James Fry, Chair, Shareholder Panel

The most significant change affecting the scrutiny function this year has been the establishment of new Council-owned companies. A Housing Company has been created to deal with certain housing matters and the Council has begun the process of establishing a trading company, which will provide a range of services directly to the Council and compete with the private sector for work in the wider city economy.

While the companies are wholly-owned by the Council, each company is managed by a board of directors operating independently. Strictly speaking the companies are not open to scrutiny in the same way as the Council's own service areas. However, the decisions taken by the Council as the owner of its companies are open to scrutiny and the Scrutiny Committee has established the Shareholder Panel to perform this function. The new Panel was made up of the chairs of the Scrutiny Committee, Finance Panel, Housing Panel and Audit and Governance Committee.

The Shareholder Panel met for the first time in March 2017 to consider the Housing Company's business plan before it was presented to the Shareholder (the members of the City Executive Board meeting as a "Shareholder Group"). The business plan set out how the Housing Company planned to meet the city's housing need by building new housing on Council-owned land, while also providing a financial return to the Council. Despite having limited time to digest the paperwork, scrutiny councillors were supportive of the broad aims of the Housing Company and able to satisfy themselves that the business plan was based on prudent assumptions. The Panel asked for a sensitivity analysis in order to better understand how different factors such as interest rate changes could affect the business plan in future, as well as modelling of different tenure mix options (the balance between social rent, shared ownership and market housing that the company could build). The Panel's findings were presented to the Shareholder Group before it formally endorsed the Housing Company's business plan.

## **Health inequalities**

Membership:

Councillor Van Coulter (Chair)

Councillor Sian Taylor

Councillor David Thomas

Councillor Liz Wade

Following on from a major wide-ranging scrutiny review of inequality in 2014/15, the Committee set up a Health Inequalities Panel, also chaired by Councillor Coulter, to consider the findings of a report by the independent Oxfordshire Health Inequalities Commission. The Commission had held a number of public meetings and taken evidence from a wide range of organisations and individuals before producing a substantial report with sixty recommendations to public bodies including health commissioners, providers and local councils.

The Panel reviewed the Commission's report and spoke to the chair, Professor Sian Griffiths OBE, as well as the Council's Older Person's Champion and officers from Council services that affect health and wellbeing, such as Housing Services.

The Panel identified ten recommendations that would enhance the work of the Council in tackling health inequalities and all of these were agreed by the City Executive Board.

Key recommendations called for:

- Better monitoring of the impacts of key council services on health and wellbeing.
- Taking health and wellbeing impacts into account in Council decision-making.
- The delivery of more health services in community facilities.
- Wider promotion of the Oxford Living Wage.

## Recycling

***“The Recycling Panel has supported the City Council’s initiatives to boost the rate of recycling, but with the city’s high population turnover, notably of students, there is always the need to educate newcomers on the need to recycle more of their household waste. Therefore the Panel pressed for a budget for educational door-to-door visits by officers and the extension of food waste collections to blocks of flats. These have achieved tangible benefits, but further work will be needed to increase the recycling rate further.”***

– Councillor James Fry, Chair, Recycling Panel

A Recycling Review Group led by Councillor James Fry in 2013/2014 recommended that the Council invested in targeted recycling education campaigns and trialed a community incentive scheme to encourage residents to recycle for charity. Following this review, the Council successfully bid for a government grant to be used on a recycling incentive scheme covering the whole city. Scrutiny has continued to monitor the Council’s progress in boosting recycling rates and the success of the incentive scheme, the “Blue Bin Recycling League”.

In November 2016 a group of Scrutiny Committee members visited the Council’s Cowley Marsh depot to consider recycling rates data and the impacts of the Blue Bin Recycling League. Members found that the Council is in the top 10% of English local authorities for recycling and is one of the best urban authorities in the country. The Blue Bin Recycling League had achieved almost 5,000 pledges, £4,800 in charitable donations and increases in collection rates across the city of between 4.28% and 11.70%. After the meeting the Scrutiny Committee recommended to the City Executive Board that every effort should be made to continue funding for recycling education campaigns after the grant funding ends in October 2018.

## Finance Panel

Membership:

Councillor Craig Simmons (Chair)

Councillor James Fry

Councillor Jean Fooks

Councillor Sian Taylor

***“Reductions in central government funding are forcing local councils to think differently about how they fund frontline services. In Oxford, we saw the writing on the wall and have been proactive in transforming our services to be more financially self-sufficient. During my three years as Chair of Finance Panel I am proud to have helped make this happen.”***

– Councillor Craig Simmons, Chair, Finance Panel (2014-15 to 2016-17)

Finance Panel has a role in overseeing and scrutinising the Council's financial performance and budgetary proposals. The Panel monitors Council spend throughout the year, considers selected financial issues and decisions, and conducts a detailed annual review of the Council's budget and medium term spending proposals.

In June 2016 the Panel considered the Council's approach to supporting credit union services in the city and met with representatives of Oxfordshire Credit Union (OCU). The Panel welcomed the progress made by OCU in becoming financially self-sustaining but regretted that a proposed merger with Blackbird Leys Credit Union had fallen through. The Panel encouraged OCU to apply for funding for a part time development officer to promote OCU services much more extensively on the ground. The Panel also recommended that information about OCU and other financial services should be made available to Council staff.

Another key priority for the Panel this year was to track the impacts of the UK's decision to leave the European Union on the Council's finances and the wider Oxford economy. The Panel found that the main impacts on the Council were related to treasury income (due to interest rates being reduced), property fund values and an income target that was measured in Euros. The Panel's discussions on the impacts of Brexit resulted in three recommendations to the City Executive Board.

The Panel conducted an in depth review of the Council's budget proposals over the New Year period, questioning senior managers about budgetary changes and testing assumptions about spending levels, income targets and financial pressures. The Panel found that financial planning had been very difficult due to uncertainties about a number of important factors such as pay, devolution, Brexit, national housing policy and future changes to the Business Rates regime. In the circumstances, the budget proposals including the Council's large programme of capital investments were considered to be sound. The Panel made 16 recommendations aimed at strengthening the proposals and improving their presentation, and all but one was agreed by the City Executive Board.

Other financial decisions scrutinised by the Panel included decisions on the Council's Treasury Management Strategy, Council Tax Support Scheme and the financial case for developing a waste transfer station in the city. The Panel also considered the outcomes of internal reviews into a number of Council services aimed at identifying best practice and financial savings.

## **Housing Panel**

Membership:

Councillor David Henwood (Chair)

Councillor Angie Goff

Councillor Jennifer Pegg

Councillor Gill Sanders

Councillor David Thomas

Councillor Liz Wade



Geno Humphrey (tenant co-optee)

***“Over the past year the Housing Panel has scrutinised key reports on homelessness, empty buildings and tower blocks, and also hosted meetings with Oxford’s universities. The latter item saw the cross-party panel make twelve recommendations to the City Executive Board, forming a catalyst for change both in policy and outcome. Key to our success has been the Panel’s ability to work cohesively together for the benefit of our community. Last year Geno Humphrey continued to be the Panel’s valued tenant co-optee, and when we considered the issue of tower block cladding following the Grenfell disaster, we heard from residents from the city’s tower blocks to better understand the pressures those families face. The insight they provided was truly invaluable”.*** Councillor David Henwood, Chair, Housing Panel

Housing Panel is responsible for scrutinising all housing services, issues and decisions. Oxford is one of the least affordable cities in the UK in which to rent or buy a home, so housing is a huge issue in the city. The Panel considered a range of topical issues related to social housing, private sector housing, student accommodation and homelessness. Most of the Panel’s work this year was initiated by scrutiny councillors although the Panel also considered City Executive Board decisions on the Council’s Private Sector Housing Policy and a review of the Lord Mayor’s Deposit Guarantee Scheme, which aims to help local people in housing need on low incomes to afford and sustain a move into privately rented housing.

In November the Panel met with representatives of both universities based in the city about their accommodation requirements. The University of Oxford said that the Council’s affordable housing policies prevented the building of employee housing schemes, such as new accommodation for post-doctoral researchers. They also argued that this group should be exempt from the target of no more than 3,000 Oxford University students living outside of university provided accommodation. Oxford Brookes University said that nursing and teaching students should also be exempt from this target and asked that additional sites be allocated for new student accommodation. The Panel recommended that the City Executive Board considers 12 specific suggestions as part of the Council’s local plan making process. These included rebalancing the student limits and excluding priority groups, allocating specific sites for new student accommodation and providing flexibility on these sites for employee housing schemes without social rent obligations. Many of the Panel’s suggestions have since been taken forwards by the Council in the local plan “preferred options” consultation.

Other topical housing issues prioritised for scrutiny included the licensing of houses in multiple occupations (HMOs), Council support for Housing Benefit claimants accessing the private rented sector, services for rough sleepers, and efforts to bring empty properties back into use. In terms of the Council’s own housing stock, the Panel looked at the issue of under-occupation, tenant satisfaction, the Council’s Great Estates investments, and plans for the Council’s garage assets and former garage sites. The Panel also monitored a selection of housing performance measures, rent collection rates and progress of the Tenant Scrutiny Panel’s review into a tower block refurbishment project.

## **The year ahead**

The Scrutiny Committee has re-elected Councillor Andrew Gant as Chair for the 2017/18 Council year and Councillor Nigel Chapman has been elected Vice Chair. He replaces Councillor Tom Hayes, who has joined the City Executive Board. The Committee also welcomes six new or returning members in Councillors Mohammed Altaf-Khan, Mark Ladbrooke, Ben Lloyd-Shogbesan, Mark Lygo, Steve Curran and David Thomas. They replace Councillors Tom Hayes, who has also joined the Board, Craig Simmons, Sian Taylor, Marie Tidball, Ruth Wilkinson and the late Van Coulter.

The new Committee has prioritised a review focused on implementing the Oxford Living Wage across the city, which will be led by Councillor Mark Ladbrooke. The Committee will continue to scrutinise decisions of the City Executive Board and a number of other issues affecting the city have been included in the scrutiny work plan, including air quality, the use of restorative justice practices, the impacts of the new Westgate Shopping Centre and elderly isolation. The Committee has also re-appointed to the finance and housing panels and has reconstituted the Shareholder Panel, which will meet as required to consider issues and decisions relating to the new Council-owned companies.

Councillor James Fry has replaced Councillor Craig Simmons as Chair of Finance Panel. The Panel will again undertake a detailed annual review of the Council's budget proposals early in the New Year and will monitor financial performance and decisions through the year.

Housing Panel will be chaired by Councillor David **Henwood / Thomas**. The Panel will look at a number of important housing decisions such as the Council's emerging housing and homelessness strategy and tenancy strategy. The Panel will revisit a number of housing and landlord issues such as the tower block refurbishment programme, the Council's Great Estates investments, and empty garages. New items on the Panel's work plan include the impacts of absent owners on housing availability, the management of void properties and the impacts of the Homelessness Reduction Act.

The Shareholder Panel is also chaired by Councillor James Fry and will continue to consider the progress of the Council's new housing company and trading company.

## **Contact us**

Scrutiny Officer, St. Aldate's Chambers, 109 St. Aldate's, Oxford, OX1 1DS; tel: 01865 252230; email: [democraticservices@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:democraticservices@oxford.gov.uk)