

# Supplement for

# Cabinet

On **Wednesday 24 January 2024** At **6.00 pm**

## Agenda Item 7 - Scrutiny Reports

### Contents

<b>7. Scrutiny Reports</b>	<b>3 - 42</b>
<p>The Scrutiny Committee met on 16 January 2024 and the Finance &amp; Performance Panel met on 22 January 2024. The following reports are expected, together with any other recommendations from those meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Leisure Services Contract Award</li><li>• Draft Corporate Strategy 2024-28 for Consultation</li><li>• Private Rented Sector Regulation Policies – Result of Consultation</li><li>• DAHA Accreditation and Domestic Abuse Review Group Update</li><li>• Biodiversity Action Plan for Oxford City Council Parks and Nature Areas – September 2023 Review</li><li>• Retrofit</li></ul>	

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:** 24 January 2024  
**Report of:** Scrutiny Committee  
**Title of Report:** Leisure Services Contract Award

<b>Summary and recommendations</b>	
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	To present Scrutiny Committee recommendations for Cabinet consideration and decision
<b>Key decision:</b>	No
<b>Scrutiny Lead Member:</b>	Councillor Lucy Pegg, Scrutiny Committee Chair
<b>Cabinet Member:</b>	Councillor Chewe Munkonge, Cabinet Member for Leisure and Parks
<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Support Thriving Communities
<b>Policy Framework:</b>	Thriving Communities Strategy
<b>Recommendation: That the Cabinet states whether it agrees or disagrees with the recommendations in the body of this report.</b>	

<b>Appendices</b>	
<b>Appendix A</b>	Draft Cabinet response to recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee

## Introduction and overview

1. The Scrutiny Committee met on 16 January 2024 to consider a report concerning the Leisure Services Contract Award. The report, which is due for Cabinet consideration on 24 January 2024, recommends that Cabinet awards a 10-year contract (with 5-year extension option) for managing and developing the Council's three leisure centres, Hinksey Outdoor Pool and the Oxford Ice Rink to Serco Leisure Ltd, subject to officers completing necessary due diligence and pre-contract negotiations; makes various delegations of authority to facilitate the contract award and smooth transition period; and agrees to receive annual reports on the performance of the leisure services and the contractor and to agree the business plan priorities for the following year.
2. The Committee would like to thank Councillor Munkonge (Cabinet Member for Leisure and Parks), Peter Matthew (Executive Director (Communities and People)),

Ian Brooke (Head of Community Services) and Emma Jackman (Head of Law and Governance) for attending the meeting to answer questions.

3. The Committee would also like to thank Jamie Slagel (public speaker) for attending to address the Committee on this item.

### **Summary and recommendations**

4. Cllr Chewe Munkonge, Cabinet Member for Leisure and Parks introduced the report and outlined the procurement process which had been undertaken prior to the recommendation for Cabinet to award the contract to Serco Leisure Ltd. It was noted that other local authorities across the country were in the position of having to close their leisure centres and swimming pools, but Oxford was fortunately not in that position. There were a number of actions which were required to be taken following the award of the contract to ensure a smooth transition to the new provider. The Leisure Services Contract was a key deliverable within the Thriving Communities Strategy.
5. A request to speak on this item was submitted to the Scrutiny Committee in advance of the meeting. Jamie Slagel attended the meeting and highlighted a number of concerns in relation to the award of the contract to the proposed provider. The concerns shared with the Committee spanned a number of years and sectors (including the leisure sector) and particularly related to concerns regarding Serco Leisure Ltd's parent company. The Committee was urged to consider the financial, legal and reputational risk to the Council of awarding the contract to the recommended supplier, alongside the risks to residents in terms of health and safety. The Committee took the public address into consideration during deliberation on the item.
6. Overall, the Committee wished to record the fact that it had grave concerns about the award of the contract to the proposed provider. However, the Committee noted that there was no real alternative option given the risk of legal challenge (and associated financial risk) if the Council did not award the contract to the winning bidder without gathering significant and concrete evidence through due diligence that the proposed provider was not suitable; and due to the fact that the in-house proposal was not financially viable.
7. The Committee asked a range of questions, including questions relating to why the Council's in-house proposals for the provision of leisure services was exempt from publication; the Council's process for assessing reputational risk; the opportunities for input afforded to Members during the procurement process; the arrangements which would be established to manage and monitor the contract; proposed fees and charges for leisure services; the contractual implications in the case of any under-performance by the provider; the impact of the management fee on the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy; social value; and the financial viability of the Council providing leisure services in-house.
8. In particular, the Committee discussed the reference in the report to the high costs of the in-house proposal for leisure services (*paragraph 21 in the Cabinet report*) and queried why there was additional information included in the exempt appendix setting out the in-house proposal which was relevant to the high costs, but had not been made public. The Committee was advised that consideration could be given to publishing more explicit and detailed information relating to the costs of the in-house

proposal. The reason why the in-house proposal was exempt from publication was to help with futureproofing, as the proposal contained commercially sensitive information and publishing it could disadvantage the Council if it wished to revisit the proposal at a future point in time. Every effort had been made to pull out the key parts of the proposal into the main Cabinet report without compromising commercially sensitive information, but further consideration could be given to this to ensure the maximum amount of information that could be made public was published.

***Recommendation 1: That the Council publishes, in the public domain, a more detailed breakdown of the higher costs in relation to the in-house proposal, particularly in respect of expenditure and staffing.***

9. The Committee noted the references in the report to arrangements being established to ensure the effective commissioning, delivery and management of the leisure services contract. Noting concerns and issues raised during the life of the current contract, the Committee was keen to receive further information on what these arrangements looked like as soon as possible. The Committee agreed it would also be beneficial for the Committee to understand the arrangements in place to ensure a smooth transition to the new contract.

***Recommendation 2: That the Council reports back to the Scrutiny Committee as soon as possible with an update on the arrangements established for the effective commissioning, delivery and management of the leisure services contract – including the arrangements established to ensure a smooth transition to the new provider.***

10. During discussion, the Committee raised concerns about the way in which the process around procuring a new leisure services provider had been managed in terms of Member engagement. Members did not feel that they had been given sufficient opportunity to input and highlighted that they had not received enough information, nor had it been received in a timely manner. As a result, the Committee agreed that lessons learned should be taken into account and applied to future large-scale procurement exercises to ensure the Council got Member engagement right.
11. It was also noted that the procurement exercise for the contract had started very close to the end date of the existing contract given the length of time required to run the whole process to award a new contract. This meant that the option to abandon the process and re-tender was not a viable one, as it would have risked the existing contract coming to an end before the process to award and mobilise the new contract had concluded. The Committee agreed it was vital that future procurement processes were started sufficiently in advance that the Council had the option to pause and reassess its options if required, including the option to abandon the process and re-tender.

***Recommendation 3: That the Council takes account of lessons learned through the leisure services contract procurement process and takes measures to ensure that future procurement exercises for large-scale tenders are started sufficiently in advance so as to allow for adequate, meaningful and timely Member involvement and to allow the Council time to pause and***

***reassess its options if required – including the option to abandon the process and re-tender.***

12. The Committee noted that there were restrictions on the level of information that Members could access during procurement processes – in particular that Members were unable to access individual bid submissions. The Committee was of the view that enhanced Member access to information during procurement processes would better enable Members to act in the best interests of the communities and residents they served.

***Recommendation 4: That the Council makes representations to Central Government expressing the need for greater transparency in local authority procurement processes for Members, to better enable them to act in the best interests of the communities and residents that they represent.***

13. Reference was made to the social value weightings placed on bid criteria and questions were raised as to why the social value weighting could not be increased from 10%. In response, the Committee was informed that this particular procurement exercise had a weighting of 60% for quality – which included aspects such as social value, equality, accessibility and inclusion – versus a 40% weighting for cost. The Committee reflected on comments made in relation to the importance of social value in previous years and agreed that it would be helpful if the Council published indicative evaluation matrices on its website so that Members and the public more widely could see what the Council was looking for from prospective bids.
14. In addition, it was noted that the Council was permitted to provide guidance to prospective bidders on what themes it wanted to see addressed within the social value criteria, however it was bidders' decision as to what to include in their bid in response to that guidance. The Committee agreed that it would be helpful if the principles of social value weightings were published on the Council's website, setting out the themes that the Council would like to see addressed in bid submissions – this would enable greater transparency for Members and the wider public.

***Recommendation 5: That the Council publishes indicative evaluation matrices for future procurement exercises on the Council website, setting out what the Council is looking for from prospective bids.***

***Recommendation 6: That the Council publishes the principles of social value weightings in procurement exercises on the Council website.***

15. Throughout the course of the meeting, the Committee expressed grave concerns in relation to the proposed provider of the leisure services contract. These largely related to reputational risk to the Council arising from the track-record of the company and its parent company, particularly when considering the Council's position as a Council of Sanctuary. Should Serco Leisure Ltd be awarded the contract by Cabinet on 24 January 2024, the Committee agreed that the Cabinet

should request that the company attends a Q&A session open to all Members to directly address and allay the concerns raised by the Scrutiny Committee. The Committee agreed that it would be prudent to seek a written response to the concerns in addition to the Q&A.

***Recommendation 7: That the Cabinet requests that Serco Leisure Ltd, if awarded the leisure services contract, attends a Q&A meeting with Members to explicitly respond to the concerns raised by the Scrutiny Committee; and follows this up in writing to be circulated to all Members for information.***

16. The Committee expressed its thanks to Jamie Slagel for attending to address the Committee and make his concerns known. As Cabinet was the ultimate decision-maker in relation to the leisure services contract, the Committee agreed it would be appropriate for the Cabinet to provide a written response to the public address made at the Scrutiny Committee, which could be shared with both the public speaker and the Scrutiny Committee.

***Recommendation 8: That the Cabinet provides a written response to the public address delivered at the Scrutiny Committee meeting in relation to the report, which can be shared with the public speaker and the Scrutiny Committee.***

<b>Report author</b>	Alice Courtney
Job title	Scrutiny Officer
Service area or department	Law and Governance
Telephone	01865 529834
e-mail	<a href="mailto:acourtney@oxford.gov.uk">acourtney@oxford.gov.uk</a>

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 16 January 2024 concerning the Leisure Services Contract Award report. The Cabinet is asked to amend and agree a formal response as appropriate.

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Agree?</b>	<b>Comment</b>
1) That the Council publishes, in the public domain, a more detailed breakdown of the higher costs in relation to the in-house proposal, particularly in respect of expenditure and staffing.	Yes	The total staffing cost for the in-house bid over 10 years is £35,710 million.
2) That the Council reports back to the Scrutiny Committee as soon as possible with an update on the arrangements established for the effective commissioning, delivery and management of the leisure services contract – including the arrangements established to ensure a smooth transition to the new provider.	Yes	Subject to Cabinet approval, we will engage with Serco to effect its detailed mobilisation plan to ensure smooth transition from Fusion. Council is also preparing detailed arrangements for effectively managing and clienting the effective delivery of the contract, including regular monitoring and reporting to appropriate Programme Board, CMT and lead members.
3) That the Council takes account of lessons learned through the leisure services contract procurement process and takes measures to ensure that future procurement exercises for large-scale tenders are started sufficiently in advance so as to allow for adequate, meaningful and timely Member involvement and to allow the Council time to pause and reassess its options if required – including the option to abandon the process and re-tender.	Yes	We will review the procurement exercise with a view to accommodating these recommendations in the future. It must be noted that complex procurements such as the leisure tender often take well over a year, and trying to design in the option to abandon from the start would lead to a longer process and risk value for money.
4) That the Council makes representations to Central Government expressing the need for greater transparency in local authority procurement processes for Members, to better enable them to act in the best interests of the communities and residents that they represent.	No	The Local Government Association (LGA) guidance provides that members should not be involved in the evaluation of bids. A combination of rules and laws means that members do not have an automatic right to information (see for example the Council's access to information rules which broadly set out what Members

		are entitled to see). Confidentiality is a key concern for bidders and contracting authorities in a procurement context. As members do not evaluate bids there is no basis for disclosure of the tenders to them.
5) That the Council publishes indicative evaluation matrices for future procurement exercises on the Council website, setting out what the Council is looking for from prospective bids.	Yes	
6) That the Council publishes the principles of social value weightings in procurement exercises on the Council website.	n/a	The Council already publishes the principles of social value weightings in procurement exercises on the Council website – see <a href="#">here</a> .
7) That the Cabinet requests that Serco Leisure Ltd, if awarded the leisure services contract, attends a Q&A meeting with Members to explicitly respond to the concerns raised by the Scrutiny Committee; and follows this up in writing to be circulated to all Members for information.	Yes	Subject to the Cabinet decision, we will make these requests to Serco and work with officers to arrange a Q&A session with Scrutiny Committee.
8) That the Cabinet provides a written response to the public address delivered at the Scrutiny Committee meeting in relation to the report, which can be shared with the public speaker and the Scrutiny Committee.	Yes	

**To:** Cabinet  
**Date:** 24 January 2024  
**Report of:** Scrutiny Committee  
**Title of Report:** Draft Corporate Strategy 2024-28 for Consultation

<b>Summary and recommendations</b>	
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	To present Scrutiny Committee recommendations for Cabinet consideration and decision
<b>Key decision:</b>	No
<b>Scrutiny Lead Member:</b>	Councillor Lucy Pegg, Scrutiny Committee Chair
<b>Cabinet Member:</b>	Councillor Susan Brown, Leader of the Council
<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	All
<b>Policy Framework:</b>	Council Strategy
<b>Recommendation: That the Cabinet states whether it agrees or disagrees with the recommendations in the body of this report.</b>	

<b>Appendices</b>	
<b>Appendix A</b>	Draft Cabinet response to recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee

### **Introduction and overview**

1. The Scrutiny Committee met on 16 January 2024 to consider a report concerning the Council's Draft Corporate Strategy 2024-28 for Consultation. The report, which is due for Cabinet consideration on 24 January 2024, recommends that Cabinet delegates authority to the Head of Corporate Strategy, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to make any changes to the draft Corporate Strategy 2024-28 as may be required following its consideration by the Scrutiny Committee and then publish the draft Corporate Strategy 2024-28 for public consultation.
2. The Committee would like to thank Councillor Brown (Leader of the Council), Caroline Green (Chief Executive), Lucy Cherry (Policy and Partnerships Officer) and Clare Keen (Policy and Partnerships Officer) for attending the meeting to answer questions.

## Summary and recommendations

3. Cllr Susan Brown, Leader of the Council introduced the report. This was a new version of the Council's Corporate Strategy and conversations had been held with a large number of partners and groups across the City to get as broad a range of views as possible. The intention was for the draft document to go out to public consultation to understand whether the Council had the current draft and proposed priorities right and whether the Council's ambitions reflected those of the City and its residents. The priority areas of focus outlined in the document were broadly similar to previous Corporate Strategies, with the main addition being a priority reflecting the efficiency and stability which was the foundation upon which the Council did everything else ('Well Run Council'). To complement the Corporate Strategy there was a separate, but related, piece of work being undertaken across the Council to develop a series of corporate key performance indicators (KPIs) to monitor progress in relation to the Council's priorities.
4. The Committee asked a range of questions, including questions relating to whether the Council's targets around housing were ambitious enough; prioritisation; how the different priorities interconnected; community wealth building; and the Council's work with anchor institutions.
5. In particular, the Committee discussed the prioritisation work being undertaken by the Council following feedback from the recent Local Government Association Corporate Peer Review and wanted to understand how that prioritisation was reflected in the draft Corporate Strategy 2024-28 compared to the Corporate Strategy 2020-24. While no work had been done to date to consider the changes between the two documents, the Committee was advised that this would likely be a useful exercise.

***Recommendation 1: That the Council undertakes a comparative analysis to clearly set out what has changed between the current Corporate Strategy 2020-24 and the draft Corporate Strategy 2024-28 as a result of prioritisation.***

6. The Committee held further discussion relating to the absence of the phrase 'community wealth building' within the draft Corporate Strategy 2024-28. While the Committee noted that the intention was to produce a jargon-free document for public consumption, it agreed that the principles of community wealth building were important and encompassed a wide variety of elements. The Committee agreed that, at the very least, language that reflected the principles of community wealth building should be incorporated into the document – and this should include a specific reference to 'shortened supply chains' within the 'Strong, Inclusive Economy' section.

***Recommendation 2: That the Council incorporates references to community wealth building, or appropriate alternative language which reflects the principles of community wealth building, within the draft Corporate Strategy 2024-28 – to include explicit use of the phrase 'shortened supply chains' within the 'Strong, Inclusive Economy' section.***

7. During discussion on the areas of focus set out on the first page of the draft Corporate Strategy 2024-28, the Committee noted that the reference to ‘facilitating more electric vehicle infrastructure’ under the climate action bullet point did not appear to be sufficiently high-level for that part of the document. It transpired that this was a drafting error and the Committee was satisfied that the alternative wording which had been omitted in error was much more suitable and high-level. However, the Committee was of the view that there was not enough emphasis within the ‘Zero Carbon Oxford’ section on working with partners across Oxford – particularly around understanding how different institutions’ decisions in relation to reducing emissions might impact other institutions and serve to just shift emissions from one organisation or area of the City to another. The Committee agreed that the draft strategy would benefit from the inclusion of wording to reflect a commitment to working holistically with partners in the interests of the City as a whole.

***Recommendation 3: That the Council includes wording under the priorities within the ‘Zero Carbon Oxford’ section along the lines of ‘working in partnership with other institutions in Oxford to ensure a joined-up approach to tackling emissions’.***

8. The Committee held further discussion in relation to the ambition to produce a jargon-free document. While the Committee agreed with the reasoning behind this, in the interests of making the document publicly accessible and digestible, there was some concern that the effort to exclude specific terms could lead to the strategy not actually making any defined commitments. As a compromise, the Committee suggested that the Council could include a glossary within the final document which would help to demystify key terms used within the strategy.

***Recommendation 4: That the Council includes a glossary of key terms used throughout the Corporate Strategy 2024-28 in the final document.***

9. It was important to the Committee that the priorities set out within the draft strategy were not considered in isolation and that the importance of the interaction and interconnectivity between them was recognised and clearly drawn out. Following discussion, it was noted that this could be done in the foreword of the final document.

***Recommendation 5: That the Council draws out and emphasises the interaction and interconnectivity between the priorities of the Corporate Strategy 2024-28 within the foreword of the final document.***

<b>Report author</b>	Alice Courtney
Job title	Scrutiny Officer
Service area or department	Law and Governance
Telephone	01865 529834
e-mail	<a href="mailto:acourtney@oxford.gov.uk">acourtney@oxford.gov.uk</a>

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 16 January 2024 concerning the Draft Corporate Strategy 2024-28 for Consultation. The Cabinet is asked to amend and agree a formal response as appropriate.

15

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Agree?</b>	<b>Comment</b>
1) That the Council undertakes a comparative analysis to clearly set out what has changed between the current Corporate Strategy 2020-24 and the draft Corporate Strategy 2024-28 as a result of prioritisation.		This work will be done as part of our response to the LGA peer review.
2) That the Council incorporates references to community wealth building, or appropriate alternative language which reflects the principles of community wealth building, within the draft Corporate Strategy 2024-28 – to include explicit use of the phrase ‘shortened supply chains’ within the ‘Strong, Inclusive Economy’ section.		The Corporate Strategy has been drafted to avoid the use of jargon or terms that are not widely understood by a general audience. We believe our commitments reflect some of the key principles of community wealth building in appropriate alternative language, in particular on the Oxford Living Wage, local economic development in disadvantaged areas, and using our procurement power to support local businesses, apprenticeships and better public spaces. We have consulted with the procurement team on including a reference to ‘shortened supply chains’. We believe that this is already implicit in our commitment to strengthening local supply chains, but we are unable to mandate or enforce shortened supply chains in our procurement. As part of strengthening our work with local businesses, we hold ‘meet the buyer’ events and ‘how to tender’ workshops primarily targeted at local businesses. On high-value contracts we ask bidders to detail their reliance on sub-contractors and name them.
3) That the Council includes wording under the priorities within the ‘Zero Carbon Oxford’ section along the lines of		We believe the commitments to work with partners to reduce building emissions across the city, and the

<p>'working in partnership with other institutions in Oxford to ensure a joined-up approach to tackling emissions'.</p>		<p>commitment to work with partners on a Local Area Energy Plan to reduce emissions, amount to a commitment to a joined-up approach to tackling emissions while also giving more concrete and measurable actions.</p>
<p>4) That the Council includes a glossary of key terms used throughout the Corporate Strategy 2024-28 in the final document.</p>		<p>This will be included in the final published documents in June 2024.</p>
<p>5) That the Council draws out and emphasises the interaction and interconnectivity between the priorities of the Corporate Strategy 2024-28 within the foreword of the final document.</p>		<p>That was always the intention and will be included in the final published documents in June 2024.</p>



**To:** Cabinet  
**Date:** 24 January 2024  
**Report of:** Scrutiny Committee  
**Title of Report:** Private Rented Sector Regulation Policies – Results of Consultation

<b>Summary and recommendations</b>	
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	To present Scrutiny Committee recommendations for Cabinet consideration and decision
<b>Key decision:</b>	No
<b>Scrutiny Lead Member:</b>	Councillor Lucy Pegg, Scrutiny Committee Chair
<b>Cabinet Member:</b>	Councillor Linda Smith, Cabinet Member for Housing
<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	All
<b>Policy Framework:</b>	Council Strategy 2020-24
<b>Recommendation: That the Cabinet states whether it agrees or disagrees with the recommendations in the body of this report.</b>	

<b>Appendices</b>	
<b>Appendix A</b>	Draft Cabinet response to recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee

### **Introduction and overview**

1. The Scrutiny Committee met on 16 January 2024 to consider a report concerning Private Rented Sector Regulation Policies – Results of Consultation. The report, which is due for Cabinet consideration on 24 January 2024, recommends that Cabinet notes the results of the public consultation; approves the amended policies (Fit and Proper Person; Banning Orders & Rogue Landlord Database Entry; and Civil Penalties in Relation to Residential Enforcement); and delegates authority to the Head of Planning and Regulatory Services to review and update the policies in consultation with the Head of Law and Governance in the event that new legislation is enacted to give the Council powers to issue fines for private rented homes.
2. The Committee would like to thank Councillor Linda Smith (Cabinet Member for Housing), David Butler (Head of Planning and Regulatory Services) and Gail Siddall (Regulatory Services Manager) for attending the meeting to answer questions.

## Summary and recommendations

3. Gail Siddall, Regulatory Services Manager introduced the report. The report sought to formalise policies and procedures which were already in use by the Council in relation to private rented sector regulation. Due to the nature of situations where the policies would be used, in that they would be used in very adverse situations where other options were not appropriate or had failed, it was important that the policies were transparent and that there had been the opportunity for feedback via the public consultation. Overall, 55 responses were received to the consultation which had demonstrated significant interest in the policies. Respondents had welcomed the opportunity to provide feedback on the policies and had confirmed that the policies were clear and transparent.
4. The Committee asked a range of questions, including questions relating to what happened to money received by the Council in respect of Civil Penalties; whether an individual could be on the Rogue Landlord Database without having a Banning Order as the policy seemed to suggest; whether the national Rogue Landlord Database was being properly utilised and working in the way it was intended; the Council's plans to ensure proper scrutiny of housing for asylum seekers; and whether the Council could include any requirements relating to domestic abuse within its private sector regulation policies.
5. In particular, the Committee discussed recent media announcements that asylum accommodation was to be excluded from the Regulator of Social Housing requirements. The requirements, introduced by the Social Housing (Regulation) Act 2023, would only apply to registered providers of social housing and only if the accommodation was leased as social housing; asylum accommodation did not normally fall under this category, which was why the Regulator's requirements would not apply to that type of accommodation. The Committee was informed that there were some anomalies in the national guidance in relation to the housing of asylum seekers and the Council could not apply Selective Licensing or HMO Licensing to asylum seeker accommodation.
6. However, where the Council received complaints in relation to asylum accommodation it did undertake reactive work to address them using appropriate legislation, which was not always housing-related legislation. It was very difficult for the Council to undertake proactive work in relation to asylum accommodation as it was not part of a licensing scheme. The Committee was assured that, although the Council had no legal powers in relation to asylum accommodation, it still took an active role as far as it possibly could in ensuring asylum seekers' needs were being addressed. The Committee agreed that the policies would benefit from clarification as to how their principles applied to social housing providers and asylum accommodation.

***Recommendation 1: That the Council clarifies how the principles of its private rented sector regulation policies apply to social housing providers and housing for asylum seekers.***

7. In addition, the Committee explored the Council's current role in ensuring issues around domestic abuse were addressed and incorporated into the policies, alongside ensuring they were joined up with other Council policies and the Council's

work towards achieving the Domestic Abuse Housing Alliance (DAHA) Accreditation. The Committee was advised that joined-up working could be explored in relation to domestic abuse if the legislation allowed for it, including taking action where the Council found contraventions or breaches of regulation.

***Recommendation 2: That the Council explores the ways in which domestic abuse and the Council's work towards achieving Domestic Abuse Housing Alliance (DAHA) Accreditation can feed into its private rented sector regulation policies to ensure alignment across the organisation.***

<b>Report author</b>	Alice Courtney
Job title	Scrutiny Officer
Service area or department	Law and Governance
Telephone	01865 529834
e-mail	<a href="mailto:acourtney@oxford.gov.uk">acourtney@oxford.gov.uk</a>

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 16 January 2024 concerning the Private Rented Sector Regulation Policies – Results of Consultation report. The Cabinet is asked to amend and agree a formal response as appropriate.

<b><i>Recommendation</i></b>	<b><i>Agree?</i></b>	<b><i>Comment</i></b>
1) That the Council clarifies how the principles of its private rented sector regulation policies apply to social housing providers and housing for asylum seekers.	Yes	This will be clarified when the policies are published, where the legislation and policies apply to such accommodation and providers.
2) That the Council explores the ways in which domestic abuse and the Council's work towards achieving Domestic Abuse Housing Alliance (DAHA) Accreditation can feed into its private rented sector regulation policies to ensure alignment across the organisation.	Yes	We will explore how these policies can align with the DAHA accreditation work area and update procedures where appropriate.

This page is intentionally left blank

**To:** Cabinet  
**Date:** 24 January 2024  
**Report of:** Scrutiny Committee  
**Title of Report:** DAHA Accreditation and Domestic Abuse Review Group Update

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

<b>Appendices</b>	
<b>Appendix A</b>	Draft Cabinet response to recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee

### **Introduction and overview**

1. The Scrutiny Committee met on 16 January 2024 to consider a report concerning the Council's progress towards the Domestic Abuse Housing Alliance (DAHA) Accreditation and progress made against the recommendations arising from the Domestic Abuse Review Group made in 2021.
2. The Committee would like to thank Councillor Lygo (Cabinet Member for Safer and Inclusive Communities), Richard Adams (Community Safety Service Manager) and Liz Jones (ASBIT Manager & Domestic Abuse Lead) for attending the meeting to answer questions.

## Summary and recommendations

3. Cllr Mark Lygo, Cabinet Member for Safer and Inclusive Communities introduced the report. Of the 48 recommendations made by the Domestic Abuse Review Group and endorsed by the Scrutiny Committee in 2021, Cabinet had agreed 26, agreed 13 in part and not agreed 9. An update on each of the recommendations agreed or agreed in part was included in Appendix A to the report. The Committee had also requested an update on the Council's progress towards achieving the DAHA Accreditation, which was set out in the report.
4. The Committee asked a range of questions, including questions relating to the condition and suitability of safe accommodation; the Council's statutory duty to provide safe accommodation; housing needs; Temporary Accommodation; support for those fleeing domestic abuse; domestic abuse training; and funding for the DAHA Accreditation.
5. In particular, the Committee discussed reports received by Members in their capacity as ward councillors from distressed residents who had fled domestic abuse and were housed in safe and/or temporary accommodation. There were concerns that the accommodation provided was not always suitable (e.g. hotel accommodation), but it was noted that there was unprecedented housing demand in Oxford which was difficult to manage; proposals would be brought forward in due course to address the surge in demand, but the situation would not change overnight and the Council was doing all it could in the meantime to address a variety of complex housing needs, including those related to domestic abuse.
6. The Committee had specific concerns in relation to the inadequacy of cooking facilities in hotel accommodation, particularly where there were children involved in domestic abuse cases. In addition, concerns were raised about the adequacy of support provided to those housed in safe and/or temporary accommodation at such a traumatic time and the Committee queried the Council's ability to ensure the provision of more dedicated and intensive 1:1 support. The Committee was assured that this type of 1:1 support was provided, and Members were requested to escalate any cases that they were aware of where adequate support was not being provided, but the Committee was not satisfied that adequate support was being delivered on the ground and urged investigation into this matter to ensure victims and survivors of domestic abuse were supported.

***Recommendation 1: That the Council investigates and assesses the adequacy and clarity of the support and signposting provided to victims and survivors of domestic abuse housed in safe and/or temporary accommodation.***

7. In addition, the Committee noted that the funding from the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) which was being used to support the Council's work toward the DAHA Accreditation was currently expected to come to an end at the end of March 2025. There was an ongoing annual cost associated with maintaining the DAHA Accreditation once achieved; following questions, it was confirmed that maintaining Accreditation on an ongoing basis could be put at risk if no new funding streams were announced. The Committee also acknowledged that the Council had been given new statutory duties by Central Government without the



provision of additional resources to enable it to meet these new obligations, which put additional pressure on the Council's already limited resources.

***Recommendation 2: That the Council proactively lobbies Central Government based on the horrific lived experiences of Oxford residents, stressing the urgent need for additional resources to support the Council in meeting its new statutory obligations relating to domestic abuse.***

8. During further discussion in relation to the Council's additional statutory duties, it was noted that the legislation also covered the lived experiences of children. The Committee noted the importance of ensuring children's experiences were captured and addressed by the Council through its domestic abuse work.

***Recommendation 3: That the Council ensures that the lived experiences of children are captured and addressed by the Council through its domestic abuse work.***

9. The Committee held a brief discussion in relation to domestic abuse training for Members. It was noted that there were plans to deliver training, but they had not yet been finalised; the Committee noted the importance of the training being delivered annually to ensure Members had adequate knowledge of domestic abuse and how they could support victims and survivors through their role as councillors. In addition, the Committee noted that the Council currently had a number of officer Domestic Abuse Champions. The Council currently had a number of Member Champions, but the Committee was not aware that there was a Member Champion specifically for Domestic Abuse. The Committee agreed that it would be useful for a Member Domestic Abuse Champion to be appointed.

***Recommendation 4: That the Council delivers domestic abuse training annually to Members going forward and appoints a Member as Domestic Abuse Champion.***

<b>Report author</b>	Alice Courtney
Job title	Scrutiny Officer
Service area or department	Law and Governance
Telephone	01865 529834
e-mail	<a href="mailto:acourtney@oxford.gov.uk">acourtney@oxford.gov.uk</a>

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 16 January 2024 concerning the DAHA Accreditation and Domestic Abuse Review Group Update. The Cabinet is asked to amend and agree a formal response as appropriate.

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Agree?</b>	<b>Comment</b>
1) That the Council investigates and assesses the adequacy and clarity of the support and signposting provided to victims and survivors of domestic abuse housed in safe and/or temporary accommodation.	In Part	Concerns were raised about the safety of people fleeing domestic abuse in temporary accommodation and hotel settings. This area will be investigated but not sanctuary or refuge accommodation.
2) That the Council proactively lobbies Central Government based on the horrific lived experiences of Oxford residents, stressing the urgent need for additional resources to support the Council in meeting its new statutory obligations relating to domestic abuse.	Agree	This is a Member-led activity.
3) That the Council ensures that the lived experiences of children are captured and addressed by the Council through its domestic abuse work.	Agree	Data on children is captured through HClick, which includes those temporarily housed in bed/breakfast and our temporary housing stock.
4) That the Council delivers domestic abuse training annually to Members going forward and appoints a Member as Domestic Abuse Champion.	In Part	A wide range of domestic abuse training courses are available through the Oxfordshire Safeguarding Children Board (OSCB) website. Officers will review if a Member course is also needed and the addition of a Member Domestic Abuse Champion.

This page is intentionally left blank

**To:** Cabinet  
**Date:** 24 January 2024  
**Report of:** Climate and Environment Panel  
**Title of Report:** Biodiversity Action Plan for Oxford City Council Parks and Nature Areas – September 2023 Review

<b>Summary and recommendations</b>	
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	To present Panel of the Scrutiny Committee recommendations for Cabinet consideration and decision
<b>Key decision:</b>	No
<b>Scrutiny Lead Member:</b>	Councillor Alex Hollingsworth, Panel Chair
<b>Cabinet Member:</b>	Cllr Chewe Munkonge, Deputy Leader (Non-Statutory) and Cabinet Member for Leisure and Parks
<b>Corporate Priority:</b>	Pursue a Zero Carbon Oxford
<b>Policy Framework:</b>	Council Strategy 2020-24
<b>Recommendation: That the Cabinet states whether it agrees or disagrees with the recommendations in the body of this report.</b>	

<b>Appendices</b>	
<b>Appendix A</b>	Draft Cabinet response to recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee

### **Introduction and overview**

1. The Climate and Environment Panel met on 29 November 2023 to consider a review of the Biodiversity Action Plan for Oxford City Council Parks and Nature Areas undertaken in September 2023. The Action Plan was developed in 2020 when the initial Biodiversity Review for parks and nature areas was carried out; and set out a site-specific five-year action plan comprised of:
  - Top twelve priority projects (for the larger parks and nature areas).
  - Smaller urban parks.
2. The review of the Action Plan undertaken in September 2023 sought to assess progress against the actions. It was recommended that the Panel note and comment on the report and agree any recommendations.

3. The Panel would like to thank Councillor Chewe Munkonge (Deputy Leader (Non-Statutory) and Cabinet Member for Leisure and Parks) and Chris Bell (Green and Blue Spaces Development Manager) for attending the meeting to answer questions.

### Summary and recommendations

4. Councillor Chewe Munkonge, Deputy Leader (Non-Statutory) and Cabinet Member for Leisure and Parks introduced the report, highlighting that there were only a small number of actions which had not been progressed and this was largely as a result of lack of available funding. Chris Bell, Green and Blue Spaces Development Manager added that the Biodiversity Review of Oxford City Council Parks and Nature Areas had been developed in 2020 to set out the Council's current progress and demonstrate what it was doing to promote and support biodiversity in Council parks and nature areas. He added that there was a lot of aspiration within the Council and highlighted the importance of identifying specific sites and projects where this aspiration could be delivered on the ground. There had been good progress made against the Action Plan, but there was still work to be done across the City.
5. The Panel asked a range of questions, including questions relating to the actions delivered which had been the most impactful; key areas where the Council still had more work to do; tree planting – specifically planting the right tree in the right place; ensuring the Action Plan was mainstreamed and not seen as an 'add-on'; the client-contractor relationship between the Council and Oxford Direct Services; data accessibility and mapping of sites/projects; and funding opportunities.
6. During discussion, the Panel noted that a Geographic Information System (GIS) project was underway at the Council and it would be useful if, as part of that project, consideration was given to collaborating with partners who hold relevant data and including an information layer within the GIS that identified particular landscapes and/or habits (e.g. peatland) alongside specific sites or projects which required funding – providing a centralised information asset. The Panel was of the view that, if this mapped information was made accessible to Members and the public then there would be opportunities for Members, community groups and the public more generally to locate projects near to them that they could support.

***Recommendation 1: That the Council, in collaboration with partners who hold relevant data, maps data relating to landscape and habitat type onto a centralised system (e.g. GIS) and populates with information about particular sites or projects which require funding; and makes this publicly accessible so that Members, community groups and the general public can find and support local projects near to them.***

7. The Panel also discussed the important role of volunteers in biodiversity work and the importance of volunteer coordination, however noted the lack of resource capacity to facilitate volunteer coordination. There was agreement among the Panel that a recommendation around obtaining additional resource for volunteer coordination would not be helpful. Instead, the Panel agreed to frame a recommendation around how volunteer coordination could be delivered

with existing resource and become part of core 'business as usual' rather than 'add-on' work which was nice to have.

***Recommendation 2: That the Council explores how volunteer coordination could be delivered within existing resource as part of the Council's core 'business as usual'.***

8. When considering the client-contractor relationship between the Council and Oxford Direct Services (ODS) in relation to the management of parks and green spaces, the Panel was interested in how the management contracts were structured. In particular, questions were raised around whether contracts were prescriptive in terms of undertaking a certain amount of work over a defined period of time, or whether they were more flexible and based on an output of supporting, protecting and enhancing biodiversity. The Panel was advised that contracts were not prescriptive, ODS held a lot of expertise and site-specific knowledge and the client-contractor relationship worked well.
9. The Panel noted minor concerns that, should there be a complete change of personnel within ODS, significant institutional memory could be lost in relation to site-specific knowledge and expertise, and in order to protect its interests it would be prudent for the Council to review the structure of contracts to ensure they are clear on whether the management of parks and green spaces is centred on prescriptive inputs (certain amount of work over a defined period of time) or outputs (supporting, protecting and enhancing biodiversity). Concerns around the loss of site-specific knowledge and expertise were noted as low likelihood but potentially large impact; the overall risk was deemed by the Panel to be low, therefore it agreed to recommend this as a longer-term piece of work.

***Recommendation 3: That the Council reviews the structure of its contracts with Oxford Direct Services in relation to parks and green space management in the longer-term, to ensure that there is clarity within those contracts as to whether the management of parks and green spaces is led by prescriptive inputs (certain amount of work over a defined period of time) or outputs (supporting, protecting and enhancing biodiversity).***

10. The Panel further discussed diverse landscapes and habitats and the different approaches required to support, protect and enhance biodiversity. The Green and Blue Spaces Development Manager advised that there had been a narrow focus on trees for some time, which had led to the planting of trees in environments which were not necessarily the most suited to trees (e.g. meadows, areas with peat deposits etc.); he further added that there was significant opportunity within Oxford to 'green-up' boundaries and thus enhance biodiversity, through the planting of hedgerows for example. The Panel agreed that there should be a focus on ensuring the right approach in the right place.

***Recommendation 4: That the Council ensures the most appropriate approach for enhancing biodiversity is taken in its parks and nature areas according to environment on a site-by-site basis – with a focus on the right approach in the right place, rather than a uniform approach across all sites.***

<b>Report author</b>	Alice Courtney
Job title	Scrutiny Officer
Service area or department	Law and Governance
Telephone	01865 529834
e-mail	<a href="mailto:acourtney@oxford.gov.uk">acourtney@oxford.gov.uk</a>



**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 29 November 2023 concerning the Biodiversity Action Plan for Oxford City Council Parks and Nature Areas – September 2023 Review. The Cabinet is asked to amend and agree a formal response as appropriate.

33

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Agree?</b>	<b>Comment</b>
1) That the Council, in collaboration with partners who hold relevant data, maps data relating to landscape and habitat type onto a centralised system (e.g. GIS) and populates with information about particular sites or projects which require funding; and makes this publicly accessible so that Members, community groups and the general public can find and support local projects near to them.	No	We recognise the benefits of this in line with the Scrutiny recommendation, however it would unfortunately require a significant amount of specialist officer time to coordinate, design, deliver and for ongoing review which is currently not budgeted or has identified officer capacity for. An option might be linked to the recent introduction of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) and this might be able to provide funding for much of the habitat enhancement projects required in future years.
2) That the Council explores how volunteer coordination could be delivered within existing resource as part of the Council's core 'business as usual'.	In Part	There will be ongoing work by the ODS Countryside Team to facilitate volunteering opportunities where possible as part of their day-to-day work, and also through the City Council's Green Spaces team with Friends of park groups.  It would be challenging to expand this further without additional resource as the majority of people tend to volunteer at the weekends when there isn't dedicated resource. Officers would be able to continue to explore external funding opportunities that may link to this.

<p>3) That the Council reviews the structure of its contracts with Oxford Direct Services in relation to parks and green space management in the longer-term, to ensure that there is clarity within those contracts as to whether the management of parks and green spaces is led by prescriptive inputs (certain amount of work over a defined period of time) or outputs (supporting, protecting and enhancing biodiversity).</p>	No	<p>There is a high level of commitment and expertise within ODS around the management of the green spaces for biodiversity. The OCC Biodiversity Review for its green spaces provides the Council's agreed approach and highlights the many habitat improvement projects and other conservation work successfully delivered over recent years.</p> <p>Whilst creating or completely renewing detailed specification contracts requires a significant amount of resource which isn't currently in place, the Council does have an OCC/ODS Client officer review meeting which might be appropriate to discuss key strategic areas within this.</p>
<p>4) That the Council ensures the most appropriate approach for enhancing biodiversity is taken in its parks and nature areas according to environment on a site-by-site basis – with a focus on the right approach in the right place, rather than a uniform approach across all sites.</p>	Yes	<p>This is very much already in place for the many habitats and other non-recreation and sports areas in OCC's parks and nature areas. This is particularly important in a location like Oxford where there is a significant variation in geology, hydrology and soil types. If managed empathetically these different topographies develop their own distinct habitats, flora and fauna, and thereby increase the overall range of biodiversity.</p>

**To:** Cabinet  
**Date:** 24 January 2024  
**Report of:** Climate and Environment Panel  
**Title of Report:** Retrofit

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

<b>Appendices</b>	
<b>Appendix A</b>	Draft Cabinet response to recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee

### **Introduction and overview**

1. The Climate and Environment Panel met on 29 November 2023 to consider a Scrutiny-commissioned item on Retrofit. 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) and Tina Mould (Head of Sustainability) for attending the meeting to present and answer questions.

### **Summary and recommendations**

3. Councillor Anna Railton, Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford and Climate Justice delivered a presentation which set out an overview of issues including

FutureFit Oxford and Pioneering Places, on which the Council was anticipating a decision on grant funding imminently; Clean Heat Streets; Planning (permitted development) and Air Source Heat Pumps; the Council's Retrofit campaign; Social Housing Decarbonisation Fund; and retrofit of the Council's property portfolio.

4. The Panel asked a range of questions, including questions relating to the technical complexity of retrofit and how it could be demystified to encourage public engagement and uptake; promotion of and response to the Council's Retrofit campaign; community retrofit schemes; lessons learned from retrofit undertaken by the universities on listed buildings; and use of solar tiles.
5. During discussion, the Panel noted that the aim of the Council's Retrofit campaign was to make the topic of retrofit and the options available more easily digestible by the public; the Panel was interested in how information could be disseminated simply at scale to encourage retrofit uptake at scale. The Panel also recognised the importance of two-way communication in relation to retrofit; and that it would be useful for the Council to maintain a list of community groups and areas in the city where residents were interested in community retrofit measures, so that opportunities could be shared.

***Recommendation 1: That the Council, through its current Retrofit campaign and any future initiatives, ensures a focus on simplification and demystification of retrofit so that the options and processes are easily digestible by the public – thus encouraging uptake at scale.***

***Recommendation 2: That the Council ensures an emphasis on two-way communication in relation to retrofit and maintains a list of interested community groups and areas of the city where residents are interested in community retrofit schemes, so that relevant information, intelligence and opportunities can be shared.***

6. The Panel also discussed the possibility of the Council sharing a list of suppliers and/or installers of retrofit with residents via its communication channels. The Panel was clear that any list should not act as an accreditation or 'stamp of approval' from the Council for various suppliers, as this was outside the remit of the Council and any supplier issues could damage the Council's reputation, but simply sharing information about which suppliers are in the market (as other councils such as Cambridge and Bath had done).

***Recommendation 3: That the Council compiles a list of local retrofit suppliers/installers to share publicly so that residents can see which suppliers are in the retrofit market.***

Report author	Alice Courtney
Job title	Scrutiny Officer
Service area or department	Law and Governance
Telephone	01865 529834

e-mail

[acourtney@oxford.gov.uk](mailto: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 29 November 2023 concerning the Retrofit item presented at the meeting. The Cabinet is asked to amend and agree a formal response as appropriate.

39

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Agree?</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<p>1) That the Council, through its current Retrofit campaign and any future initiatives, ensures a focus on simplification and demystification of retrofit so that the options and processes are easily digestible by the public – thus encouraging uptake at scale.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Council is delivering projects that aim to test retrofit solutions and give the public the opportunity to experience ‘living examples’ via open house events to see heat pumps and other retrofit solutions in situ. Two particular projects of note are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <a href="#">Clean Heat Streets</a> project seeks to install up to 90 Air Source Heat Pumps in Rose Hill and Iffley. The project offers residents the opportunity to see heat pump installations and interact with heat pump ‘champions’ in the local community. The project also works with a ‘local convenor’ who offers one-on-one support for residents through their retrofit journey, and provides clear, simple advice.</li> <li>• The <b>House Like Mine</b> Project focusses on supporting residents, those on low income, and both Council and private tenants. The project also supports private landlords who house 32.2% of those that live in Oxford and therefore are a key</li> </ul>

		<p>stakeholder group to encourage retrofit solutions. The Council has created a <a href="#">webpage</a> specifically to help these groups access advice and support for different types of retrofitting and grant opportunities, short films showcasing work already completed and actionable support to find an installer.</p> <p>The Council joint funds the Better Housing Better Health (BHBH) service with Oxfordshire County Council and the other districts. BHBH is a one-stop shop for energy advice. BHBH help us to administer and promote energy efficiency upgrade grants such as the Energy Company Obligation (ECO) scheme and the Great British Insulation Scheme (GBIS). We work together as a partnership to create useful materials on how to access grant funding and they offer support to residents with the grant application process.</p> <p>The Council is severely constrained in terms of funding and resource to offer deeper engagement in these areas. To combat these limitations, the Council leverages information and advice compiled by others via national entities such as the Energy Saving Trust, and at a local level, groups such as Low Carbon Hub, and other likeminded groups to disseminate information and offer support and advice.</p>
<p>2) That the Council ensures an emphasis on two-way communication in relation to retrofit and maintains a list of interested community groups and areas of the city where residents are interested in community retrofit schemes, so that relevant information, intelligence and opportunities can be shared.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Community engagement does take place via project work and in our work with several community groups who have an interest in community retrofit schemes. These groups include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communities for Zero Carbon</li> <li>• Oxford Local Carbon</li> <li>• Low Carbon Oxford North</li> </ul>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Environmental Action Florence Park</li> <li>• Rose Hill &amp; Iffley Low Carbon</li> <li>• Low Carbon Oxford South</li> <li>• Low Carbon West Oxford</li> <li>• Friends of the Earth Oxfordshire</li> </ul> <p>The Council has engaged with these groups and provided advice and support to community-based retrofit initiatives in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Helped secure funding for community-based retrofit projects - e.g. Eco Open Doors event, which allows people to find and visit their neighbours to see what retrofit means in a local context.</li> <li>• Assisted with promotion of community-based events and projects that focus on retrofit.</li> <li>• Assisted with dissemination of the Housewarming Guides – simplified and easy to use handbooks for retrofitting in Oxford, produced by Low Carbon Oxford North.</li> </ul> <p>Clean Heat Streets has worked closely with the Rose Hill and Iffley Low Carbon Group to provide a targeted community-based approach and keep retrofit knowledge at the centre of the community.</p> <p>Engagement work to promote grant funding is ongoing and includes staff presentations at community outreach events such as the 50+ Network event and the Community Links Oxfordshire event. Staff also work in partnership with BBC Radio Oxford on their cost-of-living clinics in-person at Templars Square and attend food larders to talk to</p>
--	--	---

		residents about grants.
3) That the Council compiles a list of local retrofit suppliers/installers to share publicly so that residents can see which suppliers are in the retrofit market.	No	<p>The Council works with Low Carbon Hub who in turn work with CosyHomes who offer a number of retrofit services in Oxfordshire. More information is available <a href="#">here</a>.</p> <p>Additionally, the Council's <a href="#">website</a> gives signposted service to organisations who assess installers such as TrustMark, and the <a href="#">MCS certified installers list</a>, where one can search via one's region to locate a suitable installer.</p> <p>Oxford City Council works in partnership with Better Housing Better Health to provide energy efficiency advice and access to grant funding for retrofit works. BHBH is run by the National Energy Foundation (NEF). NEF has a supplier network where TrustMark registered installers can be linked up to residents who qualify for funding such as ECO. The Council works with NEF to encourage suppliers to work with NEF and has requested NEF make this list public.</p> <p>A countywide source is the Climate Action Oxfordshire website offering a range of carbon cutting solutions including retrofit – it too signposts visitors to the site to local suppliers/organisations – e.g. this <a href="#">webpage</a> for loft insulation or this <a href="#">webpage</a> for energy assessments. The main energy <a href="#">homepage</a> offers other options too.</p>