

# Supplement for Council

www.oxford.gov.uk



On **Monday 29 November 2021** At **5.15 pm**

## Agenda Item 21 - Scrutiny Committee Update report

### Contents

21.	<b>Scrutiny Committee update report</b>	3 - 20
	The Chair of the Scrutiny Committee has submitted a report which updates Council on the activities of scrutiny and the implementation of recommendations since the last meeting of Council.	
	<b>Council is invited to comment on and note the report.</b>	

The agenda, reports and any additional supplements can be found together with this supplement on the [committee meeting webpage](#).

This page is intentionally left blank

**To:** Council  
**Date:** 29 November 2021  
**Report of:** Chair of the Scrutiny Committee  
**Title of Report:** Scrutiny briefing to Council

<b>Summary and recommendations</b>	
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	To update Council on the activities of the Scrutiny function
<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	All
<b>Policy Framework:</b>	Council Strategy 2020-24
<b>Recommendation:</b>	That Council resolves to note the update report.

<b>Appendices</b>	
Appendix 1	Table of Cabinet responses to Scrutiny recommendations from the reporting period.

## Introduction

1. Owing to the delivery of the Scrutiny Annual Report for 2020/21 at the last Council meeting, no update was provided from Scrutiny to October Council. As such, this report is relatively lengthy, covering the period from 14 July 2021 to 19 November 2021.

## Scrutiny Committee

2. Since the last Scrutiny update to Council the Scrutiny Committee has met three times, on 08 September, 05 October and 02 November 2021. In addition, Scrutiny's meeting of 14 July was not included in the previous report owing to its proximity to the Council meeting, meaning it too is reported on below:

14 July

3. Two substantive reports were considered at this meeting:

- Oxfordshire Plan Consultation (no recommendations)
  - Electric Vehicle Strategy (four recommendations, one agreed, three not agreed)
4. The Oxfordshire Plan is a document which sets out a vision and planning framework for the County for the period until 2050, but crucially does not stray into determining areas that fall within each district's Local Plan. As the document was being considered by multiple Councils near-simultaneously, scope did not exist for Scrutiny to make recommendation to Cabinet for changes. Instead, valuable discussion was held with Scrutiny able to raise its questions, issues and concerns for awareness by officers and members leading the project for when suitable opportunities to address them might arise. The primary topics considered included traveller sites, green belt access, play spaces, jobs paying sufficiently for people to afford new houses, and the benefits of 'blue spaces'.
  5. The report considered by Scrutiny regarding the Electric Vehicle (EV) Strategy was primarily concerned with the commissioning of an EV Strategy, rather than the strategy itself. Consequently, the Committee raised fairly far-reaching issues concerning how it would wish to see journey numbers reduced, and those journeys made being by electric vehicles, not petrol or diesel. Issues raised by Scrutiny included the degree of commitment by the Council to Connecting Oxford, and seeking that the Council's ethical investment principles were extended to cover different aspects of the EV Strategy. These recommendations were not deemed appropriate by Cabinet, with the latter being suggested as better dealt with under the forthcoming changes to the Council's procurement policy. Scrutiny's recommendation that there should be preparation for the impact of the anticipated success of the EV Strategy on other transport-related strategies, such as the Zero Emissions Zone, was agreed.

08 September

6. Three substantive reports were considered at this meeting:
  - Urban Forest Strategy (three recommendations, two agreed and one in part)
  - Council Tax Reduction Scheme (no recommendations)
  - Tourism Management Review Group Update (report delayed)
7. General support for the Council's aims to extend tree cover within the City through its Urban Forest Strategy was strengthened by confirmation within the report that there is a strong inverse correlation between tree cover and affluence across the City. News that the Council would not be seeking to address this issue unilaterally, and its recognition of the need for a 'right tree, right place' policy was also welcomed. The areas of Scrutiny's recommendations were twofold. Firstly, trying to ensure that there were not unwanted interactions between this policy and other policies, such as the emerging electric vehicle strategy. There was concern that demand for off-street charging points might make gardens liable to be made into driveways. This was accepted in part by Cabinet, who recognised the trade-offs associated with decarbonisation, but also referenced the list of mitigations that would prevent this situation being realised. The other key area for recommendations was concerning the fact that the public have strong views on trees, both positive and negative. As a consequence, it would be necessary to

prioritise consultation to deliver 'the right tree in the right place'. Likewise, when there were issues, elected members were unsure who to approach to get the issue dealt with, so the Council should make available this information to members. Both suggestions were accepted by Cabinet.

8. Recognising that the Council Tax Reduction Scheme report was only a consultation and not settled proposals, a lot of the Committee's focus of discussion was on how the consultation itself was being delivered and how different groups would access it. A number of the consultation questions were also queried for clarity. Overall, however, the Committee was very supportive of the work undertaken by the Revenues and Benefits team, and made no recommendations.
9. Owing to an oversight the Tourism Management Review Group Update report has not been officially responded to by Cabinet and will be reported on at the next Scrutiny update to Council.

05 October

10. Two substantive reports were considered at this meeting:
  - Air Quality Status Report (report delayed)
  - Development of Land at South Oxfordshire Science Village (four recommendations, all agreed)
11. Although the Air Quality Status report was heard in October and the report to Cabinet signed off by the Committee in November, the relevant Cabinet member was not available to make a response at the meeting. It was decided, therefore, to delay submission to Cabinet until December. Consequently, this item will be reported on in the next update to Council.
12. The report concerning the Development of Land at South Oxfordshire Science Village was held in confidential session, meaning many of the details of the discussion are withheld. However, the Committee did make four recommendations which were not commercially sensitive. These recommendations, all agreed by Cabinet stressed the need to advance environmental concerns as far as possible without undermining other project aims, and the need to plan for higher environmental standards, to ensure social value is maximised in the building of the development, and minor amendments over delegation arrangements.

02 November

13. Two substantive reports were considered at this meeting:
  - Anti-social Behaviour Policy (two multi-part recommendations, of which all elements agreed)
  - East Oxford Community Centre (four recommendations, three agreed and one agreed in part)
14. Anti-social behaviour is an issue not recently considered by Scrutiny, but one which has serious impacts for residents who encounter it. The three-yearly refresh of the policy, therefore, was welcomed by the Committee as an opportunity to scrutinise it in detail. In its consideration, the Committee recognised that the proposed policy

and procedure played a balanced, positive and humane role for all residents who had involvement with ASB, whether as victims or perpetrators. Its recommendations focused on amendments to the policy and procedure document, identifying areas where the Council delivers to higher standards than it suggests in the documentation (the removal of racist graffiti within 24 hours being a good example), and identifying possible areas of difficulty or challenge such as invasive evidence gathering; the negative consequences of eviction; and the particular challenges faced by those with complex mental health issues.

15. Divergent and strongly-held views by different stakeholders have required lengthy consultation and negotiation to bring a suitable plan forward for the East Oxford Community Centre. Given the diversity of opinion amongst members of the public the proposals had been of interest to Scrutiny for a long time. The opportunity to explore and share its views were therefore valued. In addition to discussion around stakeholder management, plans for supporting existing users during the development, and how the Council aimed to ensure it would become a community hub when reopened, the main concerns of the Committee were over sustainability and governance. The Committee made two recommendations concerning the first of these, suggesting that the cost-effectiveness of the carbon-reduction measures employed on the community centre should be monitored and evaluated, and that waste materials should be recycled as much as possible. Cabinet agreed with the first, and partially agreed to the second, noting budgetary concerns but agreeing to a recycling plan. The recommendation made concerning governance arose from a recognition of the importance of having a suitable and stable form of governance for the Community Centre, and that a timetable for achieving that would be beneficial. Cabinet agreed to have implemented the Council's preferred governance option within three years of the centre opening. A further recommendation, also agreed by Cabinet concerned adding further risks to the risk register.

### **Housing and Homelessness Panel**

16. The Housing and Homelessness Panel has met three times during the reporting period, on 02 September, 06 October and 04 November.
17. An innovation agreed this year by the Panel is to have one subject considered from a number of different aspects over the course of multiple meetings, in effect similar to a mini Scrutiny Review Group. The topic chosen for consideration is 'Tenant Engagement and Empowerment,' a timely topic owing to significant post-Grenfell changes announced by central government and the merging of some Housing and Communities functions internally. To aid the members in this the Panel has invited the Council's Tenant Ambassadors, who represent tenants across a number of different Council functions, to each meeting. No recommendations to Cabinet are being made at present, but a full report will be written up at the end of the civic year for Cabinet to consider.

02 September

18. Two substantive reports were considered at this meeting:
  - Housing Performance Q1 (one recommendation, agreed by Cabinet)

- Introducing Tenant Engagement (no recommendations)
19. With a new membership for the new civic year the Panel heard the Housing Performance Q1 report largely as an introduction to the breadth of activity the Housing directorate is responsible for. Arising from the discussion was a request for a Housing Performance Dashboard to be presented as a standing item at each Housing and Homelessness Panel meeting. To date this has not been possible, owing to the challenges of getting reliable data following the challenges of the migration to the new QL system. It is hoped, however, that the Panel will be able to get regular updates which are close (if not quite identical) to the ones required to be produced by the Social Housing White Paper. The recommendation which arose, agreed to by Cabinet, focused on resuming good practice which had had to be paused because of lockdown, specifically relating to involving the Lived Experience Advisory Forum in the design of services.
  20. As referenced above, Tenant Engagement and Empowerment is a topic the Panel is looking at over the duration of the year. The first presentation given was by the Tenant Engagement Team, with the Council's Tenant Ambassadors giving details of the different ways in which they contribute to the working of the Council. These include evaluation of tenders, involvement in interviews, the Great Estates project, environmental improvements, and involvement with complaints and the Housing Ombudsman's Residents Panel. As mentioned, recommendations will be agreed later on in the process and a report submitted to Cabinet later on in the civic year.

06 October

21. Two substantive reports were considered at this meeting:
  - Housing and Carbon Reduction (report delayed)
  - Social Housing White Paper Update (no recommendations)
22. Whilst the Housing and Carbon Reduction paper was heard and passed through Scrutiny, it was agreed to delay sending it to Cabinet owing to the absence of the Cabinet member. As a result, this item will be reported back in the next Scrutiny update to Council.
23. The Panel's second Tenant Engagement and Empowerment report provided an update on the wide-ranging changes the government plans to introduce to improve social housing, largely following the Grenfell tragedy. The proposals clearly have a large focus on safety, but putting tenant experience at the centre of housing provision is a thread which runs throughout and will require widespread changes for all social housing providers, including the Council. The Panel were introduced to the details of the government's proposed seven themes, that it is the right of a tenant: to be safe in their homes, to know how their landlord is performing, to have complaints dealt with fairly and promptly, to be treated with respect, to be heard by their landlord, to live in a good quality home and neighbourhood, and to be supported by the landlord into home ownership. The Panel will be revisiting the Council's own actions in response to this later in the year.

04 November

24. Two substantive reports were considered at this meeting:

- Discretionary Housing Payment Policy (1 recommendation, agreed)
  - Empty Homes (yet to be signed off by Scrutiny)
25. Discretionary Housing Payment is a payment made by a local authority to an applicant who is struggling with their housing costs. It is an extremely important benefit because the recipients tend to be individuals with few other options available – single parent families and/or families subjected to the benefits cap. Whilst central government pays a grant to the Council for this benefit, the grant for next year is to be cut by almost a quarter, despite the end of a number of Covid-related financial supports and the cost of living crisis. The Council is permitted to spend more than the government grant, but it must bear the full cost. Last year it did so by approximately £100k. The Panel heard the report, which dealt primarily with the Council's mitigation strategies for the impacts of spending beyond the government grant. It recognised the sensible approach taken in seeking to reduce the financial impact of overspend, and supported the Council's commitment to continue paying to those in need. The one recommendation arose from a lack of clarity at the Panel meeting itself, where it was uncertain whether there would be a line in the HRA budget for next year which specified anticipated overspends on Council tenants. Recognition in the budget was felt to be important as a matter of transparency over spending expected to be in the region of £50k. At Cabinet it was confirmed that the draft budget for 2022/32 does indeed include such a line.
26. The report on Empty Homes is yet to go to Scrutiny for sign-off, meaning it will be reported on in the next update.

### **Finance and Performance Panel**

27. The Finance and Performance Panel convened on two occasions during this period, on 02 August and 06 September 2021

02 August

28. Two substantive reports were considered at this meeting:
- Social Value in Procurement (two recommendations, both agreed)
  - Aareon QL Implementation Update (two recommendations, both agreed)
29. Social Value in Procurement is an issue Scrutiny has shown a lot of interest in recently. The idea being how the Council ensures that social goods accrue not only from what is procured, but also from choosing companies that operate in a way as to cultivate social value when undertaking their work. This ambition is reflected in a weighting given to each company's proposal relating to the level of social value it would deliver through the contract. The Panel heard an update on the activity the Council had taken to move this agenda forward, the key legislative changes and the Council's proposed responses. In a key metric, spending money locally, the Council has outperformed central government's target by almost 100%. The view of the Panel was that to develop this concept further, the Council must work with other partners to develop a shared local approach. This was a recommendation, which was accepted by Cabinet. Building on that, it was also felt that though the Council was clearly a leader amongst councils, councils may not necessarily be the best performers and there may be value in learning about the performance of those from



other sectors. It was recommended and accepted by Cabinet, that the Council should seek benchmarking data from a wider pool of comparators, and not only local authorities.

30. The Aareon QL system is a recently-implemented system primarily supporting the Council's Housing directorate. However, it is also closely aligned with Finance and Oxford Direct Services, meaning the challenges experienced in the implementation have been wide-ranging. The precise details of the Panel's update on those challenges were held in confidential session and are not reported. The recommendations made, however, are not confidential. These, both agreed by Cabinet, focused firstly on the extraordinary commitment shown by many Council staff in mitigating the challenges faced and ensuring that they were not inadvertently punished by the Council's HR policies for doing so. The second recommendation was a simple one about the Council ensuring that the indirect costs, such as staff time, would be included in a future lessons learnt exercise.
31. In addition to the substantive reports, the Panel selected the suite of key performance indicators it wishes to keep sight of over the course of the year to ensure particularly important targets are being met.

06 September

32. Two substantive reports were considered at this meeting:
  - Integrated Performance Report Q1 (no recommendations)
  - Treasury Management (no recommendations)
33. The Cabinet considers a quarterly report detailing the Council's delivery concerning finances, risk and performance each quarter. This report looked at the year-end performance. Although no recommendations were made in response to the report it was discussed in detail, with time devoted particularly to the Council's financial performance, with car parking, community centre and commercial property rental income streams all being discussed.
34. In straightened financial circumstances, as experienced by the Council following Covid, the performance of the Council's investments is vital. The Council's income had fallen short of budgeted expectations, but on the other hand had outperformed most similar councils. Those which performed better than the Council were local authorities with risk profiles and tolerances beyond which is felt to be prudent for this Council. No recommendations were made, but discussion was devoted to future returns, and also exploration of the Council's ethical investment policy.

### **Companies Panel**

35. There have been two meetings of the Companies Scrutiny Panel, on 20 July and 18 October 2021. As referenced in the last update to Council from Scrutiny, the governance of the Council's companies has been changed in response to recommendations made by the Council's auditors. The first meeting, 20 July, took place under the previous regimen. The Panel received updates from all four of the Council's companies and joint ventures, but made no recommendations. The meeting of 18 October took place under the new arrangements, whereby Panel members are also invited to attend the Shareholder and Joint Venture Group

meetings. The meeting of the Panel, and the Shareholder and Joint Venture Group meeting, were to discuss changes to the OxWED joint venture structure. Discussions on this were held in confidential session and are not detailed here, but following discussion the Companies Scrutiny Panel agreed to raise issue of timeliness, cost transparency and the protection of the Council's interests under the proposed restructure at the Shareholder and Joint Venture Group.

36. A meeting of the Companies Panel is scheduled for 24 November 2021 which, although prior to the meeting of Council, falls too closely to it to be reported on here.

## **Review Groups**

37. The Scrutiny Committee has agreed the topic for its annual Scrutiny Review Group, which is to be on Child Poverty. Normally, this would have begun at this point. However, it is the wish of the Committee that the Council try to work with the County Council on a joint review owing to the County Council's important role in addressing this issue. The County Council is currently undergoing a change to its Scrutiny function, which has caused a delay. However, it is expected this review will commence in January 2022.
38. Also commencing in January 2022 will be Scrutiny's review of the Council's proposed budget. The Budget Review Group will meet on 04, 06 and 10 January to hear from Heads of Service about the changes to their budgets, and to raise questions on the proposals.

Councillor Liz Wade– Chair of the Scrutiny Committee

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

Tom Hudson – Scrutiny Officer

Email: [thudson@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:thudson@oxford.gov.uk); Tel: 01865 252191

**July Cabinet**

No reports were responded to at this Cabinet meeting.

**September Cabinet**

**Urban Forest Strategy**

11

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Agree?</b>	<b>Comment</b>
1) <b><i>That the Council reviews the policy tensions between garden space and electric charging and develops a considered position on their interaction, and that it reviews its other climate-related strategies for similar unanticipated tensions.</i></b>	In part	There are many trade-offs associated with decarbonisation, at a household, city, national and international level. However, Oxford City Council is seeking to manage these through, <i>inter alia</i> , enabling on street EV charging through the GUL-e cable-gulley project, being developed jointly with ODS and Oxfordshire County Council. It is also seeking to increase tree cover across Oxford by encouraging planting where there is available land – most typically in residents <i>back</i> gardens, the grounds of colleges, businesses and other institutions, and where possible on streets and public land. The council will continue to monitor tree cover and biodiversity to see that the removal of front garden space by householders choosing to charge their vehicles, hasn't impacted these objectives.
2) <b><i>That the Council takes steps to ensure that with greater number of trees being planted, community engagement over proposals is treated as a matter of priority and local residents are given an opportunity</i></b>	Yes	

<i>to voice their views.</i>		
<b>3) That the Council makes available to councillors and members of the public information on who is responsible for what within the Urban Forest Strategy, and help with understanding who to contact in different scenarios.</b>	Yes	

### Social Value in Procurement

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Agree?</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<b>1) That the Council works with other local authorities and institutions to develop a shared OxTOMs framework in the short term and a shared approach to social value in procurement locally in the longer term.</b>	Agreed	
<b>2) That the Council requests from its internal auditor data to allow it to benchmark the social value generated through its procurement against a wider pool of comparators</b>	Agreed	

## Aareon QL Implementation

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Agree?</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<p><b>1) That the Council in a future lessons learnt exercise, includes within its audit an estimate of the cost the indirect and opportunity costs arising from the implementation of the QL system on the Council and its companies</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>We will of course thoroughly review all aspects of the QL changeover to make sure the same problems aren't experienced with future IT upgrades.</p>
<p><b>2) That the Council recognises the exemplary commitment of staff across multiple functions in managing and mitigating the challenges posed by the implementation and works with union representatives to find ways to ensure that those staff are not penalised for their commitment.</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>As far as we possibly can and of course always considering the preferences and well-being of individual staff members.</p> <p>I meet regularly with Unison and Unite as do members of CMT, and Union representatives are actively involved with current issues and future planning both within the Council and in ODS. Our offer in terms of pay, including overtime, and conditions is always negotiated seriously with the Unions. We're politically committed to this, but that aside, experience shows that public sector bodies can only move forward with the workforce "on board" in times of change and challenge.</p> <p>I've already thanked the Council and ODS staff members who have made sure our services and reputation are maintained, and I'd like to take this opportunity to put on public record our gratitude to everyone who has worked so hard on this. Our expectations of Council staff are informed by an understanding of how disrupted and stressful the past year and a half has been. Oxford is lucky to have dedicated public servants and despite difficult times, we want to make sure our relationship with the Council workforce reflects this and honours the dedication</p>

		Council workers bring to the job.
--	--	-----------------------------------

**October Cabinet**

**Science Village**

<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Agree?</i>	<i>Comment</i>
<p><b>1) That, so far as is possible without compromising other key strategic objectives for the development, the Council affords the greatest possible weight to environmental standards and seeks that this importance is reflected at all stages of the development, including the agreement between partners and in the master developer agreement.</b></p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>The Council will be one of three partners who will be promoting the development of the site and for the development to progress it will need to be commercially viable; as the report sets out, different partners have different objectives, and it will be essential to achieve consensus about the degree to which these are pursued, which may require that a balance be struck between desirable elements and the essential infrastructure required for the site such as schools and road improvements as well as much needed affordable housing. It is also worth pointing out that South Oxfordshire District Council, as the planning authority, may also have requirements that the scheme and the partners will need to meet. But, as set out in the answer to recommendation 2 below, pursuing the highest possible environmental standards while being conscious of these constraints is the best way to mitigate against both the risks of changes to environmental standards and more importantly, against the risks of climate change itself.</p>

<p><b>2) That the Council recognises the risk of national or local energy efficiency building standards rising over the course of the development, determines a risk-adjusted baseline for energy efficiency standard for buildings on the development, and seeks to encourage partners of the business case for adopting a standard beyond current South Oxfordshire District Council Local Plan standards.</b></p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>The detailed analysis of the scheme does currently include in the risk assessment the likelihood that nationally or locally set environmental standards will change, and that the timetable for any such changes is currently uncertain. The partners are aware that South Oxfordshire District Council has started worked on a new Local Plan, and has made clear its aspirations to set the highest possible environmental standards in that Plan. At this early stage of course it is not certain what those standards will be and when any new Local Plan might be adopted. Nonetheless it is the Council's view as a partner in the project that the best way to mitigate this risk is pursue standards that are not just beyond those in the Building Regulations, but more importantly beyond the more rigorous standards that are a requirement of the current South Oxfordshire Local Plan.</p>
<p><b>3) That the Council works with partners to seek to optimise social value generation throughout all the stages of the project.</b></p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>While pursuing additional measures that impact on costs and thus viability is subject to agreement and compromise between the partners, the pursuit of social value through the development is something that adds value rather than cost, and is something therefore that the Council will promote to its partners and in particular through the appointment of the Master Developer. This is a very significant development, with great opportunities for new jobs, training and skills for local people, and the City Council would like to see this sort of social value reflected not just in the outcome of the development, but as part of the criteria against which the appointment of the Master Developer is measured.</p>
<p><b>4) That the Council includes the Cabinet members for Planning and Housing Delivery and Finance and Asset Management as consultees to the delegations referred to in recommendations 1 – 3 the Cabinet</b></p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>Consultation with both Cabinet members will be added to the delegation recommendations in the report; this was a drafting error in the report, and Scrutiny are thanked for spotting it.</p>

report		
--------	--	--

### Housing Performance Q1

<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Agree?</i>	<i>Comment</i>
<p><b>1) That the Council, as Covid restrictions ease, increases the breadth and depth of its engagement with the Lived Experience Advisory Forum and other similar groups in shaping Council homelessness services.</b></p>	Yes	<p>Working with LEAF and others with lived experience to inform and help shape homelessness services is vitally important. The pandemic has made engagement more difficult, but has continued over the past year including: informing the specification for the new countywide rough sleeping and single homelessness service and Housing First support service, contributing to the developing Housing and Homelessness Strategy, and working with LEAF and King’s College London to put together a team of peer assessors to conduct the qualitative evaluation of the Step-down housing service which is part of the Out of Hospital project.</p> <p>We are committed to continue to build on this engagement, including involving LEAF in the next stages of the development of the new Housing and Homelessness Strategy, and they will be a key component of the new countywide service with representation in the governance arrangements, and a partner in ensuring the voice of service users are heard in the ongoing monitoring and development of the services.</p>



**November Cabinet**

**Anti-Social Behaviour**

<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Agree?</i>	<i>Comment</i>
<p>1) That the Council amends the Anti-Social Behaviour Policy 2022-25 as follows:</p> <p>i) Principle three to read “Anti-social behaviour will be addressed firmly, fairly, proportionately and holistically”</p> <p>ii) That reference throughout the document to ‘customers’ is reworded around ‘citizens’</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>2) That the Council amends its Anti-Social Behaviour Procedure 2022-25 as follows:</p> <p>i) to include a paragraph on the diversionary activities the Council itself provides or in partnership to prevent anti-social behaviour</p> <p>ii) to address issues around invasive evidence gathering, and link to best practice guidance</p> <p>iii) to note negative impacts associated with anti-social behaviour-related evictions, and reference the Council’s commitment to using this power as a last resort</p> <p>iv) to alter s. 7.4 so it reads “All complex cases that involve homeless or vulnerably housed people”</p> <p>v) to reference the Council’s commitment to removing racist graffiti within 24 hours</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	

--	--	--

### Discretionary Housing Payment Policy

<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Agree?</i>	<i>Comment</i>
1) That the Council includes a line within the HRA section of its proposed 2022/23 budget for DHP expenditure beyond the government grant.	Yes	There is a relevant budget line within the proposed HRA budget.

### East Oxford Community Centre

<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Agree?</i>	<i>Comment</i>
1) That the Council sets down plans for measuring and assessing the effectiveness of carbon-saving measures delivered on the East Oxford Community Centre development, and their cost efficiency in reducing carbon emissions.	Yes	
2) That the Council, where possible, recycles materials recovered from the demolition of the East Oxford Community Centre site, particularly steel and wood.	Partially	We would recommend an action for us to develop a waste and recycling plan for demolition and look to recycle in line with this. However we also need to be careful to balance this recognising how recyclable some materials are and that we need to avoid high costs that are unaffordable within the approved budget
3) That the Council implements within three years of the new community centre being opened the preferred option for its management and	Yes	

operation		
4) That the Council includes within the risk register for this project those external risks to land values referenced in paragraph 52 of the Cabinet report	Yes	

### EV Strategy

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Agree?</b>	<b>Comment</b>
1) <b><i>That the Council amends paragraph 16 of the report to remove reference to the Council already being committed to Connecting Oxford, and states instead that the council has agreed to further scheme and business case development.</i></b>	No	This Council supports the introduction of Connecting Oxford and on 9 September 2020, Scrutiny requested: <i>That the Council continues to employ its best endeavours in working with its partners to realise the plans for the Zero Emissions Zone and Connecting Oxford.</i>
2) <b><i>That the Council, in its planning for the adequacy of future EV charging infrastructure, ensures that the incentivising impact of other policies on demand for electric vehicles, such as the ZEZ, is taken into account</i></b>	Yes	The EV Strategy and Implementation Plan is being commissioned to help inform the Council on how rising demand for EV charging in Oxford could best cover the years up to 2030 by which point, Oxfordshire County Council's modelling suggests the clear majority of private vehicles in the city will be EV. Demand for EVs is being driven by a variety of factors including an increased focus by vehicle manufacturers, technology improvement, environmental awareness, and the looming deadline of 2030 after which no new petrol or diesel cars can be sold in the UK. Locally, the ZEZ may also be a factor, and this will be taken into account in the EV Strategy.

<p><b>3) That the Council investigates the practicability of not partnering with or commissioning organisations relating to the EV strategy in which it would be unable to invest because of its ethical investment policy</b></p>	<p>No</p>	<p>4a) Electric vehicle charging is a rapidly growing market with different operators including both relatively small businesses and global corporations. The purpose of the EV strategy is to enable Oxford City Council to do more itself, in particular in the areas of the city which would typically be last in the queue to receive charging infrastructure—ours is an approach grounded in fairness and social justice.</p> <p>We also believe that engagement is key to shape partners' approaches because dialogue and the airing of differences can get us to a better place. It also ensures that citizens and communities do not lose out on the EV infrastructure that they are requesting in order to be part of a greener and fairer future. We all believe as local councillors that the City Council to which we are elected has an important voice to raise and we will continue to raise it to advance our values.</p>
<p><b>3b) That the Council amends its ethical investment policy to make explicit reference to exploitative mining practices and arms trading as proscribed activities.</b></p>	<p>No</p>	<p>4b) This is not linked to the commissioning of an EV Strategy.</p>