

Supplement for

Cabinet

On **Wednesday 13 March 2024** At **6.00 pm**

Agenda Item 7 - Scrutiny Reports

Contents

7. **Scrutiny Reports**

3 - 24

The Scrutiny Committee met on 4 March 2024 and the Housing and Homelessness Panel will meet on 7 March 2024.

The following reports are expected, together with any other recommendations from those meetings:

- Oxfordshire Food Strategy Action Plan
- Request for Exceptional Circumstances Relief from the Community Infrastructure Levy
- Allocation of Preventing Homelessness Budget 2024/25
- Corporate Key Performance Indicator Review
- ~~Biodiversity Net Gain~~
- ~~Citywide Retrofit Strategy~~

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: 13 March 2024
Report of: Scrutiny Committee
Title of Report: Oxfordshire Food Strategy – City Action Plan

| 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 Louise Upton, Cabinet Member for Planning and Healthier Communities |
| Corporate Priority: | Enable an Inclusive Economy; Support Thriving Communities; 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 Scrutiny Committee met on 04 March 2024 to consider a report concerning the Oxfordshire Food Strategy – City Action Plan. The report, which is due for Cabinet consideration on 13 March 2024, recommends that Cabinet agrees the City Food Action Plan, delegates authority to the Executive Director (Communities and People) in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Healthier Communities to make any amendments to the Action Plan which are necessary following approval by other local authority partners and delegates authority to the Executive Director (Communities and People) to negotiate and enter into the necessary grant agreements to deliver the City Food Action Plan.

2. The Committee would like to thank Hagan Lewisman (Active Communities Manager) and Tom Garrod (Zero Carbon Oxford Officer) for attending the meeting to answer questions.

Summary and recommendations

3. Hagan Lewisman, Active Communities Manager introduced the report. The Oxfordshire Food Strategy was endorsed by Cabinet in June 2022 and there was a commitment to submit a more detailed action plan in due course. This report fulfilled that commitment. The City Food Action Plan had been developed in partnership and formed part of a systemwide response to address food security.
4. The Committee asked a range of questions, including questions relating to the variety of fruit and veg available at food larders; the provision of hot meals for elderly residents; the Town Hall policy for leftover food from events; sustainability; deliverability of the Action Plan; and priority areas for activity.
5. In particular, Members noted that there was often a lack of variety of the fruit and veg on offer at food larders. The Committee agreed that variety was important and the Council should work with local food larders to ensure more variety. It was noted that a study had recently been undertaken at Oxford City Farm in relation to mothers and the impact of the cost of living crisis, the findings of which the Council could draw upon to inform this work.

Recommendation 1: That the Council engages with local food larders with a view to improving the variety of fruit and veg available, having regard to the outcome of the recent study undertaken at Oxford City Farm in relation to mothers and the impact of the cost of living crisis.

6. Members also highlighted numerous experiences of leftover food from events hosted at the Town Hall being unable to be redistributed to other organisations such as food larders in order to prevent food waste. Instead, leftover food was thrown away. The Committee felt strongly that the Council should be leading by example in relation to reducing food waste and the Town Hall policy should be reviewed and amended so that leftover food did not go to waste going forward.

Recommendation 2: That the Council reviews its policy in relation to the management of leftover food from Town Hall events so that it does not go to waste.

7. During discussion on sustainability, the Committee noted there was often a focus on reducing food miles when considering lessening the environmental impact of the food system. However, the Committee agreed that reducing food waste and making diet changes (e.g. eating more plants) were far more impactful in terms of positive impact on the environment. It was agreed that the Council should be promoting the latter two factors.

Recommendation 3: That the Council promotes reducing food waste and encouraging diet change as the most impactful factors from a climate perspective, as well as reducing food miles.

8. The Committee discussed larger generators of food waste within the City, such as restaurants, and noted that more could be done in relation to working with those organisations to collect and redistribute food which would otherwise go to waste. Members highlighted that there were some active members of the community already seeking to address this and the Council could work with those individuals in order to effect change. The Committee agreed that an action related to this should be added to the Action Plan.

Recommendation 4: That the Council, working with the community, explores options for the collection of food waste from larger generators of food waste within the city and distribution among food larders; and adds this to the City Action Plan.

9. The Action Plan identified several priority areas for activity within the City that were set at the ward level. However, the Committee pointed out that there were various pockets of deprivation across Oxford that were at the sub-ward level and were not captured within the priority areas already identified. The Committee was of the view that the ward level did not accurately reflect the levels of deprivation across the City and agreed that this should be reviewed so that priority areas were set at sub-ward levels.

Recommendation 5: That the Council re-evaluates the priority areas of the city where activity will take place set out in the City Action Plan, which are currently set at the ward level, with a view to setting priority areas at a sub-ward level to more accurately reflect levels and pockets of deprivation across the City.

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| 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 March 2024 concerning the Oxfordshire Food Strategy – City Action Plan. The Cabinet is asked to amend and agree a formal response as appropriate.

| Recommendation | Agree? | Comment |
|--|---------------|---|
| 1) That the Council engages with local food larders with a view to improving the variety of fruit and veg available, having regard to the outcome of the recent study undertaken at Oxford City Farm in relation to mothers and the impact of the cost of living crisis. | Yes | The Council has been supporting the local food larders by initiatives such as funding fridges and fridge-freezers, with campaigns to donate food produce, by providing a low cost community van to help with logistics, through supplying Household Support Fund when available and through our partnership work with SOFEA on the food pipeline. We will continue to explore opportunities to support food larders and help increase the range of fruit and vegetable offered. |
| 2) That the Council reviews its policy in relation to the management of leftover food from Town Hall events so that it does not go to waste. | Yes | The Town Hall management team are working with the current caterer on reducing food waste and further opportunities around this. Currently the caterer works with the customer in advance on their food requirements, trying to ensure that minimal cooked food is left over and that all uncooked food will be re-used within their business. |
| 3) That the Council promotes reducing food waste and encouraging diet change as the most impactful factors from a climate perspective, as well as reducing food miles. | In Part | We believe that this is mostly covered in the City Food Action Plan within the third item under the heading of 'Build vibrant food communities with the capacity and skills to enjoy food together'. The lead organisation is GFO and the Council can provide a supporting role. |
| 4) That the Council, working with the community, explores options for the collection of food waste from larger generators of food waste within the city and distribution among food larders; and adds this to the City Action Plan. | No | Whilst this is a positive aspiration, there is a real risk that this is something that becomes particularly resource intensive given the scale of the ask both to the Council and to the wider system. As such it is likely to put |

| | | |
|--|---------|---|
| | | delivery of the action plan at risk. |
| 5) That the Council re-evaluates the priority areas of the city where activity will take place set out in the City Action Plan, which are currently set at the ward level, with a view to setting priority areas at a sub-ward level to more accurately reflect levels and pockets of deprivation across the City. | In Part | For some actions a citywide focus is appropriate, however for others a much more targeted approach is already advocated. For example, under 'Tackle food poverty and diet-related ill-health' the outcome on item 1 is 'Better understanding of the drivers of food insecurity at a hyper-local level enables targeted interventions and reduction in food insecurity'. We will continue to target resources to where they are most needed where we have capacity to enable it. |

To: Cabinet
Date: 13 March 2024
Report of: Scrutiny Committee
Title of Report: Request for Exceptional Circumstances Relief from the Community Infrastructure Levy

| 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 Louise Upton, Cabinet Member for Planning and Healthier Communities |
| Corporate Priority: | Enable an Inclusive Economy; Support Thriving Communities; 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 Scrutiny Committee met on 04 March 2024 to consider a report concerning a Request for Exceptional Circumstances Relief from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The report, which is due for Cabinet consideration on 13 March 2024, recommends that Cabinet approves the award of Discretionary Exceptional Circumstances Relief for CIL on the BMW Mini Plant and delegates authority to the Head of Planning & Regulatory Services to make any necessary minor corrections not materially affecting the report and to send the recommended outcome in writing to the claimant, as required by Regulation 57(7) of the CIL Regulations (as amended).

2. The Committee would like to thank David Butler (Head of Planning & Regulatory Services), Lorraine Freeman (CIL, Data Analysis and Reporting Team Leader) and Lan Nguyen (Senior Data Analyst) for attending the meeting to answer questions.

Summary and recommendations

3. David Butler, Head of Planning & Regulatory Services introduced the report, which provided the background to substantial upgrades to the existing BMW Cowley plant proposed under planning application 23/02166/FUL which was approved in December 2023 and set out the rationale for the recommendation to award Discretionary Exceptional Circumstances Relief (DECR) for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charge on the development.
4. The Committee asked a range of questions, including questions relating to the value of the proposed CIL exemption compared to the overall value of the project; the valuation judgement; the weight afforded to the environmental impact of electric vehicles being made in Oxford versus elsewhere; the likelihood of BMW pursuing the project if the Council did not grant a CIL exemption; subsidies; whether the Council was working with BMW in relation to investment in public electric vehicle infrastructure; similar CIL relief granted by other local authorities; legal risk in relation to equality of treatment of other local employers in relation to CIL exemption; and the positive impacts of the proposed development on the local and regional economy.
5. In particular, the Committee noted that the value of the proposed CIL exemption (£832,421) compared to the overall value of the project was insignificant, amounting to less than 0.1% of the total project cost. As such, the Committee was of the view that whether or not the CIL exemption was granted by the Cabinet would have very little bearing on whether or not BMW chose to pursue the already unviable project. The Committee agreed that the Cabinet should have regard to this fact in reaching its decision.

Recommendation 1: That the Cabinet, in the making of its decision, has regard to the relative insignificance of the value of the proposed CIL exemption compared to the overall project viability gap and thus the limited impact that the CIL exemption, if agreed, would have on influencing and/or changing the behaviour or intentions of BMW.

6. In addition, the Committee discussed the availability of other subsidies provided by other organisations (e.g. Central Government) and agreed that the Cabinet should have regard to this during consideration of whether or not to grant the CIL exemption, as other subsidies were available external to the Council.

Recommendation 2: That the Cabinet, in the making of its decision, has regard to the existence of other entities that are able to provide subsidies of a similar scale, in particular Central Government.

7. The Committee noted that, if the CIL exemption was agreed, there would be no funding from the development provided through CIL to mitigate the impact of the development. The Committee agreed that it should the CIL exemption be granted,

the Council should ask BMW to provide a statement as to how it would mitigate the impact of the development without the use of CIL, given that it would be a significant development.

Recommendation 3: That the Council, should the CIL exemption be approved by Cabinet, asks BMW to provide a statement setting out how it will mitigate the impact of the development without the use of CIL monies.

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| 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 March 2024 concerning the Request for Exceptional Circumstances Relief from the Community Infrastructure Levy. 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 Cabinet, in the making of its decision, has regard to the relative insignificance of the value of the proposed CIL exemption compared to the overall project viability gap and thus the limited impact that the CIL exemption, if agreed, would have on influencing and/or changing the behaviour or intentions of BMW. | No | Consideration of the value of the subsidy is mandated as part of the Subsidy Control Act and so it already forms part of the decision-making process. |
| 2) That the Cabinet, in the making of its decision, has regard to the existence of other entities that are able to provide subsidies of a similar scale, in particular Central Government. | No | The application for exceptional relief relates specifically here to the CIL liability, and no other body would be able to grant such an exemption. |
| 3) That the Council, should the CIL exemption be approved by Cabinet, asks BMW to provide a statement setting out how it will mitigate the impact of the development without the use of CIL monies. | Yes | CIL money is not used to mitigate impacts of a specific development (CIL should not be confused with Section 106 agreements that specify measures in relation to specific planning applications). Nevertheless, and noting that the statement is not a requirement of the Relief process, this will be requested of the applicant. |

This page is intentionally left blank

To: Cabinet
Date: 13 March 2024
Report of: Housing and Homelessness Panel
Title of Report: Allocation of Preventing Homelessness Grant 2024/25

| 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: | Support Thriving Communities; Enable an Inclusive Economy |
| Policy Framework: | Housing, Homelessness & Rough Sleeping Strategy 2023-28; Asset Management Strategy |
| 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 07 March 2024 to consider a report on the Allocation of Preventing Homelessness Grant 2024/25. The report, which is due for Cabinet consideration on 13 March 2024, recommends that Cabinet approves the allocation of the Preventing Homelessness Budget and identified Housing Revenue Account funds to commission homelessness services in 2024/25 as detailed in Table 1 of the report; approves a commitment of £798,532 from the Preventing Homelessness budget to fund supported accommodation provision from Matilda House for the period of 01 September 2024 to 31 March 2027; approves the Council entering into the lease of the Floyds Row premises to St Mungo's on the basis set out in the report; and various delegations of authority.

2. The Panel would like to thank Councillor Linda Smith (Cabinet Member for Housing), Richard Wood (Housing Strategy and Needs Manager), Ossi Mosley (Rough Sleeping & Single Homelessness Manager) and Francesca Barr (Senior Rough Sleeping Officer) for attending the meeting to present and answer questions.

Summary and recommendations

3. Cllr L Smith, Cabinet Member for Housing introduced the report; this report was submitted to Cabinet annually and set out the scale of the work the Council did to realise its ambition of nobody having to sleep rough in the City.
4. The Panel asked a range of questions, including questions relating to Oxfordshire Homelessness Alliance funding; the lease for Floyds Row; the impact of the services which were due to be cut; women's homelessness provision; the impact of inflationary pressures on the budget and service delivery; the Council's engagement with Central Government to highlight key issues relevant to Homelessness Services; and Severe Weather Emergency Protocol (SWEP) funding.
5. In particular, the Panel queried what happened to SWEP funds in the event that there was an underspend in any given year. The Panel was advised that funds could be moved around between different budgets or rolled forward to the following year; the money was always spent in one way or another. In discussion, the Panel agreed that SWEP funding was vital and should be earmarked exclusively for SWEP purposes; as such it should be rolled forward to future years if there was any underspend, as this would help ensure financial resilience for that provision.

Recommendation 1: That the Council carries forward any underspend in SWEP funds to the next financial year, specifically earmarked for SWEP to ensure financial resilience of that vital provision.

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| 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 07 March 2024 concerning the Allocation of Preventing Homelessness Grant 2024/25. The Cabinet is asked to amend and agree a formal response as appropriate.

17

| Recommendation | Agree? | Comment |
|--|---------------|--|
| 1) That the Council carries forward any underspend in SWEP funds to the next financial year, specifically earmarked for SWEP to ensure financial resilience of that vital provision. | In Part | In the event of the £30,000 budget for Severe Weather Emergency Protocol (SWEP) being underspent in any year, the intention would be to use this money to cover any other in-year overspends on Preventing Homelessness Grant (PHG) funded services, or to fund similar services in-year for homeless people, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and the Head of Financial Services (Section 151 Officer). If there are no such pressures, an option will be to recommend to Cabinet and Council a carry forward of the budget to next year's PHG budget to use for SWEP or other services, but this would be subject to the approval of the Head of Financial Services, who has to consider the impact on the wider Council budget. |

This page is intentionally left blank

To: Cabinet
Date: 13 March 2024
Report of: Finance and Performance Panel
Title of Report: Corporate Key Performance Indicator Review

| 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: | Councillor James Fry, Panel Chair |
| Cabinet Member: | Councillor Susan Brown, Leader of the Council |
| Corporate Priority: | All |
| Policy Framework: | Draft Corporate Strategy 2024-28 |
| 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 Finance and Performance Panel met on 22 January 2024 to receive a presentation related to the Corporate Key Performance Indicator (KPI) Review. 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 Cllr Susan Brown (Leader of the Council), Mish Tullar (Head of Corporate Strategy) and Sally Hicks (Business Intelligence Unit Lead) for attending the meeting to present and answer questions.

Summary and recommendations

3. Cllr Brown, Leader of the Council introduced the item; the development of corporate KPIs was in the very early stages and was being done alongside development of the draft Corporate Strategy 2024-28.

4. The Panel raised a number of points and made various suggestions for consideration as part of the development of corporate KPIs. During discussion around the 'number of affordable homes completed in the year by Oxford City Council' KPI, the Panel noted that the term 'affordable homes' was not necessarily widely understood by residents and communities. There was also a distinction between affordable and social homes, which the Panel agreed should be drawn out within the measure. In addition, the Panel noted that the Council had significant levers to influence the number of homes delivered within Oxford over and above those delivered directly by the Council. As such, the Panel was of the view that the KPI should be expanded to include a figure for direct delivery and a figure for total delivery across Oxford as a whole.

Recommendation 1: That the Council splits the KPI related to 'number of affordable homes completed in Oxford in the year by Oxford City Council' into number of social homes completed and number of affordable homes completed; and expands the measure to include number of homes completed by the Council (direct delivery) versus the number of homes completed overall across the city (total delivery).

5. In relation to the 'number of Oxford Living Wage employers' KPI, the Panel agreed that reporting an abstract number was not helpful as it did not provide any context. The Panel suggested that this KPI should be presented as a percentage of total employers across Oxford, or given a specific denominator so that the measure was meaningful.

Recommendation 2: That the Council contextualises the KPI related to 'number of Oxford Living Wage employers' by presenting that figure as a percentage or including a specific denominator.

6. When discussing the KPI related to 'number of Community Employment Plans which third parties commit to', that Panel agreed that it was important to drill down into that figure in order to show how many jobs had been created locally as a result of those Plans, as this would add context.

Recommendation 3: That the Council expands the KPI related to 'number of Community Employment Plans which third parties commit to' to also include the number of jobs created as a result of those Community Employment Plans.

7. The Panel considered the KPI related to 'number of children leaving primary school who are able to swim a length' and had a discussion around whether this measure was the best proxy for drawing out and tackling inequalities. It was noted that other measures may be more appropriate in terms of indicators of deprivation; and that the Council should engage with Oxford and District Action on Child Poverty to explore existing measures which could feed into the KPIs under the 'Thriving Communities' priority. It was noted that addressing the causes of poverty was largely outside of the Council's control.

Recommendation 4: That the Council engages with Oxford and District Action on Child Poverty to explore appropriate measures of deprivation which already exist and could feed into the KPIs under the 'Thriving Communities' priority, noting that addressing the causes of poverty is largely outside the Council's control.

8. In relation to KPIs under the ‘Zero Carbon Oxford’ priority, the Panel noted that the KPI related to ‘Oxford greenhouse gas emissions measured by the Government tracking towards net zero by 2040’ was influenced by a number of different things, not all of which were in the Council’s control. The Panel felt that this should be recognised by splitting this KPI into emissions which were in the Council’s direct control, those which the Council had some influence over and those which were not within the Council’s control.

Recommendation 5: That the Council splits the KPI related to ‘Oxford greenhouse gas emissions measured by Government tracking towards net zero by 2040’ into the Council’s own emissions, emissions within the city that the Council has a degree of influence over and emissions within the city that are outside the Council’s control.

9. The Panel noted the proposal not to have a corporate level KPI related to air quality. However, given the Council had a statutory responsibility in relation to air quality, the Panel was of the view that it would be appropriate for a KPI related to air quality to sit at the corporate level.

Recommendation 6: That the Council includes a corporate KPI related to air quality.

10. In relation to the KPI related to ‘percentage of ethnic minority staff in total workforce’, the Panel agreed that this measure would be much more meaningful if it focused on the pay gap, rather than the percentage of staff. The Panel further discussed that it would be helpful if this KPI was broadened out to consider the range of equality, diversity and inclusion issues (e.g. gender, disability, sexual orientation).

Recommendation 7: That the Council reframes the KPI related to ‘percentage of ethnic minority staff in total workforce’ to focus on pay gap; and broadens out the KPI to focus on a wider range of equality, diversity and inclusion issues.

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| 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 Finance and Performance Panel of the Scrutiny Committee

The document sets out the draft response of the Cabinet Member to recommendations made by the Finance and Performance Panel on 22 January 2024 concerning the Corporate Key Performance Indicator Review. The Cabinet is asked to amend and agree a formal response as appropriate.

23

| Recommendation | Agree? | Comment |
|--|---------------|---|
| 1) That the Council splits the KPI related to 'number of affordable homes completed in Oxford in the year by Oxford City Council' into number of social homes completed and number of affordable homes completed; and expands the measure to include number of homes completed by the Council (direct delivery) versus the number of homes completed overall across the city (total delivery). | | The 'number of affordable homes completed in Oxford in the year' - which includes all social rented and shared ownership housing - is felt to be the best overarching figure for a Corporate Level KPI. However, the other subsets of this measure referenced will also be included at Service Level. |
| 2) That the Council contextualises the KPI related to 'number of Oxford Living Wage employers' by presenting that figure as a percentage or including a specific denominator. | | As discussed, we ask for this information and hope to be able to provide it in future. |
| 3) That the Council expands the KPI related to 'number of Community Employment Plans which third parties commit to' to also include the number of jobs created as a result of those Community Employment Plans. | | This is a relatively new initiative, with the key initial focus being to create as many Community Employment Plans as possible. Over time, the economic development team plans to source and publish information on the number of jobs created. |
| 4) That the Council engages with Oxford and District Action on Child Poverty to explore appropriate measures of deprivation which already exist and could feed into the KPIs under the 'Thriving Communities' priority, noting that addressing the causes of poverty is largely outside the Council's control. | | The KPIs for the Thriving Community priority are still under development and the recommendations of the Scrutiny Panel comments are noted. |
| 5) That the Council splits the KPI related to 'Oxford | | The KPIs proposed already include both: i) City Council |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>greenhouse gas emissions measured by Government tracking towards net zero by 2040' into the Council's own emissions, emissions within the city that the Council has a degree of influence over and emissions within the city that are outside the Council's control.</p> | | <p>GHG emissions tonnes pa – tracking towards zero by 2030 and ii) Oxford GHG emissions measured by Government tracking towards zero by 2040.</p> |
| <p>6) That the Council includes a corporate KPI related to air quality.</p> | | <p>Air quality will continue to be measured and the data published at service level, however this won't be one of the three Corporate KPIs for Zero Carbon Oxford. Rather it is proposed that in addition to the two carbon measures – Council and City - there will be a metric around residents' satisfaction with parks and green spaces.</p> |
| <p>7) That the Council reframes the KPI related to 'percentage of ethnic minority staff in total workforce' to focus on pay gap; and broadens out the KPI to focus on a wider range of equality, diversity and inclusion issues.</p> | | <p>Each year the Council publishes a significant number of measures around its inclusive employment practices, including the representation of different groups within the workforce and pay gaps. With just one of these measures to be selected as a Corporate KPI for Well Run Council, it is felt the percentage of ethnic minority staff in the total workforce is the right one.</p> |