

Supplement for

Cabinet

On **Wednesday 12 July 2023** At **6.00 pm**

Agenda Item 7 - Scrutiny Reports

Contents

7. **Scrutiny reports**

3 - 44

The Climate & Environment Panel met on 27 June, Scrutiny Committee will meet on 4 July, and the Housing & Homelessness Panel will meet on 5 July 2023. The following reports are expected and will be published as a supplement, together with any other recommendations from those meetings:

- Draft Carbon Reduction and Sustainable Retrofit Guidance for Historic Buildings Technical Advice Note
- Biodiversity Update
- Safeguarding Report 2022/23 and Safeguarding Policy 2023-26
- Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Partnership Charter / Pledge
- Citizen Experience Strategy
- Future Resettlement Commitments for New Refugee Families
- Tenant Satisfaction (STAR) Survey

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: Cabinet
Date: 12 July 2023
Report of: Climate and Environment Panel
Title of Report: DRAFT Carbon Reduction and Sustainable Retrofit Guidance for Historic Buildings Technical Advice Note

Summary and recommendations	
Purpose of report:	To present Panel of the Scrutiny Committee recommendations for Cabinet consideration and decision
Key decision:	No
Scrutiny Lead Member:	Cllr Alex Hollingsworth, Panel Chair
Cabinet Member:	Cllr Louise Upton, Cabinet Member for Planning and Healthier Communities; Cllr Anna Railton, Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford and Climate Justice
Corporate Priority:	Pursue a Zero Carbon Oxford
Policy Framework:	Council Strategy 2020-24
Recommendation: That the Cabinet states whether it agrees or disagrees with the recommendations in the body of this report.	

Appendices	
Appendix A	Draft Cabinet response to recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee

Introduction and overview

1. The Climate and Environment Panel met on 27 June 2023 to consider the DRAFT Carbon Reduction and Sustainable Retrofit Guidance for Historic Buildings Technical Advice Note (TAN) and the customer experience for householders and other applicants seeking planning permission from the Council for carbon retrofit measures in historic buildings or in the city's conservation areas. The TAN sought to act as one of a number of tools to support applicants who were considering retrofitting their heritage or conservation area property. It was recommended that the Panel consider the TAN and agree any recommendations.

2. The Panel would like to thank Councillor Louise Upton (Cabinet Member for Planning and Healthier Communities), Councillor Anna Railton (Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford and Climate Justice), Mish Tullar (Head of Corporate Strategy), David Butler (Head of Planning Services), Rachel Williams (Planning Policy and Place Manager), Mai Jarvis (Environmental Sustainability Lead), Rose Dickinson (Carbon Reduction Team Manager) and Daniel Young (Principal Planner) for attending the meeting to answer questions.

Summary and recommendations

3. Councillor Louise Upton, Cabinet Member for Planning and Healthier Communities introduced the TAN. She welcomed the opportunity for Scrutiny to have useful input into the TAN and set the context that it was being presented at the time that the new Local Plan 2040 was being developed. The TAN was intended to act as a helpful guide for residents who were thinking about retrofitting their home and was not meant to be exhaustive. The intention was for the TAN to be published as soon as possible.
4. Daniel Young, Principal Planner added that the current Local Plan 2036 set out the Council's specific policies which would be supported by the TAN, in that it would assist residents in interpreting relevant policies. The aim of publishing the TAN imminently was to enable it to act as a 'bridging document' ahead of the Local Plan 2040 being approved and published; the TAN would subsequently be updated once the Local Plan 2040 was developed. A key aim in updating the TAN from the previous version was to make it shorter and clearer, ensure alignment with the Council's net zero ambitions and help give applicants the best chance of their retrofit application being successful.
5. The Panel agreed that its scope for input to the TAN did not include veering into detailed technical discussion and asked a range of questions, including questions relating to the TAN's scope, accessibility, case studies, best practice, customer experience and whether the Council could go further in supporting retrofit applications.
6. During discussion about accessibility, the Panel felt that the TAN included a lot of technical jargon and the document itself was quite densely worded. The Panel suggested that the TAN's accessibility and usability would be enhanced if these issues were addressed.

Recommendation 1: That the Council reviews the language used in the TAN to ensure it is accessible to residents and incorporates a glossary to explain technical terms.

Recommendation 2: That the Council includes more examples of successful domestic scale retrofit projects, including for non-listed buildings in conservation areas, as well as in listed buildings.

7. The Panel considered customer experience and questioned the assumptions that had been made around that during the development of the TAN. The TAN had been developed as a mechanism for helping the customer experience, but was only one of a number of tools for doing so. It was accepted that the customer experience in relation to retrofit could be difficult and complex; the

Council could assist in demystifying the process to a point, but there were constraints on the process set by the National Planning Policy Framework that the Council had no control or discretion over.

8. The Panel was advised that the plan was to publish the TAN as soon as possible, as that would allow an understanding to be built around whether or not the document was working for applicants. The Panel queried whether a more appropriate approach might be to engage with individuals and organisations who were currently going through the process and using their feedback to inform the TAN before publication. Officers advised that this had been done to an extent through sharing the TAN with the Zero Carbon Oxford Partnership (ZCOP) and analysis of behavioural insights taken from the Council's website. In addition, the Environmental Sustainability Team held regular discussions with partners in relation to customer experience. There was an urgency in publishing the TAN to offer some guidance and support as the level of demand for retrofit in Oxford was high and increasing.

Recommendation 3: That the Council challenges its existing assumptions around customer experience in relation to retrofit applications and seeks to engage with organisations and individuals who have gone or are currently going through the retrofit process to understand their experiences and feed those into the TAN and the broader planning process to improve usability and overall customer experience.

9. The Panel had a broader discussion around whether the Council was going far enough to support retrofit applications when considering what other local authorities, such as the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, were doing in this space. Consideration was given to the tools available to the Council which could be used to demonstrate its commitment to realising the benefits of and supporting retrofit across the City. The Panel was of the view that the Council needed clearer messaging to applicants that it wishes to actively support them in navigating the retrofit process.

Recommendation 4: That the Council reviews its existing Article 4 Directions to see whether they create unnecessary obstacles to applicants wanting to install carbon retrofit measures.

Recommendation 5: That the Council, looking at the approach taken by the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, considers using Local Development Orders to make clear that certain low carbon approaches will be approved by the Council.

10. The Panel was concerned that the language of the draft TAN, and the broader approach that lay behind it, did not strike the right balance between the desire to follow the planning process on the one hand and the need for applicants to have greater certainty about what the Council would and would not allow on the other. It was not sufficiently clear to would-be applicants that the Council would support them through the retrofit process⁵ nor was there sufficient clarity about which

measures would be acceptable. The Panel was of the view that householders and applicants would welcome much greater clarity about what measures and approaches would be appropriate in different conservation areas, given that different heritage aspects are important to the designation of different conservation areas.

11. The Panel contrasted the approach and language of the draft TAN with similar guidance for carbon retrofit measures in conservation areas published by Bath and North East Somerset Council, which the Panel felt made clear both that carbon retrofit measures would be encouraged and also gave applicants and householders clear and easy to follow advice on what measures would and would not be acceptable. The Panel felt that the approach taken by Bath and North East Somerset was one that Oxford City Council should follow, in content and in particular in tone and language.

Recommendation 6: That the Council makes it clear in the TAN and broader messaging that it supports retrofit applications in heritage and conservation areas and will actively support applicants to go through that process.

Recommendation 7: That the Council takes a much clearer approach to setting out for householders and applicants what its response will be to proposals for specific retrofit measures, being clear about how that might vary from conservation area to conservation area.

Report author	Alice Courtney
Job title	Scrutiny Officer
Service area or department	Law and Governance
Telephone	01865 529834
e-mail	acourtney@oxford.gov.uk

Appendix A

Draft Cabinet response to recommendations of the Climate and Environment Panel of the Scrutiny Committee

The document sets out the draft response of the Cabinet Member to recommendations made by the Climate and Environment Panel on 27 June 2023 concerning the DRAFT Carbon Reduction and Sustainable Retrofit Guidance for Historic Buildings Technical Advice Note (TAN). The Cabinet is asked to amend and agree a formal response as appropriate.

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
1) That the Council reviews the language used in the TAN to ensure it is accessible to residents and incorporates a glossary to explain technical terms.	Yes	<p>The policy team will review the wording in the TAN and implement a simple glossary in line with the recommendations. The topic of retrofitting heritage assets in itself can be very technical, as is the legislation and guidance within national policy, not only because of the fast evolving nature of retro-fit technologies and practices but also because of the additional sensitivities that come with redevelopment associated with our most special heritage assets. As such, it will invariably require some level of technical expertise to fully address certain elements when it comes to this type of development.</p> <p>Whilst we have made every effort to explain the terminology and concepts in plain English within the text, we would agree that a glossary could be a helpful addition and are happy to add this in. The objective of the guidance in the TAN is to convey simple advice to assist applicants in approaching the design of retrofit projects for historic buildings so that their application has the best chances of</p>

		success and we want to ensure that this is as effective as possible.
2) That the Council includes more examples of successful domestic scale retrofit projects, including for non-listed buildings in conservation areas, as well as in listed buildings.	Yes	<p>The original intention of this updated TAN was to be published as an interim measure that could help address a gap in guidance on our website and to better align this with the city's net zero objectives. The TAN currently references a variety of best practice guidance in the appendix to provide further information and flags that this would then be supported by additional guidance including specific case studies from the city that could help illustrate best practice in an Oxford context.</p> <p>In order to not unnecessarily delay the publishing of the helpful information within the TAN we propose to progress with the examples in the draft, and update the document in the future with useful and illustrative case studies, noting that the range of different sensitivities within the city will mean that they will only be able to indicate possible solutions rather than provide a blue print for other applicants.</p>
3) That the Council challenges its existing assumptions around customer experience in relation to retrofit applications and seeks to engage with organisations and individuals who have gone or are currently going through the retrofit process to understand their experiences and feed those into the TAN and the broader planning process to improve usability and overall customer experience.	Yes	The policy team and planning services more widely will continue to do its part in critically assessing its own performance and interactions with our broad customer base. Where there is scope to improve our services and the support we can provide, we will endeavour to incorporate this into our work. This may include future updates to the TAN as well as our wider resources and processes where appropriate.

4) That the Council reviews its existing Article 4 Directions to see whether they create unnecessary obstacles to applicants wanting to install carbon retrofit measures.	No	Whilst it is accepted that the Article 4 Directions were set up at a time predating the current net zero objectives in the city, a review of these is an extensive piece of work which will need to be considered in the longer term alongside other commitments, such as the extensive work related to the production of the 2040 Local Plan. Such commitment is beyond the scope of this TAN.
5) That the Council, looking at the approach taken by the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, considers using Local Development Orders to make clear that certain low carbon approaches will be approved by the Council.	No	We are aware of the approach undertaken by the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and will consider the pros and cons of this and other approaches in liaison with key stakeholders such as heritage colleagues and Historic England in due course. The current priority is the new Local Plan and we have set out our intention to try to go further than current policy as part of our preferred options consultation, though the final approach is still under consideration and will need to align with national policy to be found sound by the inspector and pass examination.
6) That the Council makes it clear in the TAN and broader messaging that it supports retrofit applications in heritage and conservation areas and will actively support applicants to go through that process.	Yes	<p>The genesis of this TAN was to more clearly support applicants in making the right choices when it comes to retrofitting their properties. The review agreed to in Recommendation 1 will help to amplify this. It is important to note that Technical Advice Notes have no statutory powers unlike the Local Plan. The role of these documents is only to provide additional guidance that supports interpretation of existing policies in the Local Plan - they are unable to go as far as establishing new policy for the city which is not in the Local Plan 2036.</p> <p>Ensuring we get the right balance between what can be set out in the TAN at present, what can help us move towards net zero objectives and support applicants, as well as what is required of us more broadly under national policy</p>

		<p>(including our statutory duty for conserving our important heritage assets as much as securing reductions in carbon dioxide emissions) is a challenging issue we have sought to address.</p> <p>The planning service provides a channel for actively supporting applicants as part of its pre-application service and through this service they are able to benefit from the advice of planning officers but also colleagues in the heritage team – we flag this clearly in the TAN in a couple of places as well as on our website.</p>
7) That the Council takes a much clearer approach to setting out for householders and applicants what its response will be to proposals for specific retrofit measures, being clear about how that might vary from conservation area to conservation area.	Yes	<p>The policy team will explore how we can be clearer in the guidance set out in the TAN, however there are limits to how simplified any high-level guidance such as the TAN can provide, especially in a city that has such a rich and varied historical context.</p>

To: Cabinet

Date: 12 July 2023

Report of: Climate and Environment Panel

Title of Report: Biodiversity Update

Summary and recommendations	
Purpose of report:	To present Panel of the Scrutiny Committee recommendations for Cabinet consideration and decision
Key decision:	No
Scrutiny Lead Member:	Cllr Alex Hollingsworth, Panel Chair
Cabinet Member:	Cllr Anna Railton, Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford and Climate Justice
Corporate Priority:	Pursue a Zero Carbon Oxford
Policy Framework:	Council Strategy 2020-24
Recommendation: That the Cabinet states whether it agrees or disagrees with the recommendations in the body of this report.	

Appendices	
Appendix A	Draft Cabinet response to recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee

Introduction and overview

1. The Climate and Environment Panel met on 27 June 2023 to consider a Biodiversity Update presentation. It was recommended that the Panel receive a presentation followed by an opportunity for discussion; and agree any recommendations.
2. The Panel would like to thank Councillor Anna Railton (Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford and Climate Justice), Mish Tullar (Head of Corporate Strategy), Mai Jarvis (Environmental Sustainability Lead), Rose Dickinson (Carbon Reduction Team Manager), Tristan Carlyle (Ecology and Biodiversity Officer) and Matt Whitney (Local Nature Partnership Manager) for attending the meeting to present and answer questions.

Summary and recommendations

3. Tristan Carlyle, Ecology and Biodiversity Officer delivered a presentation and highlighted that the narrative around the Council's thinking on biodiversity was unchanged, but the legislative framework was changing and so the Council was required to review resourcing and how it did things. The presentation spanned a number of key areas, including Biodiversity Net Gain requirements and implementation; the Environment Act 2021 and the enhanced biodiversity duty placed on local authorities; the Nature, Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006; additional reporting requirements; the Local Nature Recovery Strategy; and the Biodiversity Strategy.
4. Matt Whitney, Local Nature Partnership Manager delivered a presentation giving an overview of the Local Nature Partnership (LNP), progress to date and how the LNP interacts with the wider local strategic landscape.
5. The Panel asked a range of questions, including questions relating to the enhanced biodiversity duty; identifying and measuring the efficacy of past actions to improve biodiversity; how the Council might seek to influence businesses and other partners in terms of their biodiversity commitment; how the Council might seek to influence biodiversity commitment in its role of landlord; best practice; and whether there was scope for the Council to be doing more in the biodiversity sphere.
6. In particular, the Panel considered the biodiversity baseline assessment that the Council was required to complete and the need to ensure that the 'Council as landlord' function was included in that process, both in terms of a residential and institutional (e.g. business and agriculture) landlord.

Recommendation 1: That the Council ensures the inclusion of its function as both a residential and institutional landlord within the biodiversity baseline assessment exercise.

7. The Panel discussed the Council's ability to influence other partners and local stakeholders in their commitment to biodiversity and considered that there were opportunities for the Council to collaborate and exchange knowledge with others across the City, including the NHS, universities and colleges, to mutual benefit. The Panel was of the view that these opportunities should be pursued and exploited in the interests of promoting biodiversity citywide.

Recommendation 2: That the Council seeks to collaborate and exchange knowledge with other local landowners and institutions in the interests of promoting biodiversity citywide.

8. The Panel noted that the most direct opportunity the Council currently had around specifically engaging with businesses on biodiversity was through the Zero Carbon Oxford Partnership (ZCOP), however there was not a dedicated biodiversity workstream. While the Council was not in a position to decide to establish new ZCOP workstreams, as agreement from ZCOP members was required, the Panel considered that it would be appropriate for the Council to

suggest that a biodiversity workstream be added to ZCOP's existing workstreams.

Recommendation 3: That the Council suggests a dedicated biodiversity workstream be added to the Zero Carbon Oxford Partnership's existing workstreams.

9. On the question relating to whether the Council could be doing more in the biodiversity sphere, the Panel agreed that the Council should ensure continual horizon scanning to ensure awareness of emerging and cutting-edge biodiversity best practice in other local authorities which could be implemented locally.

Recommendation 4: That the Council continues to seek out emerging biodiversity best practice in other local authorities.

Report author	Alice Courtney
Job title	Scrutiny Officer
Service area or department	Law and Governance
Telephone	01865 529834
e-mail	acourtney@oxford.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix A

Draft Cabinet response to recommendations of the Climate and Environment Panel of the Scrutiny Committee

The document sets out the draft response of the Cabinet Member to recommendations made by the Climate and Environment Panel on 27 June 2023 concerning the Biodiversity Update presentation delivered at the meeting. The Cabinet is asked to amend and agree a formal response as appropriate.

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
1) That the Council ensures the inclusion of its function as both a residential and institutional landlord within the biodiversity baseline assessment exercise.	Yes	It is vital that when considering the Council's duty to conserve and enhance biodiversity that its function as a landowner forms part of that consideration. This must extend to all property owned; while it may be easier to consider in relation to large plots of green space or agricultural land, biodiversity should be considered in all contexts.
2) That the Council seeks to collaborate and exchange knowledge with other local landowners and institutions in the interests of promoting biodiversity citywide.	Yes	The Biodiversity Strategy will be a key vehicle for knowledge exchange, both the production of the document - which will require extensive engagement - and also likely its implementation.
3) That the Council suggests a dedicated biodiversity workstream be added to the Zero Carbon Oxford Partnership's existing workstreams.	Yes	N/A
4) That the Council continues to seek out emerging biodiversity best practice in other local authorities.	Yes	All councils are experiencing the same shifts in how to consider biodiversity, deriving from new responsibility relating to biodiversity net gain, an enhanced biodiversity duty, and new reporting requirements. Sharing and

		understanding best practice will be important to maximising the most of limited ecological resources at all Councils.
--	--	---

To: Cabinet
Date: 12 July 2023
Report of: Scrutiny Committee
Title of Report: Oxford City Council Safeguarding Report 2022/23 and Safeguarding Policy 2023-26

Summary and recommendations	
Purpose of report:	To present Scrutiny Committee recommendations for Cabinet consideration and decision
Key decision:	No
Scrutiny Lead Member:	Councillor Lucy Pegg, Scrutiny Committee Chair
Cabinet Member:	Councillor Shaista Aziz, Cabinet Member for Safer Communities
Corporate Priority:	Support Thriving Communities
Policy Framework:	Council Strategy 2020-24
Recommendation: That the Cabinet states whether it agrees or disagrees with the recommendations in the body of this report.	

Appendices	
Appendix A	Draft Cabinet response to recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee

Introduction and overview

1. The Scrutiny Committee met on 04 July 2023 to consider a report concerning the Oxford City Council Safeguarding Report 2022/23 and Safeguarding Policy 2023-26. The report, which is due for Cabinet consideration on 12 July 2023, recommends that Cabinet notes the key achievements of the safeguarding work delivered through Oxford City Council during 2022/23; approves the Safeguarding Policy 2023-26; notes the Safeguarding Action Plan 2023-24; and delegates authority to the Executive Director (Communities and People), in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Safer Communities, to make minor changes to the policy in order to continue its alignment with the Oxfordshire Multi-Agency Safeguarding Arrangements.
2. The Committee would like to thank Councillor Aziz (Cabinet Member for Safer Communities), Peter Matthew (Interim Executive Director (Communities and

People)), Ian Wright (Head of Regulatory Services and Community Safety), Richard Adams (Community Safety Manager) and Laura Jones (Safeguarding Coordinator) for attending the meeting to answer questions.

Summary and recommendations

3. Councillor Shaista Aziz, Cabinet Member for Safer Communities introduced the report. The Safeguarding Annual Report 2022/23 set out how Oxford City Council fulfils its statutory safeguarding duties by outlining the multi-agency safeguarding arrangements in Oxfordshire; sharing the results of the safeguarding self-assessment audit 2022; highlighting the key achievements and progress made in relation to the safeguarding work delivered by Oxford City Council; and updating the Council's Action Plan through the identification of areas to strengthen in 2022/23. The report also set out the Council's proposed Safeguarding Policy 2023-26. There were no real shifts in terms of report contents compared with previous years, with the exception that some of the processes and accountability had changed as highlighted in the report.
4. The Committee asked a range of questions, including questions relating to the alignment of the safeguarding policy with other policies (e.g. whistleblowing policy); the time commitment required by, and support given to, Safeguarding Champions; the content of safeguarding awareness briefings; safeguarding responsibility for specific groups of potentially vulnerable people; staffing and retention within the Council's safeguarding function; how the Council works with voluntary and community groups around safeguarding; the accessibility of the policy; adult exploitation; and the Domestic Abuse Housing Alliance (DAHA) Accreditation.
5. In particular, the Committee discussed the 60 cases of adult exploitation since the data was recorded centrally referenced in the report and asked for more detail on the situations and assistance provided, as this was useful context. The Committee noted responses to questions that it was very difficult to understand how Oxford compared to other areas, given that adult exploitation was often a 'hidden harm' and it was known that cases were under-reported. However, the Committee agreed that there was data available from other areas and the national picture, even if the issue of adult exploitation was under-reported, and it would be useful to contextualise the section on adult exploitation with more information so that the numbers included in the report told a story, as numbers on their own, without any context, were not useful.

Recommendation 1: That the Council adds context to the section on adult exploitation to give a flavour of the situations and responses; and uses available local, regional and national data to frame the figures so that they tell a story.

6. During further discussion on adult exploitation, the Committee explored whether the Council held any longitudinal information on whether there were any 'repeat victims', which may assist the Council in understanding whether support provided to adults in an exploitative situation positively changed the course of their lives. The Committee noted that the majority of cases were quite recent which limited the ability to undertake a longitudinal study and that victims and survivors tended to move across the country, so it might prove difficult to obtain that sort of data.

However, the Committee agreed that formal data from a longitudinal study would be useful in the future.

Recommendation 2: That the Council undertakes a longitudinal study of victims and survivors of adult exploitation to gain an understanding of the impact that support has in positively changing the course of lives, which is grounded in data.

7. The Committee questioned the Council's processes around working with the voluntary sector and community groups to ensure they have adequate safeguarding policies in place and whether the Council offered any safeguarding training or support to the sector. Through the procurement process, the Council currently asked organisations it bought goods or services from whether they had a safeguarding policy in place; however the challenge was around the Council's ability to check the policy was fit for purpose and take partial responsibility for safeguarding within organisations it funded. When commissioning more specific services, such as youth services, the Council was careful and ensured an adequate safeguarding policy and training, due to the nature of the service and more vulnerable service-users. The Committee noted that this was an area of work which was being actively looked into.

Recommendation 3: That the Council actively works with the voluntary sector and community groups to ensure they have adequate safeguarding policies in place and have access to suitable safeguarding training and support.

8. In discussion around changes to safeguarding procedures, the Committee noted that safeguarding training was provided to Members and Council staff and that attendees were required to complete an evaluation after the session, which was checked and responded to as necessary by the Safeguarding Coordinator. The annual safeguarding questionnaire was also used as a basis to inform training. However, the Committee noted that the safeguarding awareness briefing was not necessarily updated every time the safeguarding procedure changed, which it agreed could lead to a gap in staff knowledge.

Recommendation 4: That the Council clarifies its procedure for reporting back to staff on changes to safeguarding procedures to ensure organisational awareness.

Report author	Alice Courtney
Job title	Scrutiny Officer
Service area or department	Law and Governance
Telephone	01865 529834
e-mail	acourtney@oxford.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix A

Draft Cabinet response to recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee

The document sets out the draft response of the Cabinet Member to recommendations made by the Scrutiny Committee on 04 July 2023 concerning the Oxford City Council Safeguarding Report 2022/23 and Safeguarding Policy 2023-26. The Cabinet is asked to amend and agree a formal response as appropriate.

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment																		
1) That the Council adds context to the section on adult exploitation to give a flavour of the situations and responses; and uses available local, regional and national data to frame the figures so that they tell a story.	Yes	<p>Reporting Period Jan 2022 – Mar 2023</p> <p>Source of Data</p> <p>Local and county data – recorded by Anti-Slavery Coordinator Oxfordshire Regional data – quarterly infographics reported by Modern Slavery coordinator, Thames Valley Police National data – annual report published by Single Competent Authority (Home Office) of NRM and Duty to Notify referrals.</p> <p>Please note: TVP regional data and NRM national data is only up until end of 2022 – have not received TVP Q4 infographics and NRM data only published annually.</p> <p>Total number of adult cases:</p> <table><tr><th><u>Oxford City (Local)</u></th><th><u>Oxfordshire (County)</u></th><th><u>Thames Valley (Regional)</u></th><th><u>NRM Data (National)</u></th></tr><tr><td>78</td><td>134</td><td>356</td><td>8854</td></tr></table> <p>Total each quarter:</p> <table><tr><th><u>Quarter</u></th><th><u>Oxford City</u></th><th><u>Oxfordshire</u></th><th><u>Thames Valley</u></th><th><u>National</u></th></tr><tr><td>Q4 Jan 22 – Mar</td><td>17</td><td>34</td><td>111</td><td>2052</td></tr></table>	<u>Oxford City (Local)</u>	<u>Oxfordshire (County)</u>	<u>Thames Valley (Regional)</u>	<u>NRM Data (National)</u>	78	134	356	8854	<u>Quarter</u>	<u>Oxford City</u>	<u>Oxfordshire</u>	<u>Thames Valley</u>	<u>National</u>	Q4 Jan 22 – Mar	17	34	111	2052
<u>Oxford City (Local)</u>	<u>Oxfordshire (County)</u>	<u>Thames Valley (Regional)</u>	<u>NRM Data (National)</u>																	
78	134	356	8854																	
<u>Quarter</u>	<u>Oxford City</u>	<u>Oxfordshire</u>	<u>Thames Valley</u>	<u>National</u>																
Q4 Jan 22 – Mar	17	34	111	2052																

22					
Q1 Apr 22 – June 22	9	20	84	2264	
Q2 Jul 22 – Sept 22	12	20	75	2302	
Q3 Oct 22 – Dec 22	22	28	86	2236	
Q4 Jan 23 – Mar 23	18	32	-	-	

Types of Exploitation:

<u>Exploitation Type</u>	<u>Oxford City</u>	<u>Oxfordshire</u>	<u>National</u>
Criminal Exploitation	23	50	1384
Domestic Servitude	3	8	137
Financial Exploitation	1	1	0
Labour Exploitation	18	37	4570
Sexual Exploitation	32	36	1128
Unknown	1	2	708
Organ Harvesting	0	0	2

Please note: Thames Valley data not included as exploitation type provided is total number (both adults and children)

- Out of the 78 cases reported 60 were individual, 7 were businesses and 11 premises.
- 56 are no longer being exploited - 29 who were already receiving support through NRM and 31 following multi-agency partnership working to safeguard victims and disrupt exploiter activity.
- Disruption outcomes have included closure orders on premises (brothels), financial penalties incurred through other partners such as immigration, HMRC and council teams, police investigations and action and Gangmasters Labour Abuse Authority taking action where labour exploitation is occurring.

2) That the Council undertakes a longitudinal study of victims and survivors of adult exploitation to gain an understanding of the impact that support has in positively changing the course of lives, which is grounded in data.	Yes	The Council will monitor case outcomes over time to assess the impact of support to victims of modern slavery reported to the Council. This will form part of the Anti-Slavery Coordinator's work plan.
3) That the Council actively works with the voluntary sector and community groups to ensure they have adequate safeguarding policies in place and have access to suitable safeguarding training and support.	No	<p><u>Organisations receiving funding from the Council will be required to have a safeguarding policy that aligns to the Oxfordshire Multi-Agency Safeguarding Arrangements.</u></p> <p><u>Responsibility for the production, implementation and adherence to the policy is the responsibility of the organisation itself.</u></p> <p>Safeguarding Policy has been updated to state:</p> <p><i>12.2 The Council will review the safeguarding policies of commissioned and grant funded services on application to the Council to check they comply with the standards set by Oxfordshire Safeguarding Children Board and Oxfordshire Safeguarding Adults Board. The Safeguarding Coordinator obtains annual Commissioned Services Safeguarding Self Assessments from each service.</i></p>
4) That the Council clarifies its procedure for reporting back to staff on changes to safeguarding procedures to ensure organisational awareness.	Yes	<p>The safeguarding awareness briefing is updated quarterly in line with local and national procedures. Upon amending internal policy and procedures, changes are communicated to staff using the following methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly safeguarding newsletter (next due at the end of July) • Weekly Connected Council newsletter • Intranet news story release • Safeguarding awareness briefing update • Communication with HR colleagues to update induction packs with updated policy and procedures • Replacement of existing policy and procedures on external and internal web pages • Dissemination to teams via Safeguarding Champion network <p>Training section of the Safeguarding Policy has been updated to state:</p> <p><i>8.7 Procedural changes will be communicated to staff through updates to the</i></p>

		<i>internal safeguarding awareness briefing and internal communications platforms.</i>
--	--	--

To: Cabinet
Date: 12 July 2023
Report of: Scrutiny Committee
Title of Report: Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Partnership (OIEP) Charter/Pledge

Summary and recommendations	
Purpose of report:	To present Scrutiny Committee recommendations for Cabinet consideration and decision
Key decision:	No
Scrutiny Lead Member:	Councillor Lucy Pegg, Scrutiny Committee Chair
Cabinet Member:	Councillor Susan Brown, Cabinet Member for Inclusive Economy and Partnerships
Corporate Priority:	Enable an Inclusive Economy
Policy Framework:	Council Strategy 2020-24
Recommendation: That the Cabinet states whether it agrees or disagrees with the recommendations in the body of this report.	

Appendices	
Appendix A	Draft Cabinet response to recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee

Introduction and overview

1. The Scrutiny Committee met on 04 July 2023 to consider a report concerning the Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Partnership (OIEP) Charter/Pledge. The report, which is due for Cabinet consideration on 12 July 2023, recommends that Cabinet approves Oxford City Council's participation in the OIEP Charter and endorses a series of Oxford City Council pledges that officers in respective service areas will deliver against, within existing budget and for the duration of the current Medium Term Financial Strategy. Oxford City Council progress/performance against the pledges will be reported against annually and the results shared on Oxford City Council's website.
2. The Committee would like to thank Clayton Lavallin (Economic Development Team Leader) and Emma Coles (Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Partnership Manager) for attending the meeting to answer questions.

Summary and recommendations

3. Clayton Lavallin, Economic Development Team Leader and Emma Coles, Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Partnership Manager introduced the report. The OIEP was a countywide group which brought together employers, business, education, community groups and local government, including Oxford City Council, in the interests of working towards a more inclusive economy across Oxfordshire.
4. The Committee asked a range of questions, including questions relating to the rationale behind pledge selection; the distribution of proposed Council pledges across the six pledge themes; communications; whether the Council could go further with the pledges; and whether the Council's companies were engaged in the OIEP.
5. During discussion, the Committee noted that the full list of possible pledges was not included within the report and the list did not appear to be easily accessible online. In the interests of transparency and the ability for the Council to be held to account on what it pledged, the Committee agreed that the full list of pledges should be easily and prominently available online.

Recommendation 1: That the Council requests that the Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Partnership ensures the full list of possible pledges is easily and prominently available online.

6. The Committee challenged the rationale for the selection, or non-selection, of pledges. The report highlighted that pledges had been selected from five out of the six pledge themes and the Committee was surprised to see that no pledges had been selected from the 'recruit inclusively' theme, as the Council had previously made a number of commitments in that area. The Committee was also of the view that there were a number of pledges within the other themes that the Council could have committed to, but for one reason or another had not. There was no clear rationale articulated as to why pledges had or had not been selected within the report, alongside no clear prioritisation criteria, which the Committee agreed was an omission. While the Committee understood that it may not be practical to select all of the pledges, it agreed that the provision of more information as to the decision-making process around pledge selection would be useful.

Recommendation 2: That the Council reviews the full list of possible pledges to see if it could sign-up to additional pledges; including whether the Council could sign-up to any pledges within the 'recruit inclusively' theme.

Recommendation 3: That the Council undertakes a RAG rating audit for the full list of potential pledges outlining what it could do against each one, whether there are any additional budget or resource implications, whether the Council is currently meeting a pledge or if more work needs to be done and then prioritises pledges on the basis of that audit, to provide assurance that the Council is doing as much as possible to ensure an inclusive economy.

7. During further discussion around the rationale for pledge selection, the Committee noted that it was unclear from the report whether pledges were selected because they represented work that the Council was already doing or had done, similar to a checklist; or whether they had been chosen because they represented gaps in the Council's current work, making them more aspirational pledges. It was also unclear on what basis the OIEP required pledge selection to be made, or if there was flexibility for individual organisations to determine their own approach. The Committee agreed that communications around the framing of pledges at the OIEP and Council level needed to be improved so that it was clear whether the pledges were more of a checklist, or an aspirational 'to do' list.

Recommendation 4: That the Council engages with the Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Partnership to understand whether it has a preferred approach for organisations' pledge selection approach, or whether there is flexibility for organisations to determine their own approach; and requests that this be clearly articulated in an appropriate location.

Recommendation 5: That the Council improves its communications on how its pledge commitments are framed to ensure clarity around whether they are a checklist of work already completed or underway, or whether they represent a more aspirational 'to do' list; and clearly articulates this locally.

8. Relating to the pledges around procurement, the Committee identified that unionisation appeared to be a key area which was missing. Procurement was an important tool which could be used to support unionised workplaces, such as through committing to buying only from organisations which have Trade Union Recognition Agreements in place for their workforce. The Committee noted responses from officers that this area was likely not included as it did not feature in any of the initial working group discussions; however the list of pledges was a living document and so this area could be fed back to the working group for consideration.

Recommendation 6: That the Council suggests to the Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Partnership the addition of pledges relating to the inclusion of organisations with Trade Union Recognition Agreements as a preference during procurement exercises.

Report author	Alice Courtney
Job title	Scrutiny Officer
Service area or department	Law and Governance
Telephone	01865 529834
e-mail	acourtney@oxford.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix A

Draft Cabinet response to recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee

The document sets out the draft response of the Cabinet Member to recommendations made by the Scrutiny Committee on 04 July 2023 concerning the Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Partnership (OIEP) Charter/Pledge. The Cabinet is asked to amend and agree a formal response as appropriate.

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment			
1) That the Council requests that the Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Partnership ensures the full list of possible pledges is easily and prominently available online.	Yes	As referenced at the meeting, the OIEP is in the process of setting up its own website – so the link to the pledges will change by September this year; the OIEP currently sits on the Future Oxfordshire Partnership website and has a specific page on the Charter including a link to the pledges: Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Charter - Future Oxfordshire Partnership			
2) That the Council reviews the full list of possible pledges to see if it could sign-up to additional pledges; including whether the Council could sign-up to any pledges within the 'recruit inclusively' theme.	Yes	<p>The Council has signed up to an inclusive recruitment pledge under 'Opportunities to work' group: <u>Opportunities to work</u> - Supporting those furthest from the labour market on their journey towards secure employment</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>As an employer we pledge to improve the diversity of our workforce through more inclusive recruitment practices</i></td><td>Gail Makin, Head of People</td><td>People Strategy</td></tr> </table>	<i>As an employer we pledge to improve the diversity of our workforce through more inclusive recruitment practices</i>	Gail Makin, Head of People	People Strategy
<i>As an employer we pledge to improve the diversity of our workforce through more inclusive recruitment practices</i>	Gail Makin, Head of People	People Strategy			
3) That the Council undertakes a RAG rating audit for the full list of potential pledges outlining what it could do against each one, whether there are any additional budget or resource implications, whether the Council is currently meeting a pledge or if more work needs to be done and then prioritises pledges on the basis of that audit, to provide assurance that the Council is doing as much as possible to ensure an inclusive economy.	Yes	<p>Participation in the Charter requires commitment to select pledges only, organisations are not expected to sign up to all pledges or to be audited on them.</p> <p>Therefore, it is in addition to participation in the Charter/pledges and to respond to Scrutiny Committee's further recommendations that officers will report back to Scrutiny Committee on an annual basis (July 2024 onwards) with an audit of progress against both agreed pledge commitments and the full list of all pledges to identify any further potential areas to sign up to and/or endorse the pledges. A baseline will be compiled in this year (July 2023) against which to measure progress in subsequent years.</p> <p>This audit will provide assurance that the Council is doing as much as</p>			

		possible to ensure an inclusive economy.
4) That the Council engages with the Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Partnership to understand whether it has a preferred approach for organisations' pledge selection approach, or whether there is flexibility for organisations to determine their own approach; and requests that this be clearly articulated in an appropriate location.	Yes	<p>The approach for the Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Charter is designed to be flexible in terms of signing up to pledges, the main aim of the Charter is increased engagement from employers and progress towards a more inclusive economy through meaningful actions as well as the ability to showcase good practice. Organisations are asked to choose a selection of pledges that are most relevant; it could be things they are already doing and will continue to do over the next 12 months or it could be something they are looking to start work on this year.</p> <p>This will be communicated via the new OIEP website (in development) in addition to current information which sits on the Future Oxfordshire Partnership website and has a specific page on the Charter including a link to the pledges: Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Charter - Future Oxfordshire Partnership</p>
5) That the Council improves its communications on how its pledge commitments are framed to ensure clarity around whether they are a checklist of work already completed or underway, or whether they represent a more aspirational 'to do' list; and clearly articulates this locally.	Yes	<p>Officers will work with colleagues in internal communications to feedback detailed and point-by-point responses to staff and union engagement in the Charter and pledges and feedback for each point raised any identified actions resulting from the engagement.</p> <p>A 'You said, we did' approach will frame this checklist and be presented back to staff and unions via the intranet from September 2023.</p>
6) That the Council suggests to the Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Partnership the addition of pledges relating to the inclusion of organisations with Trade Union Recognition Agreements as a preference during procurement exercises.	Yes, subject to OIEP decision	Emma Coles (Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Partnership Manager) will take this back to the Oxfordshire Inclusive Economy Partnership Steering Group for consideration.

To: Cabinet

Date: 12 July 2023

Report of: Scrutiny Committee

Title of Report: Citizen Experience Strategy

Summary and recommendations	
Purpose of report:	To present Scrutiny Committee recommendations for Cabinet consideration and decision
Key decision:	No
Scrutiny Lead Member:	Councillor Lucy Pegg, Scrutiny Committee Chair
Cabinet Member:	Councillor Nigel Chapman, Cabinet Member for Citizen Focused Services and Council Companies
Corporate Priority:	All
Policy Framework:	Council Strategy 2020-24
Recommendation: That the Cabinet states whether it agrees or disagrees with the recommendations in the body of this report.	

Appendices	
Appendix A	Draft Cabinet response to recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee

Introduction and overview

1. The Scrutiny Committee met on 04 July 2023 to consider a report concerning the Citizen Experience Strategy. The report, which is due for Cabinet consideration on 12 July 2023, recommends that Cabinet approves the Citizen Experience Strategy.
2. The Committee would like to thank Councillor Chapman (Cabinet Member for Citizen Focused Services and Council Companies), Helen Bishop (Head of Business Improvement) and Vicki Galvin (Senior Programme Manager for Customer Experience) for attending the meeting to answer questions.

Summary and recommendations

3. Councillor Nigel Chapman, Cabinet Member for Citizen Focused Services and Council Companies introduced the report. The Citizen Experience Strategy outlined

the approach the Council will be taking to provide a positive experience for all of Oxford's citizens in accessing its services and engaging with it as a provider of them. The strategy sought to align all Council services with the approach and embrace other organisations and community groups so that the right support could be provided for anyone living in, working in, or visiting Oxford.

4. The Committee asked a range of questions, including questions relating to consultation methodology; use of language and terminology; customer satisfaction statistics; how the Council works with partners; managing citizen expectations; digital opportunities and digital exclusion; and the Council's direction of travel in terms of diverting contact online rather than face-to-face or via telephone.
5. In particular, the Committee discussed the choice of the word 'citizen' and whether that was an accurate descriptor. The Committee noted the difficulty in finding one word to describe a number of different groups, but agreed that the word 'citizen' was quite emotive and could exclude a number of different groups. There was consensus that the use of the word 'citizen' within the strategy in its current form need not be changed, but that ongoing feedback should be sought so that language could be adjusted as necessary in future iterations of the strategy.

Recommendation 1: That the Council seeks ongoing feedback on how individuals and groups engage with the strategy and whether they feel excluded by the use of the term 'citizen'; and listens to and reflects on this feedback with a view to adjusting the language accordingly in future iterations of the strategy.

6. During further discussion on the use of the word 'citizen', the Committee noted the current context that a number of groups and individuals were feeling excluded generally and agreed that this should be drawn out in the strategy.

Recommendation 2: That the Council contextualises the strategy by drawing out the general feelings of exclusion felt by many groups and individuals in the current climate.

Report author	Alice Courtney
Job title	Scrutiny Officer
Service area or department	Law and Governance
Telephone	01865 529834
e-mail	acourtney@oxford.gov.uk

Appendix A

Draft Cabinet response to recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee

The document sets out the draft response of the Cabinet Member to recommendations made by the Scrutiny Committee on 04 July 2023 concerning the Citizen Experience Strategy. The Cabinet is asked to amend and agree a formal response as appropriate.

<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Agree?</i>	<i>Comment</i>
1) That the Council seeks ongoing feedback on how individuals and groups engage with the strategy and whether they feel excluded by the use of the term 'citizen'; and listens to and reflects on this feedback with a view to adjusting the language accordingly in future iterations of the strategy.	Yes	We will monitor engagement with the strategy, including the use of language within it, and use this insight to inform future work. An annual review of the strategy will be provided to the Cabinet Member for Citizen Focused Services and Council Companies, which can also be made available for consideration by the Scrutiny Committee.
2) That the Council contextualises the strategy by drawing out the general feelings of exclusion felt by many groups and individuals in the current climate.	Yes	As per the equalities impact assessment included in the report, the intention is to undertake a more detailed equalities impact assessment for each major workstream. This process should identify any "general feelings of exclusion" and ensure the appropriate mitigations are implemented.

This page is intentionally left blank

To: Cabinet

Date: 12 July 2023

Report of: Housing and Homelessness Panel

Title of Report: Future Resettlement Commitments for New Refugee Families

Summary and recommendations	
Purpose of report:	To present Panel of the Scrutiny Committee recommendations for Cabinet consideration and decision
Key decision:	No
Scrutiny Lead Member:	Cllr Lizzy Diggins, Panel Chair
Cabinet Member:	Cllr Linda Smith, Cabinet Member for Housing
Corporate Priority:	Deliver More Affordable Housing; Support Thriving Communities
Policy Framework:	Housing, Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2023-28
Recommendation: That the Cabinet states whether it agrees or disagrees with the recommendations in the body of this report.	

Appendices	
Appendix A	Draft Cabinet response to recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee

Introduction and overview

1. The Housing and Homelessness Panel met on 05 July 2023 to consider a report concerning Future Resettlement Commitments for New Refugee Families. The report, which is due for Cabinet consideration on 12 July 2023, recommends that Cabinet approves the resettlement of a minimum of 8 refugee families per year from any of the resettlement schemes highlighted in the report for a period of 5 years from 2023 to 2028, on the condition that the requirements in paragraph 21 of the report are consistently met to ensure scheme viability; and delegates authority to the:
 - Executive Director (Communities and People), in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing, to agree the resettlement of additional refugees above this allocation (which will incur additional expenditure from

Home Office grant funding for support provision) subject to sufficient grant funding; approves the use of Home Office grant funding of up to £1,313,840 (see Appendix 2 of the report) to procure the provision of 2 years of person centred support for each refugee family arriving in Oxford during the 5 year period between 2023 -2028;

- Head of Housing in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing to approve the use of the Home Office grant funding to procure additional person centred support as required;
 - Head of Housing in consultation with the Head of Financial Services/S151 Officer, the Head of Law and Governance and the Cabinet Member for Housing to allocate the approved budget and enter into contract(s) with a provider(s) for the provision of person centred support.
2. The Panel would like to thank Councillor Linda Smith (Cabinet Member for Housing), Nerys Parry (Head of Housing Services), Richard Wood (Housing Strategy and Needs Manager), Alan Chandler (Senior Refugee and Migrant Officer) and Paul Reid (Rapid Rehousing Manager) for attending the meeting to answer questions.

Summary and recommendations

3. Councillor Linda Smith, Cabinet Member for Housing introduced the report. There was an ongoing need to resettle refugee families, as globally there were circa 100 million forcibly displaced people. The commitments outlined in the report were consistent with Oxford's values as a City of Sanctuary and aligned with work to date supporting refugees. The proposed commitment to resettle 8 refugee families per year for 5 years was determined to be manageable and sustainable; the commitment was consistent with the commitment in previous years. A number of factors had fed into the proposed commitment to resettle 8 families per year for the 5 year period – including the availability of affordable accommodation in the City and capacity to offer wraparound support to those families.
4. The Panel asked a range of questions, including questions relating to the rationale behind the commitment to resettle 8 refugee families per year for the next 5 years; whether the Council's commitment could be more ambitious; financial viability of the scheme; placement of families within the City; how the scheme was monitored; and the support available to refugee families.
5. In particular, the Panel sought clarification on the Council's scope to increase the number of families resettled per year. A tension was identified within the report, in that it stated the commitment was to resettle a *minimum* of 8 refugee families per year; but the report also stated if an excess of 8 properties per year was secured, then that excess would contribute to the following year's commitment. The two statements did not appear to align. The Panel was advised that the proposal was to resettle 8 refugee families per year, but if that target was reached quickly and additional properties were secured in any given year, there was a small amount of flexibility to resettle more than 8 families per year. However, any large increase to the commitment of 8 families per year was not possible as significantly more resource would be required. The Panel agreed

that this position was not set out clearly in the report and would benefit from clarification.

Recommendation 1: That the Council clarifies its position in relation to the flexibility within its commitment to resettle more than 8 refugee families per year for the next 5 years; explicitly stating that any significant surplus will be rolled into the following year's commitment, but that there is capacity to support a small number of additional families in any given year.

6. The Panel had a broader discussion around the differences in language used to describe individuals' status, depending on which scheme they arrived in the UK under. It was noted that the term 'refugee' and 'asylum seeker' were often used to describe individuals from Afghanistan and Syria, for instance, yet individuals from Ukraine were referred to as 'guests'. While the Panel acknowledged that this mirrored the language used by the Government within its various resettlement schemes, it agreed that there was no requirement for the Council to perpetuate feelings of inequality between individuals from different countries who had all fled similar situations of war and conflict by using the same potentially divisive language.

Recommendation 2: That the Council considers the language used within future reports and documents to ensure that individuals and families entering the UK having fled war, conflict and/or persecution are given equal status regardless of their country of origin.

Report author	Alice Courtney
Job title	Scrutiny Officer
Service area or department	Law and Governance
Telephone	01865 529834
e-mail	acourtney@oxford.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix A

Draft Cabinet response to recommendations of the Housing and Homelessness Panel of the Scrutiny Committee

The document sets out the draft response of the Cabinet Member to recommendations made by the Housing and Homelessness Panel on 05 July 2023 concerning Future Resettlement Commitments for New Refugee Families. The Cabinet is asked to amend and agree a formal response as appropriate.

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
1) That the Council clarifies its position in relation to the flexibility within its commitment to resettle more than 8 refugee families per year for the next 5 years; explicitly stating that any significant surplus will be rolled into the following year's commitment, but that there is capacity to support a small number of additional families in any given year.	Yes	The report recommends to Cabinet a commitment of 8 households a year for resettlement, as long as conditions outlined in paragraph 21 are met. In addition, it recommends delegation of authority to exceed that number in any given year. This provision has been included to ensure that, if opportunities to rehouse more households become available over the 5 year period, the ability is there to proceed quickly without additional approval, in line with the Council's strategic objectives. It is not anticipated that the Council would exceed the 8 households significantly each year, due to resourcing limitations, but in particular due to the very limited supply of suitable housing for families needing resettlement, as part of the broader supply and housing need challenges Oxford is facing. Any households resettled through the scheme above the 8 annually will be counted against the profile for the next year. This is because over the course of the 5 years we are aiming to resettle 40 families and this provision has been included as resettlement is often inconsistent, with

		households sometimes arriving rapidly in a short period, followed by gaps, driven by our ability to procure properties. It may be that in practice we have some years that the 8 is exceeded, followed by other years when it is not. This provision therefore provides an ongoing view on if we are on track to meet our overall commitments or not.
2) That the Council considers the language used within future reports and documents to ensure that individuals and families entering the UK having fled war, conflict and/or persecution are given equal status regardless of their country of origin.	Yes	The upmost effort goes into using the right language when drafting reports and documents in order to be clear in meaning, and to describe the status of clients who have come to Oxford fleeing war, conflict and persecution in the most appropriate language. Added effort will be put into future reports to seek to use more consistent language to describe different groups of people when possible. However, in order to ensure accuracy and clear legal meaning, at times reports must use the language prescribed in legislation, to ensure clear application of decisions made by Cabinet and Council, and to ensure compliance with ring-fenced central government funding.

To: Cabinet
Date: 12 July 2023
Report of: Housing and Homelessness Panel
Title of Report: Tenant Satisfaction (STAR) Survey

Summary and recommendations	
Purpose of report:	To present Panel of the Scrutiny Committee recommendations for Cabinet consideration and decision
Key decision:	No
Scrutiny Lead Member:	Cllr Lizzy Diggins, Panel Chair
Cabinet Member:	Cllr Linda Smith, Cabinet Member for Housing
Corporate Priority:	Deliver More Affordable Housing; Support Thriving Communities
Policy Framework:	Housing, Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2023-28
Recommendation: That the Cabinet states whether it agrees or disagrees with the recommendations in the body of this report.	

Appendices	
Appendix A	Draft Cabinet response to recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee

Introduction and overview

1. The Housing and Homelessness Panel met on 05 July 2023 to consider a report concerning the results of the Tenant Satisfaction (STAR) Survey 2022. It was recommended that the Panel consider the report and agree any recommendations.
2. The Panel would like to thank Councillor Linda Smith (Cabinet Member for Housing), Nerys Parry (Head of Housing Services) and Patricia Andrade (Tenancy Management Manager) for attending the meeting to present and answer questions.

Summary and recommendations

3. Councillor Linda Smith, Cabinet Member for Housing introduced the report. The results of the Tenant Satisfaction (STAR) Survey 2022 had been positive overall, however there were a few areas for improvement which the Council would be focusing on – namely communications and repairs. Improvement work was already underway in respect of repairs, as new technology was due to be rolled out imminently which would enable tenants to log their own repairs on the system, which would streamline the process. Patricia Andrade, Tenancy Management Manager presented the survey's key findings to the Panel.
4. The Panel asked a range of questions, including questions relating to how the Council planned to address any tenant dissatisfaction highlighted by the results; how the Council prioritised repairs to housing stock; survey methodology; and best practice within the identified areas for improvement.
5. The Panel was interested in understanding the total number of Council tenants in each of the City's wards, as the current report did not make it easy for Members to ascertain whether the number of survey responses from their respective wards represented a large or small proportion of the total number of Council tenants in that ward. The Panel agreed that this would be a helpful inclusion in future reports.

Recommendation 1: That the Council includes information on the number of Council tenants per ward in future Tenant Satisfaction (STAR) Survey reports.

Report author	Alice Courtney
Job title	Scrutiny Officer
Service area or department	Law and Governance
Telephone	01865 529834
e-mail	acourtney@oxford.gov.uk

Appendix A

Draft Cabinet response to recommendations of the Housing and Homelessness Panel of the Scrutiny Committee

The document sets out the draft response of the Cabinet Member to recommendations made by the Housing and Homelessness Panel on 05 July 2023 concerning the Tenant Satisfaction (STAR) Survey. The Cabinet is asked to amend and agree a formal response as appropriate.

<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Agree?</i>	<i>Comment</i>
1) That the Council includes information on the number of Council tenants per ward in future Tenant Satisfaction (STAR) Survey reports.	In Part	The STAR is one questionnaire per property, therefore it would be clearer if the information is based on the number of properties per ward which can be provided.

This page is intentionally left blank