

# Agenda

www.oxford.gov.uk



## Housing Panel (Panel of the Scrutiny Committee)

Date: **Thursday 27 July 2017**

---

Time: **5.00 pm**

---

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

---

For any further information please contact:

**Andrew Brown, Scrutiny Officer**

Telephone: 01865 252230

Email: [abrown2@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:abrown2@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.

# Housing Panel (Panel of the Scrutiny Committee)

## Membership

Councillor Angie Goff  
Councillor David Henwood  
Councillor Jennifer Pegg  
Councillor Gill Sanders  
Councillor David Thomas  
Councillor Elizabeth Wade  
Geno Humphrey (co-optee)

### **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 internal and Council member requirement. 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)
- Sent to you in hard copy form upon payment of an annual subscription.

# AGENDA

Pages

## 1 APOLOGIES

Substitutes are not allowed.

## 2 ELECTION OF CHAIR FOR 2017/18 COUNCIL YEAR

The Panel is asked to elect a chair for the 2017/18 Council year.

The chair must be a member of the Scrutiny Committee and can be from any political group.

## 3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

## 4 FIRE SAFETY IN TOWER BLOCKS

Background Information
Members requested a submission from officers on fire safety in the Council's tower blocks in light of the tragic fire at Grenfell Tower in London. Members have also asked to hear the views of individual tower block residents.
Why is it on the agenda?
For the Panel to receive a verbal update on the Council's response to the Grenfell disaster and hear the views of tower block residents.
Who has been invited to comment?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Councillor Mike Rowley, Board Member for Housing;</li><li>• Caroline Green, Assistant Chief Executive;</li><li>• Stephen Clarke, Head of Housing Services;</li><li>• Martin Shaw, Property Services Manager.</li></ul>

## 5 TENANT SCRUTINY PANEL TOWER PROJECT UPDATE

9 - 28

Background Information
The Tenant Scrutiny Panel (TSP) has undertaken a review of the tower block refurbishment project and the Housing Panel has asked to be kept informed of progress.
Why is it on the agenda?
For the Panel to receive a briefing on the outcomes of the TSP review and the Council's response.
Who has been invited to comment?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Geno Humphrey, Chair of Tenant Scrutiny Panel;</li><li>• Councillor Mike Rowley, Board Member for Housing;</li><li>• Stephen Clarke, Head of Housing Services.</li></ul>

## 6 HOUSING PERFORMANCE - QUARTER 4

29 - 32

Background Information
The Housing Panel has a role in monitoring Council performance against housing targets. This report contains outcomes at the end of 2016/17 quarter 4 (March 2017) for a set of housing performance indicators. The Panel has also asked to monitor the numbers of households and children living in temporary accommodation, and this information is also included.
Why is it on the agenda?
For the Panel to note and comment on housing performance at the end of 2016/17 quarter 4 and the numbers of families and children in temporary accommodation.
Who has been invited to comment?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Stephen Clarke, Head of Housing Services.</li></ul>

## 7 RECOMMENDATIONS UPDATE - UNIVERSITY HOUSING NEEDS

33 - 36

In April 2017 the Panel submitted a report to the City Executive Board about university housing needs to inform the Local Plan Preferred Options. The Board Member for Planning and Regulatory Services offered to provide a detailed written response to the Panel's recommendations once the Local Plan Preferred Options had been published

The Panel is asked to note and comment on the Board Member's responses.

## 8 HOUSING PANEL WORK PROGRAMME

37 - 50

For the Panel to note and agree its work plan, which can be adjusted to reflect the wishes of the Panel.

**9 NOTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

51 - 54

For the Panel to note and approve the record of the meeting held on 26 April 2017.

**10 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Meetings are scheduled as follows:

5 September 2017  
12 October 2017  
13 November 2017  
8 March 2018  
9 April 2018

All meetings begin at 5.00pm.

## **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.

## **Review of Oxford City Council's Tower Block Refurbishment Programme**

Undertaken by the Tenant Scrutiny Panel (TSP)

June 2016 - February 2017.

### **Background**

The panel was originally made up of six members but due to the ill-health of one member and the resignation of another, the remaining members felt they should produce an interim report at this stage. We recommend that at the end of the project, another review be carried out to look at the overall outcome of the project by a larger panel. We wish to convey our thanks to the Oxford City Council (OCC) officers for their co-operation in producing documents and providing explanations when requested. A comprehensive list can be found at the end of this document.

### **Introduction**

This review has been written whilst work is still being carried out at Evenlode, Windrush and Hockmore towers. None are yet complete, therefore we are unable to finalise our findings on parts of our initial objectives. We do however feel that we have been given sufficient information on some aspects enabling us to identify areas of good practice and concerns and so we have based our report on those facts.

The decision to carry out this review took into consideration that it is the biggest project, both in value and structure that OCC has undertaken. This also goes with its policy, objectives and commitments towards its residents. Therefore, in our opinion, the review is beneficial for both the OCC and the TSP. It is also (in nature) different from previous reviews carried out.

We started by defining the scale of the works in accordance with this great project and scope of review. Since the contract for the five Tower Blocks had been signed and the selected contractor (WDES) had already started work, we decided to start the review forthwith in order to catch up. We decided to concentrate on the first three blocks, determined by their start and completion dates, followed by the other two blocks. All blocks have similarities in the refurbishment and improvements being undertaken. We could then

evaluate both good practice and shortcomings in our review. We would hope that our findings could be utilised in future projects.

### **Methodology**

To catch up, the TSP made a number of site visits. These included meeting with the contractor and tenants as well as submitting our request for information. We have attended presentations and consultation meetings with the relevant staff involved with the project.

The TSP members were allowed to have a look at the contract and tender documents in situ. During the desktop reviews, we had the chance to get an idea of the running of the contract and performance of OCC in executing the contract, along with the performance of the contractor's management team and any follow up with them. We have also seen some progress reports which give a view of the practice, achievements and problems met and how they could be resolved.

### **Our objectives**

#### **1. To determine that the Tower Block Refurbishment Programme produced an end product worthy of the major financial cost involved.**

1.1 The panel would like to note that the initial financial cost of refurbishment started at £12 million, through £15m, to £18m and finishing at the final contract value of £20.1 million was confusing, also the first justification for the project lifetime being 30 years after refurbishment could not be cost effective.

1.2 Although we did not see the feasibility study we were still under the impression for some time, until it was clarified to us and corrected later, that the increase was due to additions and alterations. Also, the lifetime of the Tower Blocks will be 60 years or more (possibly 80). This figure was also confirmed by WDES. These facts made it evident and logical to decide on refurbishment versus demolition. Finance were able to confirm the money to pay the increased figure was available and indeed that this figure did include monies for unforeseen extra expenses.



1.3 We have been following the programme and smooth running of the works by consultation with the residents, reports of co-operation between OCC management and WDES staff and viewing what has been accomplished so far.

1.4 The need for employing various consultants and each of their roles has been fully explored and we find nothing of concern. As we cannot yet see the end product we feel this is the only comment we can make at this stage.

**2. To recognise good practices and communication during the partnership of WDES, OCC and residents and recommend that they be included in any future projects.**

2.1 We want to commend the appointment of a Resident Liaison Co-ordinator (who was attached to the Tenant Involvement Team) by OCC to help alleviate the communication problems that were sure to occur in a project of this magnitude. She was the point of contact for both residents and the contractor when situations arose because of missed appointments and other problems. She was also responsible for contacting the various departments within OCC when their input was required. Delays were alleviated by her knowledge of the project which meant access to quick solutions. We must commend how this role has been undertaken. By creating a single point of contact other members of staff have been free to fulfil their normal responsibilities whilst providing support when necessary (helping with door to door surveys for instance). This position should be regarded as a must for any future projects – even small ones. We recommend that it remains as part of the Tenant Involvement Team.

2.2 Access to the works has faced some problems and inconvenience for both the contractor and tenants. In order to avoid similar problems (which can cause delays and inconvenience to the contractual arrangements), comprehensive arrangements should be undertaken by consultation and meetings, these would help establish ground rules between contractors, OCC and residents so that work could be completed on schedule.

2.3 The panel identified from a resident's survey carried out in Evenlode and Windrush that

some areas required a change of practice. WDES made alterations in their procedures around making appointments for access to properties, produced newsletters and displayed work schedules in the blocks. The practice of making face to face contact with residents at the start of these projects is much better than just pushing letters through doors. Whilst this is time consuming we feel it should be considered as best practice as it develops good relationships between all parties.

2.4 Special consideration should be given to elderly and disabled residents and if they feel the need for a chaperone they should be given the chance to reschedule visits. Similar consideration should be afforded to residents who have a poor understanding of the English language. We are fully aware that this is an OCC policy but would like to see the same policy being adopted by any contractor.

### **3. Make sure residents are all fully informed on how to use new heating and updated water system efficiently.**

3.1 Tenants we have spoken to have confirmed that information has been provided on the change of systems. It might be advisable if a follow up visit by an Energy Advice Officer is made after the main heating bills are received to ensure that the instructions have been fully understood. The panel have requested three questions to be included on the final satisfaction reports to be completed by residents. This will help us to formulate our final conclusions on how residents feel about the new systems.

### **4. To monitor the experience for residents throughout the refurbishment cycle and determine how unexpected problems were rectified to a satisfactory conclusion.**

4.1 Whilst most aspects appear to have been solved on an ad hoc basis, two issues came to light in the satisfaction surveys and we must commend WDES for how they dealt with them. Residents complained of offensive language being used by sub-contractors, especially whilst they were working on the cradles, also the attitude and lack of care being taken whilst working in people's flats. Both of these issues were taken up by WDES with their sub-contractors and the level of complaints dropped dramatically. Problems also occurred when lifts were out of commission but again, we heard that in many cases the contractors offered help to people.

4.2 The Anti-Social Behaviour team (ASB) could be asked to intervene and give advice and maybe take action if need be.

**5. To establish at all stages of the project, transparency is maintained to ensure that WDES produce the final expected product.**

5.1 At one time, one of the TSP members thought that OCC could have taken over this project, but it was explained to him that it is not within the capacity of OCC to do so. It required a professional body and specialist staff and workforce.

5.2 The review body fully accepts this need and therefore endorses the appointment of these bodies. After establishing the value of the work being done by the consultants E.C.Harris, we are happy that all stages are being monitored carefully.

5.3 We would recommend that the new OCC housing company follows an equally exacting process when dealing with any construction developments it may undertake.

**6. To make sure that all on-going maintenance costs have been fully recognised and that they have had procedures put in place to cover the financial costs involved.**

6.1 The panel have recognised the costs involved in maintaining and cleaning of the cladding and windows but to date have no evidence that these are covered by any budget.

6.2 Although we were advised that the exterior of the windows could be cleaned from inside the flats safely we have doubts that some residents will feel confident to undertake this task. We strongly recommend that OCC take responsibility for cleaning all windows as well as the cladding. We recognise that this could increase the service charge but in the interests of Health and Safety we think this is a price worth paying.

6.3 One of the contractual conditions is cleaning the cladding every two years otherwise it will lose its function by accumulating fungus, according to the contractor.

Therefore the confirmation that OCC will take this responsibility and that there is a budget for it, is essential.

## **7. To identify any areas which could improve community cohesion for future high rise housing developments.**

7.1 It is imperative that the community cohesion issues have to be looked into with focus, high priority and care.

7.2 This is an area which needs to be considered not only for high rise flats but all future housing. The nature of today's living means that people's lifestyles have altered. Much social housing is for (a) single people who need assistance (because of health problems, both physical or mental) or older people who have little or no family contact or (b) families (single parent included) with children where parents have to/want to work. Parents have to enlist childcare and often have no family support having had to move away from the area they grew up in.

7.3 For many, sites such as 'Facebook' are the means they use to keep social contact with others. Maybe this is an area that could be explored. Could a site provide the means for tenants in an area to 'talk' to each other and perhaps develop community ideas?

7.4 OCC could perhaps provide free Wi Fi and information be supplied in new tenants packs. When community events are held in the area they could be published on the site. Inter area teams of tenants could compete at quizzes, sports activities, baking skills etc. if the initial contacts are successful.

7.5 Past experience has shown that tenant's associations can be equally very good and very bad. They are reliant upon there being a group both willing and able to run these groups. It maybe with the use of 'social media' some of the past headaches might be avoided.

7.6 One recommendation we would make is that any future developments include community buildings which can be used by residents groups. They need to have rooms for groups, both large and small, so consideration should be given to more flexible designs

where rooms can be combined together when needed.

7.7 Sports facilities seem to suffer from a lack of accommodation where space is available for permanent storage of equipment. It has been encouraging to see the facilities the OCC have helped to provide for sports in Oxford, such as pavilions for football teams and we commend them for this. Future developments must provide these facilities, especially when they mean children have to live in flats and have no gardens to play in. Safe playing areas, such as we have seen at Denny Gardens, are a must when future developments are envisaged.

7.8 We hope the commitments of WDES as given in their agreed contract with regard to all elements relating to community cohesion will be fully met. This is another area we cannot give our views on until the completion of the project. OCC can play a major role in achieving this through strengthening communication and partnership with all the stakeholders, as well as monitoring the contractor's commitment and mutual interests in this respect.

## **8. Review respite requirements and how provision can be met for current and future projects.**

8.1 Please refer to comments in the following section on respite facilities. We were unhappy that respite space which was spoken about in the main WDES office, when the TSP met the site manager at the start of the project, did not materialise.

## **9. Assess the environmental impact including pollution (noise, airborne and waste) as a result of the works.**

9.1 Without doubt the noise pollution caused by the roofing works in the blocks is the one issue that has registered with everyone. It was necessary work and could not be avoided. In these instances the council and contractors must ensure that residents are aware of the level of noise involved. Good communication is vital. Respite facilities within the blocks is not acceptable, provision must be off site. However few residents took up the offer of respite in Evenlode or Windrush but as it was only available on site this may be the reason.

9.2 We have received no reports of other pollution causing problems. We do believe however that on occasion, the caretakers have had to clear mess left by contractors. This issue needs to be resolved in any future developments as to who is responsible for this work. We refer to this point in items of concern.

## **10. Items of concern**

10.1 We have had certain items brought to our attention from reading the Clerk of Works report. We would like to highlight:

10.2 At Evenlode Tower, it was soon identified that many contractors arrived to start work and were unable to because the mast climbers were not in place. Sufficient time had not been allowed for their installation. This led to delays for some contractors which could have been avoided had the schedule been correct. It has however been pleasing to see this did not reoccur at Windrush or Hockmore so obviously lessons were learnt.

10.3 Contractors working on the cladding had to be stopped because of temperature issues. The prompt action of OCC reporting the issue to WDES meant the work was halted before too much damage was done by the sub-contractor. This action should not have been necessary as the contractors should have been aware of the criteria for the process of attaching the cladding.

10.4 The public right of way issue should have been dealt with prior to the work on Evenlode. The delay in achieving a S278 caused by the section 247 going to the County Council and the Department of Transport could take 4-5 months according to the letter from Richard Crook (Construction Manager of WDES) to David Tatman (Senior Consultant representing OCC). This will surely lead to extra costs. We can only hope that Oxfordshire County Council and the Department of Transport grant permission without any further delay. An investigation as to why this happened should be undertaken to establish how this omission occurred and to ensure that this is not an issue in future developments.

10.5 At Hockmore Tower there is an on-going safety problem regarding the scaffold loading bay. New River Retail did not grant permission to use the South Elevation roof for

storage so all materials are lifted by a large fork lift to the storage area above the front entrance and exit to the site. Permission has been granted for WDES to store skips, materials etc. at the nearby car park of the closed Nelson public house. Hockmore Tower was always going to be a difficult site to manage but why were these problems not foreseen?

10.6 The other issue that appears to be outstanding is that of fire doors/front doors not being fire compliant. This again is causing delays and doubtless extra cost. At the time of this report we do not know what action has been taken/ has been agreed.

10.7 We think it should have been raised earlier when the safety issue was first discovered.

10.8 Health and Safety: It is fair to say that the issue of security, safety and protection has been well covered contractually. We look forward to seeing proof of actual implementations so that we can review it.

10.9 We have seen no official Health and Safety records, such as accident books, for the sites. There were references to Health and Safety made in the sample Clerk of the Work's reports we viewed but nothing further.

10.10 We have not seen any manuals, documents and instructions to show that residents are fully aware of how to use the new facilities and what the procedures are in case of emergencies.

10.11 The responsibilities for cleaning inside and outside of the buildings both during and after works, along with the repair of any damages needs to be clarified so that disputes can be avoided. The contractor should ensure that all sub-contractors are aware of their responsibilities. OCC staff should not be expected to shoulder extra duties when they are probably dealing with extra work caused by the disruptions during this project.

## **11. The Manual of Repairs**

11.1 We suggest that it contains a separate attachment of a route map showing all the



water lines inside the building, electricity, sprinklers, hydrants etc. related to the system in the blocks and the surrounding area and the mains.

## **12. Solar Energy**

12.1 We were pleased with the possibility of installing solar cells for the electricity and heating in the roof of Hockmore Tower. We were informed of the difficulties of installing them on the other towers due to the nature of the structures; we would suggest in view of its numerous benefits and being the policy of OCC to go solar we propose that OCC approaches the consultants to see if there are any smart alternatives that could be utilised in future OCC works and projects where solar energy is not feasible.

**13. At this stage the Panel do not feel able to move to the Indicators of success** –To be meaningful this should be considered at the end of the project. We have tried to highlight where good practice has been established and also the concerns we have identified.

Oxford City Council Tenant Scrutiny Panel

The panel would like to thank the following officers for their time and co-operation in helping us conduct this review with added thanks to their supporting teams who helped collate facts and figures.

Stephen Clarke	Head of Housing and Property
Jack Bradley	Senior Building Surveyor (Project Lead)
Simon Warde	Tenant Involvement Manager
Amy Weller	Resident Liaison Coordinator
Cat Arnold	Senior Management Accountant
David Watt	Finance Business Partner
John Ryan	Tenant Liaison Surveyor (Clerk of Works)
Adnan Chaudhry	Leasehold Management Officer

We have referred to the contractor throughout as WDES but are aware of their change of title to Fortem



**We do not wish the following to be regarded as part of the review, but would like the officers to be made aware of our feelings**

One area we would like to add our comments is the issue of the leaseholders and their charges.

When 'Right to Buy' was established, we do not think that the problem of having leaseholders in these types of buildings was considered. In the panel's opinion the OCC have treated the leaseholders fairly regarding the costs levied. Like OCC, we await the outcome of the tribunal. We consider the publicity generated by some individuals and local press totally unjustified and unwarranted and would like the OCC to know they have our backing on their handling of this issue.

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Response to the Tenant Scrutiny Panel Review - Tower Block Refurbishment Programme**

### **Introduction**

This paper is in response to the TSP (Tenant Scrutiny Panel) report on the Tower Block Refurbishment project. It considers the recommendations and observations presented, with an aim to either provide clarity on those observations or feedback on the recommendation.

Firstly OCC (Oxford City Council) would like to acknowledge all of the hard work and dedication the TSP have put towards this review. We admire the TSP for focusing on this project, due to its size and complexity. We also appreciate that this will have been a steep learning curve, although hope that the panel has found this both rewarding and informative.

It has been OCC's aim to help facilitate your review through the support of the Tenant Involvement team, as well as provide you access to both the information and staff you have requested. Our desire is to be transparent and make sure that we continue to work in partnership.

The Head of Housing and Property Services is very supportive of tenant led scrutiny and was eager to read through your report. From doing so, he arranged a meeting with a number of staff from his department to discuss your findings. Following that, OCC listed all your observations and recommendations requiring acknowledgement and provided a formal response. The details of which can be found in the section below.

This review along with its observations and recommendations is welcomed and is seen as an opportunity to engage fully with tenants to work together over the provision of their services.

## Recommendations & Observations

TSP Recommendations & Observations	OCC Response	Timescale
<p>1.1 The panel would like to note that the initial financial cost of refurbishment started at £12 million, through £15m, to £18m and finishing at the final contract value of £20.1 million was confusing, also the first justification for the project lifetime being 30 years after refurbishment could not be cost effective.</p> <p>Further clarity sought on the rising cost of the project &amp; why OCC specified a '30 year' life span.</p>	<p>The project was born out of a number of issues raised through the day to day maintenance of the building and feedback from housing management. As with any project, the scope is likely to increase in the initial stages as further investigations take place to define the works.</p> <p>Because of the scale of the works and the costs associated with accessing the building to carry out the works OCC took the decision to deal with all works in one go. This is more cost effective in the long run and helps us make sure we can continue to provide high quality accommodation that meets modern standards of safety and energy efficiency.</p> <p>Buildings are typically profiled over a 30 year life. The life of each component varies but the life span of each element is used to assess the overall cost effectiveness of the works and predict future replacement works.</p> <p>In reality the condition of individual components are assessed when they reach the end of their theoretical life and will not necessarily be replaced at that time if they are still in serviceable condition.</p>	N/A
<p>2.1 TSP want to commend the appointment of a Resident Liaison Co-ordinator</p>	<p>We agree that the appointment of a Resident Liaison Coordinator has been valuable. OCC will consider appointing a Resident Liaison Coordinator on future projects, where there will likely be a significant impact on residents.</p>	N/A This will be reviewed on a project by project basis.

<p>2.4 Special consideration should be given to elderly and disabled residents and if they feel the need for a chaperone they should be given the chance to reschedule visits. Similar consideration should be afforded to residents who have a poor understanding of the English language.</p>	<p>With regards to special consideration for elderly and disabled residents, this already forms part of the procurement process and will be included in future projects.</p> <p>Fortem also carried out individual profiling visits at the start of each block to assess who might need additional support throughout the project.</p> <p>We additionally also take into account individual requirements where possible and we benefit from the Resident Liaison Coordinator being in post to assist with this process.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>3. The TSP would like reassurance that residents will be fully informed on how to use new heating and updated water system efficiently.</p>	<p>We can confirm that the resident's eligible for the new heating and hot water system have been fully instructed on how those systems operate. A communication strategy surrounding this is in place including follow up visits and all residents receive a laminated instruction sheet advising how to correctly use the systems. This information will also be supplied to any incoming residents to the blocks to make sure they are fully aware of how each element operates and feel confident in how to use each system properly.</p> <p>We will source a copy of Fortem's instruction sheet and provide it to the TSP.</p>	<p>9<sup>th</sup> May 2017</p>
<p>6.2 Although we were advised that the exterior of the windows could be cleaned from inside the flats safely we have doubts that some residents will feel confident to undertake this task. We strongly recommend that OCC take responsibility for cleaning all windows as well as the cladding.</p>	<p>Residents will be given the key to remove the window restrictor once the mast climbers have been removed and the balcony is completed. Guidance is given and residents are shown how to safely rotate the windows for cleaning.</p> <p>All residents will be advised to keep the window restriction block in place for their own safety and a disclaimer will need to be signed by the resident when handing over the restrictor key to make sure they understand fully how to operate the window and that they are responsible for the safety of their household.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

<p>6.3 One of the contractual conditions is cleaning the cladding every two years otherwise it will lose its function by accumulating fungus, according to the contractor. Therefore the confirmation that OCC will take this responsibility and that there is a budget for it, is essential.</p>	<p>We are able to confirm that as part of the project, Fortem have installed abseiling mechanisms on the roofs of the tower blocks.</p> <p>We will add both the cleaning of the cladding and all windows as appropriate into our planned maintenance programme.</p> <p>We will take the responsibility as the building is ours to maintain and we will budget for it appropriately in accordance with current practice. We will update the TSP at the appropriate time.</p>	<p>TBC</p>
<p>7.1 It is imperative that the community cohesion issues have to be looked into with focus, high priority and care.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">22</p>	<p>Resident engagement has been encouraged at all stages of the project; from the initial consultation, newsletters and throughout the refurbishment works.</p> <p>There is a social value commitment linked to the contract of works which Fortem are fully committed to fulfilling.</p> <p>We will source a copy of Fortem's Social Value achievements and provide it to the TSP.</p> <p>We would encourage and support a TRA (Tenant &amp; Residents Association) if enough residents wished to have one and they were committed to running it. We are however unable to force community cohesion.</p>	<p>9<sup>th</sup> May '17</p>

<p>7.6 One recommendation we would make is that any future developments include community buildings which can be used by residents groups. They need to have rooms for groups, both large and small, so consideration should be given to more flexible designs where rooms can be combined together when needed.</p>	<p>We feel that there is already adequate provision throughout Oxford in relation to community facilities, such as community centres. We therefore do not agree with the recommendation of providing community buildings as part of the scope of works.</p> <p>All tower blocks are a short distance from accessible community centres, which can be utilised by residents if they wished. Where projects are likely to take place and have a significant impact on residents, we will promote the facilities that are already available within their community.</p> <p>In addition, the Tenant Involvement team widely promote and run training activities at community centres.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>8.1 We were unhappy that respite space which were spoken about in the main Fortem office, did not materialise.</p> <p>We feel that respite facilities within the tower blocks, is not acceptable. We suggest that provisions must be off site.</p> <p>We also feel that good communication is vital and that OCC ensure that residents are aware of the level of noise involved.</p>	<p>We have made provision for such facilities; however, we have found that these have barely been used. We feel and from previous experience that residents do not necessarily want the complication of moving their daily belongings to temporary locations off site, just for a day.</p> <p>We want there to be an additional satisfaction survey after the works have completed at all tower blocks and there has been a settling period. To seek more feedback on respite facilities, we will include this within the survey and share anonymous outcomes with the TSP.</p> <p>OCC will do more to ensure that we are accurate and honest about the level of disturbance and at what stages of the project this is likely to occur. An example could be roofing works.</p>	<p>TBC – 2018</p> <p>N/A This will be reviewed on a project by project basis.</p>

<p>9.2 The caretakers have had to clear mess left by contractors. This issue needs to be resolved in any future developments as to who is responsible for this work.</p>	<p>We are grateful for the panel raising these concerns and we agree that greater emphasis should be put on checking the cleanliness of the block at the end of the day by contractors, to make sure the workload of the caretaker is not increased as a result of the works.</p> <p>We will build into our process regular inspection of the site to make sure proper levels of cleanliness are maintained.</p>	<p>N/A This will be reviewed on a project by project basis.</p>
<p>10.4 The public right of way issue should have been dealt with prior to the work on Evenlode.</p>	<p>It is regrettable that the adopted highway issue was not addressed during the feasibility stage.</p> <p>We are able to confirm that the necessary permissions are imminent and we do not foresee a delay to the works overall project timescale.</p> <p>This will form part of the lessons learned for future projects.</p>	<p>N/A This will be reviewed on a project by project basis.</p>
<p>10.5 At Hockmore Tower there is an on-going safety problem regarding the scaffold loading bay.</p> <p>New River Retail did not grant permission to use the South Elevation roof for storage.</p>	<p>The safety concerns raised regarding the loading bay at Hockmore will form part of the lessons learned.</p> <p>An agreement should have been in place with New River sooner to mitigate this issue from arising.</p>	<p>N/A This will be reviewed on a project by project basis.</p>
<p>10.6 A reported issue being outstanding is that of front doors not being fire compliant. Please confirm what action has been taken/has been agreed?</p>	<p>We discovered that additional works were required to the front doors making sure that they would comply with the fire strategy.</p> <p>We can confirm that Direct Service were then instructed to carry out the necessary remedial works to the front doors, which have now been completed.</p>	<p>Complete</p>



<p>10.10 We have not seen any manuals, documents and instructions to show that residents are fully aware of how to use the new facilities and what the procedures are in case of emergencies.</p>	<p>OCC requires clarity on whether your comments relates to emergencies repairs, or fire evacuation procedures.</p> <p>As per item 2.4, the resident's instruction packs cover all the new installations. There also has to be clear instructions for dealing with fires, strategy and escape communicated to all residents.</p>	
<p>12.1 We were pleased with the possibility of installing solar cells for the electricity and heating in the roof of Hockmore Tower.</p>	<p>We are able to confirm that solar panels have been installed to the south facing elevation of Hockmore Tower.</p> <p>The panels will provide energy to the communal areas of the tower block.</p>	<p>Complete</p>

## **Tenant Scrutiny – Next Stages**

OCC take note that the TSP considers this to be an interim review and that the panel suggest there be final review on completion of the project.

Being that the refurbishment is a large scale project, OCC would like to offer some guidance on where focus may be best suited for the final stages.

- On completion of all works; the TSP to work with OCC on a final satisfaction survey. The TSP to sign off the survey, as well as analyse the results.
- OCC would like your opinion on Fortem's social value commitment and whether they have been satisfactorily met.
- OCC would like to know the TSP's views on the process of their review. This could include:
  - a) What lessons have been learned whilst undertaking the review and what would you like to implement in future reviews?
  - b) Summary of your feelings towards the refurbishment project and the value of carrying out this review?
  - c) What degree of involvement do you feel the TSP should have in a project and at what stage should you get involved?
  - d) Would the TSP find it beneficial to have a member join the initial Project Board, so they could follow the process through from start to finish?  
This would be beneficial by providing a resident's point of view to the officers of the Project Board?

## **Conclusion**

We hope that our responses have adequately covered the recommendations and observations of the Tenant Scrutiny Panel report.

In addition to this written response, we welcome the TSP meeting with staff from Property Services to present this response in person and answer any additional questions you may have. This can be arranged if requested.

Head of Service: Steven Clarke



Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

**Performance Summary  
Housing Panel**

**Green = target met  
Amber = within tolerance  
Red = outside tolerance**

**Trends compare relative performance with  
Prd: previous month**

**Prev Year End: previous March**

**Mar-2017**

**Year on Year: the same period from the previous year**

Measure		Owner	Result 2015/16	Latest Data		Year End Target 2016/17	RAG	Trends			Comments
Ref	Description			Target	Result			Prd	Prev Year End	Year on Year	
<b>An Efficient and Effective Council</b>											
HP008	Number of new homes granted permission in the city	Patsy Dell	Not Recorded	400 Number	420 Number	400 Number	G	↗			The data for new planning permissions in 2017/2017 shows that the Council is continuing to respond positively to development and the need to deliver new homes
NI156	Limit our use of temporary accommodation at 2015 levels	Stephen Clarke	115 Number	120 Number	96 Number	120 Number	G	↗	↗	↗	This is an exceptional year end result, against a target of less than 120 households in temporary accommodation. Reducing or maintaining the number of households in temporary accommodation is a challenging target in a very difficult external environment, where the demand for services remains high, and the ability to find suitable accommodation, at affordable rents, locally is increasingly difficult. This result is testament to the continued exceptional homeless prevention work and temporary accommodation management undertaken by Housing Needs teams. This is a snapshot count at the end of March, and is much lower than the monthly average for the year, which is due to a rise in lettings under the Real Lettings initiative in the 4th quarter, as well as maintained social lettings, with improved relet times into Council voids. A further six households in temporary accommodation are excluded from this count, as the Council no longer has a statutory homeless duty to them and they are being evicted from accommodation
BV066a	Percentage of rent collected	Tanya Bandekar	98.25%	98.25%	98.54%	98.25%	G	↗	↗	↗	The percentage Rent collected at the end of March 2017 was the best results for 6 years. A combination of using a new escalation policy to tackle low levels of debts at an early stage, and focussing resources to the higher level debts, we have seen a dramatic improvement in the way we tackle debt
DS011	Percentage of Right to Repairs completed on time (Gas and Responsive)	Sean Fry	99.70%	99.00%	99.66%	99.00%	G	→	↘	↘	14,660 jobs completed on time, out of the 14,710 jobs completed YTD
DS012	Percentage of Routine Repairs completed on time (Gas and Responsive)	Sean Fry	95.39%	96.50%	95.93%	96.50%	A	↘	↗	↗	14,635 jobs completed on time, out of the 15,256 jobs completed YTD. Working on WIP

27

HC016	Number of affordable homes for rent delivered	Stephen Clarke	166 Number	7 Number	0 Number	7 Number	R				Completion of 7 rented flats at Dora Carr Close is programmed for next year
HP003	The number of people estimated to be sleeping rough	Stephen Clarke	56 Number	45 Number	47 Number	45 Number	R				Rough sleepers estimate on a typical night in November 2016 was 47, down from 56 in November 2015. Although estimate slightly down on last year, 47 people rough sleeping on any given night is a high number, and still over target of 45. Rough sleeping remains an issue in the city, due to a number of factors that remain similar to previous years, including lack of move-on from the adult homeless pathway due to a lack of affordable or otherwise suitable accommodation. We are also seeing unprecedented future challenges due to a significant reduction in provision of supported accommodation for rough sleepers and single homeless people coming into effect from June 2017, due to County Council cuts to Housing Related Support
HP004	The number of successful interventions with rough sleepers	Stephen Clarke	326 Number	300 Number	383 Number	300 Number	G				Target met
BV064	Empty homes returned to use	Stephen Clarke	20 Homes	14 Homes	22 Homes	14 Homes	G				Target met
CS002	Time to process changes in circumstances	Helen Bishop	8 Days	9 Days	11 Days	9 Days	R				The result for the year was a disappointing 11.24 days well adrift of the challenging 9 day target. Procedures have been reviewed and we can expect considerably better results in 2017/18
CS005	Time to process new benefits claims	Helen Bishop	13.86 days	13.00 days	12.86 days	13.00 days	G				An excellent result for March when the 455 new applications were processed in an average of 10.9 days, meant that the end of year result was 12.86 days, thus within the challenging target of 13 days. This was a one day improvement on last year's result of 13.86 days
HC003	Homeless Acceptances	Stephen Clarke	141 Number	132 Number	125 Number	132 Number	G				Target met
HC004	Homelessness cases prevented	Stephen Clarke	1,170 Number	1,100 Number	1,107 Number	1,100 Number	G				Target met, though homeless preventions are becoming increasingly difficult due to the buoyant private rented sector market and unaffordability of rents
HP006	Total number of affordable homes completed in year	Stephen Clarke	Not Recorded	35 Number	20 Number	35 Number	R				Completion of 7 rented and 8 shared ownership flats at Dora Carr Close is programmed for next year

**Number of households in temporary accommodation**

	<b>31-Dec-16</b>	<b>31-Mar-17</b>	<b>30-Jun-17</b>
Families with dependent children or expected babies	97	80	80
Single households	15	11	13
Other	2	5	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>94</b>
Number of children in temp accommodation	165	148	147

This page is intentionally left blank

**To: Housing Panel (Panel of the Scrutiny Committee)**

**Date: 27th July 2017**

**Executive Member: Board Member for Planning and Regulatory Services**

**Title: Detailed response to Scrutiny recommendations on university housing needs**

31

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Agree?</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<p>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:</p>	<p>Y</p>	<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 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)		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.
b) Allocating specific sites for new student accommodation for the two universities; (paras. 8a & 16)		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.
c) Limiting the amount of student accommodation allowed within any given geographical area; (para. 17)		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.
d) Encouraging the universities to provide accessible accommodation as part of any proposed new developments of student accommodation; para 18)		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.
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 & 19)		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.
f) Extending the targets for students living outside of provided accommodation to other large educational institutions based in the city; (para. 20)		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.
g) Limiting the use of new student accommodation to the two universities; (para. 21)		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.
h) Whether university students housed in non-university provided student housing should count towards the 3,000 target figure; (para. 22)		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.
i) Encouraging private developers of student accommodation to work closely with the universities; (para. 23)		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 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)		July 2017 – Opt 12: <i>Meeting intermediate housing or employment sector specific needs based on local affordability approaches</i> 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.
k) Providing some flexibility to substitute some of the social rent planning		July 2017 – Opt 12: <i>Meeting intermediate housing or employment sector specific needs based on local affordability approaches</i>

<p>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>		<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>
<p>l) Providing additional flexibility in the balance of dwellings policy specifically for key worker housing schemes. (para. 26)</p>		<p>July 2017 – Opt 16: <i>Mix of dwelling sizes to maintain and deliver balanced communities ('balance of dwellings')</i>  Opt 17: <i>Thresholds for mix of dwelling sizes ('balance of dwellings')</i>  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>

# SCRUTINY WORK PLAN

## July 2017 – April 2018

Published on: 11/07/17

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	To scrutinise shareholder decisions relating to wholly Council-owned companies.	Cllrs Chapman, Fry, Gant, Henwood & Simmons.

### Current and planned review groups and one-off panels

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	TBC	Cllr Ladbrooke (chair), TBC

### Indicative timings of 2017/18 review panels

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
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> <li>• provide a framework for collaboration and action</li> <li>• assist in the allocation of resources &amp; prioritise actions</li> </ul>	Planning and Regulatory Services, Corporate Strategy and Economic Development	Fiona Piercy, Interim Assistant Chief Executive, Regeneration and Economy
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
Commissioned Advice Strategy 2018-2021 - Progress report	Yes	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
Scrutiny Committee Annual Report	Yes	To update the Council on the work of the Scrutiny Committee for the year 2016/17.	Councillor Andrew Gant	Andrew Brown, Scrutiny Officer

## 9 OCTOBER 2017 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Discretionary Housing Payments spend	No	To monitor Discretionary Housing Payments spend mid-way through the year.	Customer and Corporate Services	Paul Wilding, Programme Manager Revenue & Benefits
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
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
Monitoring Grants Allocated to Community and 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
Review of Community Grants Programme	Yes	To inform the CEB of the review and request agreement for an approach which expands our 'offer' to the three year Community and Voluntary Sector grant programme from April 2018	Culture and Communities	Julia Tomkins, Grants & External Funding Officer

## 7 NOVEMBER 2017 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS

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
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
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.	A Clean and Green Oxford	Mai Jarvis, Environmental Quality Team Manager

### 5 DECEMBER 2017 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
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 – NO REPORTS CURRENTLY SCHEDULED

### 6 FEBRUARY 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
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
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

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
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
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

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Fusion Lifestyle's 2018/19 Annual Service Plan	No	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

40

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
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
Impacts of the Westgate Shopping Centre	No	To consider plans for the reopening of the Westgate Shopping Centre including public transport, parking and city centre management.	Corporate Strategy and Economic Development	Fiona Piercy, Interim Assistant Chief Executive, Regeneration and Economy
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 loneliness and social isolation among older people and how the Council can provide support	Culture and Communities	Ian Brooke, Head of Community Services



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
Oxford Living Wage	No	To consider how the Council is promoting the Oxford Living Wage to local employers and what more can be done.	Corporate Strategy and Economic Development	Caroline Green, Assistant Chief Executive
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

### 11 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, Corporate Asset Management and Public Health	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
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
Additional funding for feasibility studies for investment property development opportunities	Yes	To update CEB on feasibility studies in relation to the investment property development opportunities and seek additional funding commitment to development stage.	Finance, Asset Management	Nick Twigg, Major Projects & Development Manager
Treasury Management Performance: Annual Report and Performance 2016/17	Yes	The Treasury Management Performance Report 2016/17 sets out the position at 31 March 2017 (Full Year)	Finance, Asset Management	Bill Lewis, Financial Accounting Manager

42

### 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, Corporate Asset Management and Public Health	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	No	To receive a briefing on a new Budget for the period 2018/2019.	Finance, Asset Management	Section 151 Officer

Treasury Management Performance 2017/18	Yes	The Treasury Management Performance Report 2017/18 sets out the position at 30 September 2017 (Half Year)	Finance, Asset Management	Bill Lewis, Financial Accounting Manager
---	-----	---	---------------------------	--

### 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

43

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

### FINANCE PANEL - TO BE SCHEDULED

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
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

## HOUSING PANEL

### 10 JULY 2017 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS

Agenda item	Decision	Description	CEB Portfolio	Report Contact
Housing performance - quarter 4	No	To consider year-end Council performance against a set of housing service measures chosen by the Panel.	Housing	Stephen Clarke, Head of Housing Services
Fire safety in tower blocks	No	To receive a verbal briefing on the Council's response to the Grenfell Tower disaster.	Housing	Stephen Clarke, Head of Housing Services
Tower block refurbishment	No	To receive a progress update on the Tenant Scrutiny Panel's review of the tower block refurbishment project.	Housing	Stephen Clarke, Head of Housing Services

### 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
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
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

**12 OCTOBER 2017 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS**

<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>CEB Portfolio</b>	<b>Report Contact</b>
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
Leaseholder relationships	No	To consider Council relationships with leaseholders including the views of individual leaseholders.	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.	Councillor Mike Rowley	Simon Warde, Tenant Involvement Manager
Review of Home Choice Pilot	Yes	To update CEB on the 1st year's operation of the Home Choice Pilot.	Housing	Paul Wilding, Programme Manager Revenue & Benefits
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

45

**13 NOVEMBER 2017- PROVISIONAL REPORTS**

<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>CEB Portfolio</b>	<b>Report Contact</b>
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
Rent performance	No	To monitor the Council's rents performance including current and former tenant arrears.	Housing	Tanya Bandekar, Service Manager Revenue & Benefits

**8 MARCH 2018 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS**

<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>CEB Portfolio</b>	<b>Report Contact</b>
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.		
--	-----	---	--	--

#### 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

#### 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
Tenancy 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
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
Regulating the Private Rented Sector	Yes	To consider options to designate a Selective Licensing scheme in the City to improve the management of properties in the private rented sector.	Planning and Regulatory Services	Adrian Chowns, Team Leader HMO Enforcement Team

**SHAREHOLDER PANEL**

**17 JULY 2017 - PROVISIONAL REPORTS**

47

<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>CEB Portfolio</b>	<b>Report Contact</b>
Direct Services Trading Company - progress report	Yes	<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>• Which services should be transferred, and if so into which part of the structure principally having regard to the financial impact on the Council.</li> <li>• Which if any staff should transfer from the Council to the Local Authority Trading Company.</li> <li>• Client side arrangements as appropriate</li> </ul> <p>and to request an additional working capital loan from the Council.</p>	Finance, Asset Management, A Clean and Green Oxford, Customer and Corporate Services	Simon Howick

**SHAREHOLDER PANEL - TO BE SCHEDULED**

<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>CEB Portfolio</b>	<b>Report Contact</b>
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

This page is intentionally left blank



## HOUSING PANEL (PANEL OF THE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE)

**Wednesday 26 April 2017**

**PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:** Councillors Henwood (Chair), Pegg, Sanders, Thomas and Wade; Geno Humphrey (tenant co-optee).

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Andrew Brown (Scrutiny Officer), Melanie Mutch (Empty Property Officer (Private Sector)), Martin Shaw (Property Services Manager) and Ann Phillips (Tenancy Management Manager)

### **92. APOLOGIES**

The Panel noted apologies from Councillor Angie Goff, Stephen Clarke, Bill Graves and Frances Evans

### **93. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations.

### **94. EMPTY PROPERTIES**

The Empty Property Officer introduced the report. She said that she had been in post since 2005 and that the Council had had an empty property strategy in place since 2009. Since then the number of empty properties in the city had reduced from around 900 to about 300 currently, with 75 of these empty for more than 2 years and 25 for over 10 years. This decrease couldn't be solely accredited to Council interventions, which involved officers from a number of different services. The strategy was due for a refresh and a consultation would take place over the summer.

The Empty Property Officer advised that an empty property was defined as any dwelling that had been continuously unoccupied for over 6 months. Second homes were covered by different legislation and owners of second homes had to demonstrate that they lived there at least once a year, for example by producing utility bills showing energy usage.

In response to a question about targeting empty commercial premises, the Empty Property Officer said that she is made aware of 3-4 sites per year. Legislation restricted enforcement opportunities for non-dwelling properties but Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPO) could be an option in some cases.

The Panel asked questions about the circumstances around some specific empty properties in the city and heard that all cases were different and the Council used a range of approaches to encourage owners to bring them back into use. Owners of empty properties often had a defence so in many cases achieving successful outcomes required a lot of support and effort.

The Panel asked what resources would be required to support a substantial CPO programme. The Empty Property Officer advised that the CPO process

was immensely time consuming and while the Council was gaining more experience in this area, enhanced in-house legal expertise would be needed. The Council could also potentially facilitate CPOs on behalf of external financiers. One issue with the CPO process was a requirement to demonstrate that empty dwellings were causing harm. Officers found that neighbours often retracted complaints if they thought a property would be brought back into use as social housing.

The Panel queried the timing of the consultation and received assurances that avenues such as Tenants in Touch were used to encourage residents to report empty properties, which they could do anonymously online.

The Empty Property Officer explained that the figures in Appendix 2 for the numbers of properties brought back into use were affected by the numbers of new builds coming onto the market hence a minus figure was shown in year 6.

The Panel agreed to scrutinise the new empty property strategy and voiced support for the additional use of CPO powers.

## **95. GREAT ESTATES UPDATE**

The Property Services Manager said that the Great Estates programme comprised of 2-3 major improvement schemes per year plus a number of smaller schemes. Wherever possible these schemes were aligned with cyclical maintenance and off-street parking improvements to achieve better overall outcomes. Tenants and leaseholders were routinely consulted as they knew their estates best. This involved door knocking, exhibitions, and surveys. Officers wanted to know where anti-social behaviour (ASB) was taking place so that opportunities for ASB it could be designed-out. Officers wanted people to be proud of their estates and feel the investments had been worthwhile.

The Property Services Manager said that officers had found that the lead in process had been quite considerable, often involving 6-9 months of preparation before improvement works could start. This had resulted in £400k of slippage but it was expected that future spending targets would be met. Some blocks needed external treatment works and officers were surveying and cataloguing blocks in order to understand solutions and costs. These could inform a future rolling programme of further improvements, subject to funding.

The Panel voiced support for the programme and suggested that the types of schemes taking place provided an ideal opportunity for local young people to get involved in their delivery, for example as apprentices. The Panel also suggested that may be an idea to involve children in redesigning communal areas where these were being vandalised. The Property Services Manager said that he would take these suggestions away.

The Panel questioned how schemes were selected and heard that they were prioritised from suggestions by local members, residents and officers. It was suggested that members representing unparished wards might wish to direct some of their allocated CIL funding to environmental improvements in estates.

The Panel encouraged the planting of trees, particularly where trees were being removed as part of an improvement scheme.

The Panel raised concerns about cars were parked on grass and questioned whether additional off-street parking could be delivered in these areas. The Property Services Manager advised that the biggest limitation was obtaining planning consents.

The Panel welcomed the report and asked for a further update in 12 months to include:

- More details about off-street parking improvements.
- Feedback from residents.
- Any metrics that can be provided to illustrate how improvements had made a difference (e.g. numbers of additional parking spaces provided).

## **96. EMPTY GARAGES AND FORMER GARAGE SITES**

The Tenancy Management Manager introduced the report. She said that responsibility for the management of the Council's garage assets had transferred to her team in December 2015. They had seen that there were a lot of empty units and set up a project to address this, with a focus on Blackbird Leys, where many empty garages were located.

The Panel questioned why some particular blocks did not appear to be listed in Appendix 1 and suggested that they should be listed by ward, based on current ward names and circulated to ward members.

The Panel resolved to go into private session to discuss information contained in the confidential appendices.

## **97. TOWER BLOCK REFURBISHMENT**

The Chair of the Tenant Scrutiny Panel (TSP) advised that the TSP report had now been submitted to senior officers and would be presented at the next Housing Panel meeting.

## **98. HOUSING PANEL WORK PROGRAMME**

The Scrutiny Officer advised panel members to email him any suggestions.

## **99. NOTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

Noted.

## **100. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The Scrutiny Officer advised that due to the impacts of the General Election, the next Housing Panel meeting was now provisionally scheduled for 10 July 2017, not 14 June 2017 as listed in the paperwork.

**101. EXEMPT APPENDICES - GARAGE ASSET MANAGEMENT**

**The meeting started at 5.00 pm and ended at 6.45 pm**