

Agenda

www.oxford.gov.uk



Cabinet

Date: **Thursday 3 October 2019**

Time: **6.00 pm**

Place: **Freemen's Room - Oxford Town Hall**

For any further information please contact:

John Mitchell, Committee and Member Services Officer

Telephone: 01865252217

Email: jmitchell@oxford.gov.uk

Details of how City Councillors and members of the public may engage with this meeting may be found on page 7 of this agenda.

As a matter of courtesy, if you intend to record the meeting please let the Committee Services Officer know how you wish to do this before the start of the meeting.

Cabinet

Membership

Chair/ Leader	Councillor Susan Brown	Leader of the Council, Cabinet Member for Economic Development and Partnerships
Vice Chair/ Deputy Leader	Councillor Linda Smith	Deputy Leader (Statutory), Cabinet Member for Leisure and Housing
	Councillor Ed Turner	Deputy Leader, Cabinet Member for Finance and Asset Management
	Councillor Nigel Chapman	Cabinet Member for Safer Communities and Customer Focused Services
	Councillor Mary Clarkson	Cabinet Member for Culture and City Centre
	Councillor Tom Hayes	Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford
	Councillor Alex Hollingsworth	Cabinet Member for Planning and Sustainable Transport
	Councillor Mike Rowley	Cabinet Member for Affordable Housing
	Councillor Marie Tidball	Cabinet Member for Supporting Local Communities
	Councillor Louise Upton	Cabinet Member for Healthy Oxford

The quorum for this meeting is three, substitutes are not allowed.

Future items to be discussed by the Cabinet can be found on the Forward Plan which is available on the Council's [website](#)

Copies of this agenda

Reference copies are available to consult in the Town Hall Reception. Agendas are published 6 working days before the meeting and the draft minutes a few days after.

All agendas, reports and minutes are available online and can be:

- viewed on our website – mycouncil.oxford.gov.uk
- downloaded from our website
- viewed using the computers in the Customer Services, St Aldate's, or
- subscribed to electronically by registering online at mycouncil.oxford.gov.uk

AGENDA

PART ONE PUBLIC BUSINESS

Pages

- 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
- 2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
- 3 ADDRESSES AND QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC
- 4 COUNCILLOR ADDRESSES ON ANY ITEM FOR DECISION ON THE BOARD'S AGENDA
- 5 COUNCILLOR ADDRESSES ON NEIGHBOURHOOD ISSUES
- 6 ITEMS RAISED BY BOARD MEMBERS
- 7 SCRUTINY COMMITTEE REPORT

Scrutiny Committee will consider the Commissioning of Services at Floyds Row item at its meeting on 01 October. Any recommendations to Cabinet flowing from that meeting will be published as a supplement to this agenda.

- 8 COMMISSIONING OF SERVICES AT FLOYDS ROW

9 - 30

Lead Member: Deputy Leader (Statutory) - Leisure and Housing (Councillor Linda Smith)

The Head of Housing has submitted a report to seek approval to increase the capital budget envelope for the Floyds Row project; to delegate authority to commission further capital works; and to commission the service contract to operate services from this new project.

Recommendations: Cabinet is recommended to:

1. **Recommend** that Council revise the capital budget for this project, to take the capital envelope of the project to £1,892,300, including contingencies, as outlined in Appendix 3 Option A, increasing the budget by £1,134k. Noting grant funding already secured of £275k capital funding from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG), and £100k from Public Health England, which will reduce the funding requirement from the Council's 2019/20 capital

programme accordingly, and noting that additional external funding contributions are being progressed from a variety of sources, including the MHCLG; Oxfordshire District and County Councils; the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group and other charitable sources;

2.**Recommend** that Council make budget provision for the gross revenue costs of providing Floyds Row in the sum of £1.069 million in 2019-20 funded by grants and contributions;

3.**Delegate** authority to the Assistant Chief Executive, in consultation with the Head of Finance and Head of Law and Governance, to enter into contracts to complete the full capital works to convert the building (phases 1 and 2), on the basis that in the opinion of the Head of Finance, that this continues to represent best value;

4.**Delegate** authority to the Regeneration and Major Projects Service Manager, in consultation with the Heads of Housing and Finance, to enter into a lease of Floyds Row for a peppercorn rent, on the basis as summarised in this report;

5.**Delegate** authority to the Head of Housing, to enter into a Service Contract as set out in this report, for the delivery of services at Floyds Row from 1st April 2020 to 31st March 2021,

6.**Note** that the current Street Outreach Team contract with the Council will be varied to include the interim service arrangements (worth c.£400k) up to end March 2020 within existing budget and funding envelopes;

7.**Delegate** authority to the Head of Housing to undertake the re-procurement of the Street Outreach and Floyds Row commissioned services during 2020/21, noting a further report will be brought to Cabinet in late 2020, to recommend the award of contract; and the annual report on rough sleeping and single homelessness commissioning spend, will be brought to Cabinet in March 2020;

8.**Agree** to provide the grant funding proposed in this report in order to facilitate the initial trial period of operation of the Floyds Row assessment centre; and

9.**Note** the progress with the development of this venue and new services, as part of a wider transformation programme. Noting that interim Somewhere Safe to Stay and Winter Shelter services will commence from Simon House from late October 2019, with some services moving to Floyds Row in January 2020, with the current programme expecting the completion of Floyds Row by end March 2020.

9 MINUTES

31 - 36

Recommendation: That Cabinet resolves to APPROVE the minutes of the meeting held on 11 September 2019 as a true and accurate record.

10 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Meetings are scheduled for the following dates:

- 09 October 2019
- 13 November 2019
- 11 December 2019

All meetings start at 6pm.

DECLARING INTERESTS

General duty

You must declare any disclosable pecuniary interests when the meeting reaches the item on the agenda headed "Declarations of Interest" or as soon as it becomes apparent to you.

What is a disclosable pecuniary interest?

Disclosable pecuniary interests relate to your* employment; sponsorship (ie payment for expenses incurred by you in carrying out your duties as a councillor or towards your election expenses); contracts; land in the Council's area; licences for land in the Council's area; corporate tenancies; and securities. These declarations must be recorded in each councillor's Register of Interests which is publicly available on the Council's website.

Declaring an interest

Where any matter disclosed in your Register of Interests is being considered at a meeting, you must declare that you have an interest. You should also disclose the nature as well as the existence of the interest.

If you have a disclosable pecuniary interest, after having declared it at the meeting you must not participate in discussion or voting on the item and must withdraw from the meeting whilst the matter is discussed.

Member's Code of Conduct and public perception

Even if you do not have a disclosable pecuniary interest in a matter, the Members' Code of Conduct says that a member "must serve only the public interest and must never improperly confer an advantage or disadvantage on any person including yourself" and that "you must not place yourself in situations where your honesty and integrity may be questioned". What this means is that the matter of interests must be viewed within the context of the Code as a whole and regard should continue to be paid to the perception of the public.

*Disclosable pecuniary interests that must be declared are not only those of the member her or himself but also those of the member's spouse, civil partner or person they are living with as husband or wife or as if they were civil partners.

HOW OXFORD CITY COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC CAN ENGAGE AT THE CABINET

Addresses and questions by members of the public, (15 minutes in total)

Members of the public can submit questions in writing about any item for decision at the meeting. Questions, stating the relevant agenda item, must be received by the Head of Law and Governance by 9.30am two clear working day before the meeting (eg for a Tuesday meeting, the deadline would be 9.30am on the Friday before). Questions can be submitted either by letter or by email (to cabinet@oxford.gov.uk).

Answers to the questions will be provided in writing at the meeting; supplementary questions will not be allowed. If it is not possible to provide an answer at the meeting it will be included in the minutes that are published on the Council's website within 2 working days of the meeting.

The Chair has discretion in exceptional circumstances to agree that a submitted question or related statement (dealing with matters that appear on the agenda) can be asked verbally at the meeting. In these cases, the question and/or address is limited to 3 minutes, and will be answered verbally by the Chair or another Cabinet member or an officer of the Council. The text of any proposed address must be submitted within the same timescale as questions.

For this agenda item the Chair's decision is final.

Councillors speaking at meetings

Oxford City councillors may, when the chair agrees, address the Cabinet on an item for decision on the agenda (other than on the minutes). The member seeking to make an address must notify the Head of Law and Governance by 9.30am at least one clear working day before the meeting, stating the relevant agenda items. An address may last for no more than three minutes. If an address is made, the Cabinet member who has political responsibility for the item for decision may respond or the Cabinet will have regard to the points raised in reaching its decision.

Councillors speaking on Neighbourhood issues (10 minutes in total)

Any City Councillor can raise local issues on behalf of communities directly with the Cabinet. The member seeking to make an address must notify the Head of Law and Governance by 9.30am at least one clear working day before the meeting, giving outline details of the issue. Priority will be given to those members who have not already addressed the Cabinet within the year and in the order received. Issues can only be raised once unless otherwise agreed by the Cabinet. The Cabinet's responsibility will be to hear the issue and respond at the meeting, if possible, or arrange a written response within 10 working days.

Items raised by Cabinet members

Such items must be submitted within the same timescale as questions and will be for discussion only and not for a Cabinet decision. Any item which requires a decision of the Cabinet will be the subject of a report to a future meeting of the Cabinet

To: Cabinet
Date: 3 October 2019
Report of: Head of Housing
Title of Report: Floyds Row – Single Homelessness Engagement and Assessment Centre – Approvals for additional capital funding and commissioning the delivery of the services from this new facility

Summary and recommendations	
Purpose of report:	To seek approval to increase the capital budget envelope for the Floyds Row project; to delegate authority to commission further capital works; and to commission the service contract to operate services from this new project.
Key decision:	Yes
Executive Board Member:	Councillor Linda Smith, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Leisure and Housing
Corporate Priority:	Meeting Housing Needs
Policy Framework:	Housing and Homelessness Strategy 2018 to 2021
Recommendations: That Cabinet resolves to:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recommend that Council revise the capital budget for this project, to take the capital envelope of the project to £1,892,300, including contingencies, as outlined in Appendix 3 Option A, increasing the budget by £1,134k. Noting grant funding already secured of £275k capital funding from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG), and £100k from Public Health England, which will reduce the funding requirement from the Council's 2019/20 capital programme accordingly, and noting that additional external funding contributions are being progressed from a variety of sources, including the MHCLG; Oxfordshire District and County Councils; the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group and other charitable sources; 2. Recommend that Council make budget provision for the gross revenue costs of providing Floyds Row in the sum of £1.069 million in 2019-20 funded by grants and contributions; 3. Delegate authority to the Assistant Chief Executive, in consultation with the Head of Finance and Head of Law and Governance, to enter into contracts to complete the full capital works to convert the building (phases 1 and 2), on the basis that in the opinion of the Head of Finance, that this continues to represent best value; 	

4. **Delegate authority** to the Regeneration and Major Projects Service Manager, in consultation with the Heads of Housing and Finance, to enter into a lease of Floyds Row for a peppercorn rent, on the basis as summarised in this report;
5. **Delegate authority** to the Head of Housing, to enter into a Service Contract as set out in this report, for the delivery of services at Floyds Row from 1st April 2020 to 31st March 2021,
6. **Note** that the current Street Outreach Team contract with the Council will be varied to include the interim service arrangements (worth c.£400k) up to end March 2020 within existing budget and funding envelopes;
7. **Delegate authority** to the Head of Housing to undertake the re-procurement of the Street Outreach and Floyds Row commissioned services during 2020/21, noting a further report will be brought to Cabinet in late 2020, to recommend the award of contract; and the annual report on rough sleeping and single homelessness commissioning spend, will be brought to Cabinet in March 2020;
8. **Agree** to provide the grant funding proposed in this report in order to facilitate the initial trial period of operation of the Floyds Row assessment centre; and
9. **Note** the progress with the development of this venue and new services, as part of a wider transformation programme. Noting that interim Somewhere Safe to Stay and Winter Shelter services will commence from Simon House from late October 2019, with some services moving to Floyds Row in January 2020, with the current programme expecting the completion of Floyds Row by end March 2020.

Appendices

Appendix 1	Risk Register
Appendix 2	Equality Impact Assessment
Appendix 3	Financial Analysis and Comparability Statement of Proposed Options

Introduction and Background

1. This report provides an update to Cabinet on the continued progress of the development of Floyds Row, as the venue for the delivery of a new engagement and assessment centre for rough sleepers and single homeless people. Project Approval was given at City Executive Board on 10th April 2019, and the CEB recommendation to amend the initial capital budget for the project was agreed at Council.
2. As with other areas of the country, Oxfordshire has seen a dramatic increase in the numbers of rough sleepers on its streets. Whilst rough sleeping is most visible in Oxford where the majority of services are provided, single homelessness is experienced – and its' impacts felt - across the county. Quarterly street counts carried out by Oxford City Council continue to show that whilst the number of people

sleeping rough fluctuates, the general trend remains high and most people sleeping rough in the city do not have a connection to Oxford.

3. The high number of rough sleepers and people at risk of rough sleeping calls for a rapid and effective response. On average, over the past year, the City's outreach team have identified 20 individuals each month who were brand new to rough sleeping in Oxford, with this sometimes being much higher – 42 in May 2019. The human cost of rough sleeping is severe; the average age of death for a person who dies whilst living on the streets or in homeless accommodation is 47 years old compared to 77 for the general population. A high and increasing proportion of people sleeping rough and accommodated in the Adult Homeless Pathway are experiencing multiple disadvantage, including drug and alcohol dependency and mental health issues.
4. The Oxfordshire councils and the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group have already recognised that there is a need to work together to tackle this issue, and build on the current joint commissioning arrangements to review needs and services across the county and develop a strategy for rough sleeping and single homelessness in Oxfordshire. The City Council and District Council partners have committed through successive funding bids to delivering the government's ambition to halve rough sleeping by 2022 and end it by 2027. The successful bids to Rough Sleeping Initiative (RSI) and Rapid Rehousing Pathway (RRP) funding submitted by Oxford City Council and Cherwell District Council on behalf of partner authorities, have helped to develop more co-ordinated services for persons sleeping rough or at risk of homelessness.
5. In Oxford, the City Council's successful bid for (RSI) funding has already delivered positive results. 44% of rough sleepers who visited the new multi-agency service hub between September and March 2019 were in long term accommodation by the end of the period and only 27% were still rough sleeping (almost two thirds of whom were rough sleeping prior to 2018/19). The November street count in Oxford was down from 61 in 2017 to 45 in 2018, suggesting a good impact from the initiatives in place so far.
6. Floyd's Row is the first step towards the transformation of Oxfordshire's services and support for rough sleepers and single homeless people, with the focus on prevention and early intervention, engaging people with services and co-producing accurate assessments of need in order to prevent a return to the street.
7. The vision for Floyds Row is that it will deliver a range of services that will be available to all those in need (regardless of local connection), including:
 - Dedicated **winter shelter** (16 spaces) and an **assessment hub** operating 24/7, 365 days a year, as a safe venue to support people rough sleeping and often with complex needs
 - Specialised clinical **treatment hub** for single homeless people with drug and alcohol issues which will greatly improve opportunities to engage people in

- services when they seek accommodation; improve health outcomes; and reduce dependency on emergency services
- **Somewhere safe to stay service** (20 spaces) stays of up to seven days including some provision to those without recourse to public funds, and
 - **Staging Post** (20 spaces), to accommodate people for up to 28 days to facilitate them moving forward with their housing plan.
8. The accommodation facilities will mostly be dormitory based, but will have separate provision for women, and separate rooms/ bedrooms that can be available for vulnerable people
9. Crucially, Floyds Row will provide a front door available to clients at risk of rough sleeping. As such it is a key enabler for a new preventative focused way of working, building on the success of the current countywide Trailblazer programme, as well as joint working between Housing Options and outreach teams at the temporary RSI hub.

Progress Update

10. The City Council was successful in its bid to the MHCLG, under the Rapid Rehousing Pathway fund, to support the project at Floyd's Row. The bid was led by the City council but made in partnership with the other Oxfordshire Councils. The grant awarded was for £275,000 capital funding and £483,700 revenue for spending in 2019/20. This was conditional on the Council delivering an interim Somewhere Safe to Stay Service in a temporary location prior to the service being delivered from Floyds Row, once the building is ready.
11. Public Health England has also awarded £100,000 of capital funding to the project, following a successful bid submission made in partnership with Oxfordshire County Council. This will fund a clinical treatment facility for drug and alcohol recovery, as part of the offer for clients visiting or staying in the building.
12. Since the City Executive Board meeting in April 2019, and the bid submission, the development of the building and services at Floyds Row has progressed at pace under existing budget approvals. Since then, the full extent of the works required to change the use of the building for this new purpose has been fully explored; costed and market tested. These costs have however, increased significantly from the initial estimates and the budget envelope originally envisaged, with both revenue and capital funding gaps currently identified.
13. The significant capital cost increases have mostly been driven from requirements to meet current building regulations due to the change of use of the building, and also the scale of the proposals. The capital cost of the project has developed as follows:

a) Initial Project Cost - April 2019 - c.£550k

This estimate was based on in-house costings and limited property survey work, with no developed proposals as to what the new service would require.

b) First works estimate - June 2019 - c.£750k

This was based on the Quantity Surveyor's report at initial plan stage. This was a desk-top exercise but did not at that stage include full inspection information, and assumptions were made on certain physical aspects of the building.

c) Overall Project Cost - August 2019 - c.£1.9m

This final costing now fully takes into account the detailed design, including all the requirements to meet current building regulations due to the change of use. It includes fees; strip-out works; construction; fit-out, a construction contingency for any additional costs associated with phasing and a 10% project contingency. The construction element includes items of considerable cost:

- Thermal efficiency – including secondary glazing, photo voltaic panels; etc
- Disabled access – to include ramps; toilets; showers; door changes/ automated door opening
- Fire safety – additional fire detection and compartmentation measures considerably over the current installation
- Additional toilets and showers due to the change of use and numbers of clients that may be accommodated overnight
- Removal of the suspended ceiling for design; operational; housing management; health and safety; and fire safety reasons
- Full replacement of the heating system (including hot water supply)
- Replacement of lighting and power cabling, etc
- Mechanical ventilation sufficient to meet the change of use, the old system having been identified as not providing sufficient air-change capacity
- New stud walls; glazing; and decoration to provide a 'psychologically-informed environment' that meets with design principles of this being a welcoming; functional; familiar; calm; visibly safe; versatile; and busy space

14. In order to progress with the project and meet ambitious deadlines for the opening of additional services this winter, some works (within the existing budget envelope) have already been progressed, Oxford Direct Services Ltd (ODS) having successfully tendered for this work.

15. Due to the increased costs, beyond the current capital envelope, the construction of the project has been split into phased elements:

- Initial strip out works (early July to end of August 2019) – already completed – c.£80k
- Phase 1 construction (early September to end November 2019) – c.£720k – To complete one wing of the building and all plant/ core services. Work is underway with a letter of intent issued by the City Council to ODS for up to £600k of works, with this as the budget limit to ensure works are within existing budget approval.

- Phase 2 construction (early December to end of February 2020) – c. £713k (plus some additional costs, estimated as up to £70k due to the splitting of the contract into two phases) – To complete the remaining two wings of the building
16. Further cost information is provided later in this report and in Appendix 3. The project requires additional spending approval of capital funding of c. £120k to complete phase 1, recognising that an additional sum of £250k has already been vires within capital budgets under officer delegations.
17. The timescales for completion of the building are now based on phase one completing (the first wing of the building) by December 2019, with snagging; fit-out; and staff training then expected to take place through December, for an opening at the start of January. The remaining wings are expected to be completed in Spring 2020, if funding is provided.

Service Delivery

18. Officers now have greater certainty over the expected delivery costs of this service. These have also risen substantially since estimates in early Spring 2019, in the main, in order to provide a sufficient staffing cohort that can operate the building safely and achieve the desired outcomes for clients that the Council requires, not least in terms of rapid move-on, and to operate this in a shift pattern that allows for the 24/7 operation of the building, and full assessment and engagement processes, from breakfast to late night, on every day of the week.
19. Similar services delivered by St Mungo's in London have seen promising outcomes, with 1643 clients entering 'No Second Night Out' (NSNO) hubs in London in 2018-19, and only 20% subsequently seen sleeping rough.
20. Currently, in Oxford, St Mungo's are commissioned to deliver an outreach service at a cost of approximately £350k per annum, with eight full-time staff. Additional pots of funding have been secured throughout the year and have already been used to commission additional services on top of this core contract, as follows:
- RSI funding - three additional outreach workers
 - Controlling Migration Fund - an EEA migrant focused worker
 - Rapid Rehousing Pathway funding - two additional "navigator" posts
21. St Mungo's will be commissioned to deliver the services at Floyds Row, including the Street Outreach team (although reducing the additional services, listed above, when these current funding streams end). The annual net cost of the full project to the Council is £1.2m (on average, over the four years). In addition to this, £120k will be contributed by St Mungo's each year, subject to the full project being progressed and a long-term lease being agreed.

22. The Council spend will be partly funded through the re-profiling of expenditure that currently goes towards the core outreach cost, and also funded partly by income from service charge (which contributes towards the cost of housing management staff). In year one, costs are covered as they will also be supplemented by some MHCLG grant funding. From year two however, there is a deficit.
23. A Memorandum of Understanding on a Strategic Partnership between St Mungo's and Oxford City Council has been drafted for agreement. One element of this is for a 30 year lease of Floyds Row to be agreed between the Council and St Mungo's. This is proposed to be charged at a peppercorn rent only. The lease will require St Mungo's to enter into a reasonable management agreement with another provider should that provider be commissioned to provide the service after April 2021.
24. Break clauses will also apply at review points in the lease to allow each party to re-assess the service requirement landscape, emerging needs, and other initiatives and financial circumstances. The current planning consent for Floyds Row, in terms of change of use, is currently only for five years also. The financial cost of seeking planning consent for change of use again, should that be required from year 6 on, is negligible.
25. The rental income assumptions within Council budgets for the lease rental return on the building, which is foregone, is proposed to be recompensed from the revenue funding for this project, and this assumption is included within the financial modelling .

Interim Service arrangements

26. Given the challenges in delivering Floyds Row, the building is not expected to be ready for service delivery until late December 2019. As the Council has committed to the MHCLG to deliver the Somewhere Safe to Stay (SStS) service by the 21st October 2019, and members have committed to provide a winter shelter from early winter, the Council has put in place arrangements for an interim service, to operate out of Simon House, managed by St Mungo's. This interim arrangement will have twelve spaces for an SStS service and between ten and fifteen spaces for a winter shelter.

Procurement Arrangements

27. In order to commission services up until March 2020, it is proposed that the current Street Outreach contract with St Mungo's is varied for this purpose. This contract is for £350k per annum and was granted on a 3 years+ the ability to extend for a further 2 years basis. Procurement rules allow for variation of up to 50% of the total contract value in certain circumstances. It is proposed that an additional c.£400k be added onto the contract, which is within this permitted level of flexibility and meets the further requirements of contract extension.
28. When the current contract with St Mungo's expires, it is proposed that to facilitate a trial period of the revised operation, a one year grant agreement be entered into with St Mungo's from 1st April 2020 to 31st March 2021, to fund the outreach and

Floyds Row services, before going to full tender. This allows for the rapid mobilisation of this service; time for the service to bed in and for lessons to be learnt; and to enable a full and evidenced specification to be written for tender. This trial period is important given this service is different to any delivered previously.

Options

29. Officers recommend that Floyds Row is fully developed (Option A) as this provides the best value for money, as well as the best outcomes for clients.

30. However there are options to partially complete the project:

- **Option A:** Full completion of project, delivery of 20 Staging Post beds, 20 StSS beds and 16 Winter Shelter beds in addition to assessment hub
- **Option B:** Completion of two wings [with construction ceasing part way through Phase 2]. Delivery of 20 StSS beds and 16 Winter Shelter beds in addition to assessment hub. No Staging Post
- **Option C:** Completion of one wing only with construction ceasing at the end of Phase 1]. Delivery of 12 StSS beds and 4 Winter Shelter beds in addition to assessment hub. No Staging Post

31. Table One summarises each option in financial terms (further detail in Appendix 3)

Table One: Financial Appraisal of Options:

		£ 000			Revenue		
		Capital	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5
Option A: Three Wings	Total Costs	1892	1069	1500	1500	1500	1500
	Total Income	934	1069	903	726	726	726
	Total Gap	958	0	597	774	774	774
Option B: Two Wings	Total Costs	1496	1069	1280	1280	1280	1280
	Total Income	934	1069	655	478	478	478
	Total Gap	562	0	625	802	802	802
Option C: One Wing	Total Costs	1131	1069	1180	1180	1180	1180
	Total Income	934	1069	572	395	395	395
	Total Gap	197	0	608	785	785	785

32. Option A represents the best value for money in terms of revenue spend. Option B leaves a higher revenue gap whereas Option C leaves a slightly lower gap – but by providing significantly fewer services and accommodation spaces.

33. Appendix 3 also illustrates that Option A represents best value, by showing a cost per bed calculation. Option A is shown with the net cost representing a cost per bed space of £69,238. Option B represents £99,800 per bed space, rising to £197,488 in Option C, which has the least value for money.

34. The relative costs come about for the following reasons:

- In Option A, St Mungo's are providing £120k of additional funding to the model, on the basis of a long term partnership agreement.
- Also only in Option A, some of the rental costs of the building can be offset by rental income from the Staging Post. This is not possible in Options B or C.
- Option A allows for staffing efficiencies to be made when running multiple services from the same location.

35. It is possible that under Options B and C, alternative use of the unused wings could be made which could generate additional income. However significant work would be required to assess whether this is viable, and additional capital improvement works will be required. It is not expected that full market rent would be achieved.

36. Options B and C are not recommended due to poor expected client outcomes (no step change from current provision) and that the costs required do not therefore represent best value. In particular, Option C is not recommended as it leads to an overall net loss of beds (some sit-up beds will be lost and only 16 beds gained at Floyds Row).

37. If the recommended option to proceed with the full contract (Option A) is not proceeded with, then there are still cost impacts that need to be funded. If the Council was not to proceed with Option A these would be:

- a. The remainder of phase 1 costs (to bring one wing into use). As detailed in paragraph fifteen, this requires an additional £370k spending – £120k of which has yet to be approved by Council.
- b. Revenue costs (net of reduced income) to operate the service as set out above

Financial implications

38. The financial modelling for each options costs and funding, for capital budgets, with revenue modelling, are set out in Appendix 3. For the preferred option of 56 bed spaces the following financial implications are relevant :

Capital

- Increase the capital budget from £758k to £1,892k noting the need to borrow to finance this additional spend with a cost of capital of around 6% and noting existing grant funding of £375k.

Revenue

- Agreeing a net revenue budget for the operation of Floyds Row of approximately £774k per annum and noting

- the cost of operating the service to the Council, as provided by St Mungo's at £1.2 million per annum (net of funding from St Mungo's of £120k per annum)
- the reduction in the sit up and outreach service of £410k per annum
- that the rent on the building estimated at £180k per annum is to be covered within the project finances
- the increased revenue cost can be covered initially from grants in year 1 of operation in 2019-20 and from the Councils homelessness reserve until this is exhausted in 2022-23. An alternative funding stream will be required from thereon if Floyds Row is to remain open.

39. In light of the increased costs associated with project delivery, the Council is pursuing a number of potential routes for additional funding:

i) Capital

The identified funding gap of £958k is likely to reduce, if all of some of these deliver:

a) Further MHCLG grant

The Leader of the Council has written to Robert Jenrick MP, the new Secretary of State at MHCLG, outlining the full costs of the scheme and requesting further contribution. Officials have indicated that they expect that further funding will be made available for 2020/2021 ahead of consideration for longer term funding as part of the comprehensive spending review in 2021/2022. Nationally, a sum comprising of more than the national Rough Sleeper Initiative (RSI) and Rapid rehousing Pathway (RRP) funding streams has been provided for the 2020/2021 year, suggesting that a continuance of current programmes at current rates may be possible. £275k capital funding has been provided to date.

b) Fundraising

Fundraising from the Oxfordshire Community Foundation; St Mungo's and other community options are expected to deliver additional funding into the project. Two easily identified areas for this, at the lowest scale, would be to fund the fit-out (£50k) and landscaping work costs (£25k)

c) Contingencies

Provision for contingencies has been included for phase 1 and phase 2 of the construction project, however, as indicated by the risk register, extensive survey; opening-up; and strip-out work has already been undertaken to minimise this risk. Any contingency not spent reduces the capital requirement of the project

ii) Revenue

The identified funding gap of £785k pa, from year 3, is likely to reduce if all of some of these deliver:

a) Further MHCLG grant

As indicated above, further funding has already been requested from the MHCLG for Floyds Row. Nationally, the funding for rough sleeping and single

homelessness has been maintained (and slightly increased overall) for 20/21, and we expect to work with the MHCLG to co-produce a proposal this Autumn. £452k has already been awarded for Floyds Row/ interim service revenue costs in 19/20 from the RRP fund. The continuance of RSI funding is also possible in addition to this (c.£500k awarded for 19/20) and likely to be considered together.

b) Contributions from Countywide partners

The Chief Executive has asked the County Council and Oxfordshire District Councils to also consider each making a contribution to this project for at least two years, in recognition of the countywide impact of rough sleeping and the services that are to be developed at this site. The OCCG (Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group) has also been asked to consider this request.

c) Fundraising Strategy

The Council is developing a fund raising strategy with St Mungo's and the Oxfordshire Community Foundation (OCF) to seek contributions from donors. St Mungo's have already agreed to fund three posts – equivalent to c.£120k per year. The Council has committed to developing a longer term strategic partnership with St Mungo's and for a leasing arrangement that would facilitate further fund raising by St Mungo's, with consideration of sharing some of the financial risk of these funding streams being insufficient to meet identified funding gaps.

d) Service transformation

Service transformation of the adult homeless pathway is also underway and savings from current commissioning are also expected to help fund the additional revenue costs of this project.

40. Without any of these sources of funding secured, the project will not be viable in the longer term. Little of this fundraising strategy can be relied on at this current moment. If no further funding is identified, the shortfall could be funded initially from reserves. There are additional pressures from the cost of homelessness which is already charged to the homelessness reserve besides of Floyds Row and in the absence of any savings or grant assuming Flexible Homeless Support Grant of £500k per annum, which has yet to be confirmed past this year then the reduction on the homelessness reserve would be exhausted by the end of year 3 (2021/22) of this project.

41. Given the time pressure to continue with the construction of the 56 bed accommodation to meet opening times in January 2020, and then Spring 2020, Members will need to consider initially how the increased costs can be accommodated pending the review of the Councils budget in December 2020. If funding from other sources (including MHCLG grants and contributions from other partners) were secured, this would allow the use of reserves to be re-profiled and spread over a longer period of time. Any remaining funding gap will need to be met through further transformation of the Countywide adult homeless pathway or through identifying funding from other sources.

42. Given the time pressure to continue with the construction of the 56 bed accommodation to meet opening times in January 2020, then Spring 2020, Members will need to consider initially how the increased costs can be accommodated pending the review of the Councils budget in December 2020.

Legal issues

43. The capital and service contract arrangements and route to commissioning the full service are considered to comply with The Public Contracts Regulations 2015. In particular the contract extension with St Mungo's meets the requirements of Regulation 72 (1)(c) as all of the following conditions are fulfilled:

(i) the need for modification to the contract has been brought about by circumstances which a diligent contracting authority could not have foreseen;

(ii) the modification does not alter the overall nature of the contract;

(iii) any increase in price does not exceed 50% of the value of the original contract

44. The Council has a duty to try to prevent and relieve homelessness under the Housing Act 1996, as amended and its responsibilities and duties under the Homelessness Reduction Act 2017 to prevent and relieve homelessness for all eligible applicants threatened with homelessness, regardless of priority need.. The Council also has general powers under the Localism Act 2011 that it may use to provide additional community well-being services.

Level of risk

45. A Risk Register is provided at Appendix 1.

Equalities impact

46. An Equalities Impact Assessment is provided at Appendix 2. There are no adverse impacts in undertaking this activity, with the potential to improve provision for persons in housing need under all the options considered, with the greatest positive impact, for more people, resulting from Option A.

Conclusion

47. That the Council should look to use this rare opportunity to deliver a new and exceptional service at the Floyds Row location that will deliver a new range of early service interventions to persons sleeping rough and single people at risk of homelessness, and provide a step-change in transforming provision in Oxford and Oxfordshire.

48. That officers will continue to develop all the initiatives identified above to close the funding gaps identified through alternative funding streams.

Report author	Dave Scholes
Job title	Housing Strategy and Needs Manager
Service area or department	Housing and Property
Telephone	01865 252636
e-mail	dscholes@oxford.gov.uk
Background Papers:	None

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 1: Risk Register - Cabinet - 3 October 2019

last updated: 06/09/19

Polly McKinlay PM Project Manager - Senior Commissioning Officer (Rough Sleeping and Single Homelessness)
 Dave Scholes DS Project Sponsor - Housing Strategy and Needs Manager
 Rachel Lawrence RL Rough Sleeping and Single Homelessness Manager

Ref	Title	Risk description	Opp/ threat	Cause	Consequence	Date Raised	Owner	Gross				Current		Residual		Controls			
								I	P	I	P	I	P	Control description	Due date	Status	Progress %	Action Owner	
1	Further building control requirements	Building control identifies items required not currently costed - e.g. fire modifications, energy efficiency measures, additional showers and toilets, etc	Threat	Draft costings did not take into account building regulations	Would increase overall cost	11.3.19	PM/DS		3	3	4	5	2	2	There is a 10% project contingency and a 10% build contingency, built into the costings. We have done some initial work with building control, and will make it a priority when the architectural team is appointed. We will investigate similar projects to see how they navigated requirements.	Ongoing	Building control requirements have increased the cost significantly	90	PM and DS
2	Council governance delays	Council governance processes are unable to agree to move the project forward at exactly the point where this is needed	Threat	Council governance processes are slow and/or officers not understanding of processes and deadlines	Delay in award of and progression with build contract	11.3.19	PM/DS		2	3	2	2	1	1	A project timeline will be assembled so that the project team are aware of critical points and when submissions must be made	Ongoing	Key dates are being scheduled in and papers being prepared- e.g. the April CEB. Risk of leaders not approving funds for phase 1. Phase 2 being delayed until approval from cabinet and council in October but phasing approach means little overall impact.	50	PM
3	Capital costs shortfall	The funds required to build the project cannot be met from income sources and so need to be covered by housing reserves.	Threat	Unsuccessful bid to MHCLG and failure of fundraising attempts	Housing reserves reduce significantly and by the end of the current MTFP period, the Council would need to assess homelessness risks against the size of the reserves and potentially make financial adjustments to improve the position	13.3.19	PM/RL		3	3	4	4	3	3	Bid being submitted to RRP Fund. Advice of RS advisor will be sought prior to submitting bid to ensure maximum chance of success. External trusts (e.g. OCF) pursued for fundraising opportunities.	Ongoing	Capital costs are much higher than originally projected and thus whilst funding has been secured from MHCLG and PHE, there is still a shortfall	70	PM/RL
4	Provider (revenue) costs increase and there is a shortfall in meeting them	A service provider cannot be identified to provide the service specified within the cost envelope envisaged. Lease and revenue cannot be agreed with new provider	Threat	Unrealistic demands from service provider, poor relationship and/or negotiation between client and service provider, unrealistic cost estimates from client	Service revenue costings increase without income to meet them and/or reduced service offer must be put in place	13.3.19	PM/RL		4	4	3	3	3	2	Advice of initial service provider is being sought, so they can provide input into costings which appear realistic and appropriate. Cost information from comparable services have been used, with the staff team required and FTEs considered	Ongoing	Revenue costs are much higher than originally anticipated. Significant mitigation has already taken place, with costs much reduced from the initial position. Receipt of further government funding is likely, however this remains a significant risk. Delays in opening service have led to delays in decommissioning of other services, also impacting on revenue position.	60	PM/RL
5	Phase 2 not given approval	Cabinet does not give approval to Phase 2 of project so that only one wing is developed	Threat	Cabinet decides that Phase 2 is unaffordable given capital cost increase	Second and third wings are not built and cannot be used for the service. Poor VfM given phase 1 costs include some overall building costs	6.9.19	PM/DS		4	2	4	2	2	2	Advise cabinet and council of reasons to undertake Phases 1 & 2 - that this represents best value for money. Consider alternative uses for other wings if not developed for this use.	Ongoing	This will be known by mid October	50	PM/DS
6	Design stage identifies further and currently uncosted build requirements	Additional and previously unidentified issues being identified during the build process that require additional works or spend	Threat	Build requirements not being thought through in draft design, e.g. air circulation systems, etc	Could increase time or cost	11.3.19	PM/DS		3	3	4	5	2	2	There is a 10% project contingency and a 10% build contingency, built into the costings. Feasibility work has been undertaken to ensure draft design is based on building requirements as far as possible. Process of co-design will help further ensure this.	Ongoing	Well controlled risk	90	PM/DS
7	Design stage identified further planning requirements	Design stage identifies further works that require further planning permission	Threat	Original planning application did not foresee additional requirements	This could create delays on process & further risk of no approvals	11.3.19	PM		2	3	2	5	2	2	We have liaised with planning to ensure that the initial correct planning application was made and we will be clear with the architectural team that external works should be avoided where at all possible	Ongoing	This was the case (unavoidable) and has had a small impact on cost, but was approved in good time	90	PM
8	Building Control not approved	Building Control does not give approval to overall design concept	Threat	Design concept did not take into account building control	Unable to deliver concept and/or need to spend money/time reconfiguring	11.3.19	PM		4	2	3	1	3	1	Advance conversations were had with building control. Will seek to engage them with architectural consultants early.	Ongoing	Tracker being updated. Majority of items are green. Few items still to be cleared with further information to be provided by architects. However no outstanding major	75	PM

9	Phased approach	Project is being completed in two phases in order that it can start to be delivered as early as possible.	Threat	Increased costs of phasing (e.g. erecting barriers), risks to clients if building work taking place whilst building already being occupied.	Need to deliver project as early as possible to deliver services	13.3.19	PM/DS/MS									Ensure that phased approach is properly costed and that health and safety guidance is followed and given to architects/constructors as relevant.	Ongoing	Phased approach is planned. Phasing impact on price known and accounted for. Pre-construction meetings and ongoing meetings with contractors to minimise H&S risks.	50	PM/DS/MS
10	ODS build/supply chain delays	Direct Services cannot schedule the work to start as expected, nor can complete within the proposed contract length, or experience difficulties mobilising required suppliers - e.g. for a new boiler.	Threat	ODS not prepared and/or timeframe unrealistic and/or suppliers not mobilised quickly enough	Would create delays on the project and delay opening	11.3.19	PM/DS									Advance planning, consideration of a phased approach to delivery and internal discussions with ODS to make them aware of timeframe and prepare to deliver project. Advance planning for supply chain issues - e.g. being aware of lead in time required to source new boiler.	Ongoing	Initial discussions taken forwards with ODS. Phasing still being considered	30	DS/MS
11	Architectural delay	Architects firm does not complete the work in the required timeframe	Threat	Architects do not have sufficient time. Client does not manage sufficiently, or timeframe unrealistic	Would create delays on the project	11.3.19	PM/DS									The limited timeframe has been made very clear in the tender and will further be made clear when architects appointed, with a timetable laid out from the start. The client will manage the architects throughout the design process, to ensure they stay on track.	Ongoing	Architects have completed work in good time however there have been some delays - e.g. getting M&E information and providing it to building control. Further delays could still occur - e.g. in phasing of project. Regular meetings taking place to ensure project completed on time	80	PM/DS
12	HB income insufficient	Insufficient income from housing benefit	Threat	Rate card is knocked back for being excessive. Claims are not made and/or clients are not followed up for payment	Scheme is forced to draw on reserves more than intended	13.3.19	PM/RL									Clients will not be asked to pay a direct service charge in the 72h SStS service. The service specification will include making HB claims as a specific role requirement. Voids and bad debt provision have already been factored into calculations and HB Service Manager has been consulted on scheme and agrees with the concept/ HBV eligibility expectations	Ongoing	Detail being finalised with rate card and spec, however positive foundations have been laid with service internally to fast-track claims. St Mungos foresee high risk with claiming full rent/service charge - final approach yet to be	70	PM/RL
13	Difficulty in mobilising service provider	Service Provider does not have staff and sufficient logistics in place in order to open service by early winter.	Threat	Service Provider is unable to mobilise sufficiently in order to provide service specified, and on time, due to poor time management and planning, any legal difficulties (e.g. TUPE implications), or unrealistic demands from the Client	Service cannot be provided on time	13.3.19	PM/RL									Early and consistent consultation with service provider, quick resolution by Client to any issues that arise, advice sought promptly and as needed, Client to provide realistic timeframe and mitigations for delays in getting to full staffing capacity	Ongoing	Many discussions have been had with service provider who are aware of timeframe. Recruitment has now started in good time. Advice has been sought on legal implications e.g TUPE. Some early issues apparent - e.g. senior service manager going out to advert again following no suitable candidate found. Secondment opportunities being identified as Plan B	60	PM/RL
14	Poor constructor quality	Contractors do not complete the work to the required standard	Threat	Poor quality instruction and/or poor quality leadership and workmanship	Could mean project of poor quality	6.9.18	PM/DS									ODS are subject to rigorous checks on quality. JCT contract being put in place to ensure expectations clear. Strong internal relationships to manage any disputes or issues	Ongoing	Regular meetings held between client, architects and constructors to ensure high quality and any misunderstandings resolved	50	PM/DS
15	Poor architectural quality	Architects firm does not complete the work to the required standard	Threat	Architects do not have sufficient expertise or time. Client does not instruct sufficiently. Result in building not being well designed for use.	Could mean project of poor quality	11.3.19	PM/DS									A tendering process has been undertaken to ensure that a high quality firm is selected, and a draft specification written to ensure the brief is clear. They will be managed closely throughout the process by a client who has sufficient understanding of project requirements.	Ongoing	Architects appointed through competitive tender and with clear specification. Finalising specification for stage 5 to ensure continued high quality input.	80	PM/DS
16	Costs/Variation exceeding contingency	The price of construction goes over the price quoted due to variations required	Threat	Quote was unrealistically low or building surveys/scope of work was incomplete and did not foresee necessary variations	Would make the project more expensive.	11.3.19	PM/DS									Architect and constructor has been made aware of limited cost envelope. Contract includes contingency and a minimum of provisional items.	Ongoing	Gavin Cumberland in charge of any variations and has enough knowledge to interrogate necessity well	50	PM/DS

17	Poor service outcomes	The service does not succeed in moving people off of the street and into sustained positive outcomes	Threat	Poor performance by service provider, insufficient enablers (e.g. poor systems, limited availability of move-on options, staffing issues). Undefined expectations - people expect too much from it	Service attains a poor reputation and only has limited success in ensuring that nobody has to sleep rough on streets of Oxford	13.3.19	PM/RL		3	3	3	2	3	2	Tightly specified service specification with clear monitoring arrangements in place to ensure outcomes are achieved. Broader transformation programme of work to ensure that enablers are in place - e.g. expansion of move on accommodation	Ongoing	Further work to do on wider transformation programme and on specifying and defining service outcomes and measurements but we have a good base to progress from including a draft specification and clear expectations with provider. Not a current risk	50	PM/RL
18	Project not used by clients	Client refusal to use project/insufficient engagement	Threat	Poor reputation, design creates risks for clients	Project cannot reduce rough sleeping numbers as hoped	13.3.19	PM/RL		3	3	3	3	2	2	Clients are engaged in design of project, to ensure it reflects service user needs. All rough sleeping data indicated high levels of need for this service. Street engagement approaches will be amended to reflect this new provision, as will the relationship between this service and others in the adult homeless pathways/ other pathways. New area plan to be developed inc community safety	Ongoing	Co-design and consultation being built into design process. No current concerns	50	PM/RL
19	Impacts of service on local area	Clients using project behave in a way that has impacts on other clients in the project and on the surrounding area/city centre	Threat	Behaviour of clients is not appropriately managed by service providers, design of building facilitates antisocial behaviour	Scheme gets a bad reputation amongst rough sleepers and amongst the public/neighbours which takes officer time to resolve and decreases project outcomes, clients are scared to use it and continue to sleep rough, major incidents happen which gives poor reputation and puts people at risk	13.3.19	PM/RL		3	4	3	3	3	2	Design will seek to include features that help provide a safe environment and reduce anti-social behaviour. Specification will include an anti-social behaviour management plan and stakeholder engagement	Ongoing	Architects spec includes concepts such as PIE, which will help to design a safe environment. ASB management plan will be based on work already undertaken at Bonn Square. No current concerns	50	PM/RL
20	Demand too high/Supply too low	Too many rough sleepers need to use the service and it does not have capacity, resulting in waiting lists	Threat	The number of rough sleepers increases more than anticipated or move-through the project is insufficient	The project does not have (or is perceived not to have) the expected impact on reducing numbers of rough sleepers, and members and public call for additional initiatives which cannot be funded.	13.3.19	PM/RL		2	4	2	4	2	3	Demand modelling for service, flexible capacity, flexible approach to commissioning of other services as required - subject to funding constraints. Tight management of adult homeless pathway, of voids etc, to ensure maximum throughput	Ongoing	Work has started on maximising effectiveness of services and adult homeless pathway - more to be undertaken	30	PM/RL
21	Demand too low/supply too high 25	There are not enough clients in need to fill the capacity of the service	Threat	Lower numbers of rough sleepers than expected. Particularly a risk in later years of the project, where we hope demand will decrease	Number of clients too low means insufficient housing benefit income	13.3.19	PM/RL		3	2	3	2	1	2	Other options for use of the space to be identified so that some space can continue to attract income without the entire service needing to be decommissioned. Staff numbers to be flexible, by some posts being awarded on temporary contracts	Ongoing	Other options for income generation/use of space are still being explored	30	PM/RL
22	Dissatisfaction from other local stakeholders	Other providers may challenge the approach of client not initially procuring the service but instead awarding a grant contract	Threat	Initial service provision will not be procured - instead, existing contract will be modified	Other providers service performance in other projects declines. RS&SH team members time is taken up in resolving disputes. Potential (though unlikely) legal challenge.	13.3.19	PM/RL		2	3	2	2	1	2	Maintain good relationships with other service providers and give them some input into project. Seek legal/procurement advice on likelihood and basis for any challenge. Seek to tender the new contract from year 2 on.	Ongoing	Other service providers being made aware of approach to be taken and being included in discussions about other ways they can contribute. No current concerns raised.	65	PM/RL
23	QS delays	QS requires longer than a week to cost the works schedule	Threat	Timeline unrealistic or architect does not appoint QS with sufficient time and/or expertise	Would create delays on the project	11.3.19	PM/DS		2	4	2	2	2	2	The limited timeframe has been made very clear in the tender and will further be made clear to the architectural team who will be closely managed by the client to ensure that appointment of QS is not delayed	Ongoing	Q/S appears to be producing work according to schedule. All Q/S work now produced	100	PM/DS
24	ODS tender delays	Direct Services require more than a week to provide a costed tender	Threat	Timeline unrealistic or ODS do not have sufficient time and/or expertise	Would create delays on the project	11.3.19	DS/MS		2	3	2	3	2	2	Advance planning and internal discussions to make clear to ODS that timeframe is had	Ongoing	Further discussions to be had with ODS. ODS quote now received.	100	DS
25	Procurement delay	Use of the portal creates delays in process	Threat	Portal has minimum time requirements	Would create delays on the project	11.3.19	PM		2	4	0	0	0	0	Solved - timeline reflects accurate speed of procurement which is not creating delays	Ongoing	Solved	100	PM/RL
26	Planning permission not approved	Planning permission not awarded or conditions unacceptable	Threat	Objections are raised against the application that lead members to vote against the proposal	Scheme cannot go ahead/appeal must be sought	11.3.19	PM		5	2	2	1	1	1	PM attending planning committee	Closed	Planning permission was granted 12.3, limited conditions were made, with expectation of discharge. Planning permission for the external was granted on 9.7	100	PM

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 2

Appendix 2: Equality Impact Assessment – Floyds Row – Cabinet 3 October 2019

1. Which group (s) of people has been identified as being disadvantaged by your proposals?
What are the equality impacts?

No groups have been identified as being disadvantaged by this proposal. The initiative recommended focuses on better meeting the needs of rough sleepers and vulnerable homeless persons through ensuring access to emergency short-stay accommodation and new engagement and assessment services.

2. In brief, what changes are you planning to make to your current or proposed new or changed policy, strategy, procedure, project or service to minimise or eliminate the adverse equality impacts?

Please provide further details of the proposed actions, timetable for making the changes and the person(s) responsible for making the changes on the resultant action plan

Consideration as to the protected characteristics of customers has been considered throughout the design and service specification stages of this project, and action taken to provide the most appropriate assistance to customers circumstances and needs, in this service and across the adult homeless pathway. The new services proposed offer access to more clients than previously, including those rough sleeping in Oxford but without local connection or recourse to public funds. The need to ensure the safety and security of all persons using the building is key, recognising that the services will be assisting highly vulnerable people, many with complex needs, with a key requirement being the safety and needs of vulnerable women and persons who may identify as LBGTQI+. The design brief also requires effective disabled access provision to be made to all services.

3. Please provide details of whom you will consult on the proposed changes and if you do not plan to consult, please provide the rationale behind that decision.

Please note that you are required to involve disabled people in decisions that impact on them

No groups have been identified as being disadvantaged by this proposal, and it is expected to have a positive impact on many vulnerable people as outlined. As much co-design was incorporated into initial designs as the timescale for rapid delivery allowed, and further service user engagement opportunities are to be identified and exploited in later phases of this work, and in the operation of the services themselves.

4. Can the adverse impacts you identified during the initial screening be justified without making any adjustments to the existing or new policy, strategy, procedure, project or service?

Please set out the basis on which you justify making no adjustments

No adverse impacts, relating to protected characteristics, have been identified.

5. You are legally required to monitor and review the proposed changes after implementation to check they work as planned and to screen for unexpected equality impacts.

Please provide details of how you will monitor/evaluate or review your proposals and when the review will take place

All plans and requirements will be monitored throughout the development period, and through regular contract management and monitoring once the new services are commissioned.

Appendix 2

Lead officer responsible for signing off the EqIA: Dave Scholes, Housing Strategy & Needs Manager. Date: September 2019

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes of a meeting of the CABINET on Wednesday 11 September 2019

www.oxford.gov.uk



Committee members:

Councillor Brown (Chair)	Councillor Chapman
Councillor Clarkson	Councillor Hayes
Councillor Hollingsworth	Councillor Rowley
Councillor Tidball	Councillor Upton

Officers:

Gordon Mitchell, Chief Executive
Tom Bridgman, Executive Director (Development)
Aileen Carlisle, Interim Executive Director (Communities and Customers)
Tim Sadler, Transition Director / Chairman Direct Services Companies
Anita Bradley, Monitoring Officer
Nigel Kennedy, Head of Financial Services
Laura Bessell, Benefits Manager
Julia Tomkins, Grants & External Funding Officer
John Mitchell, Committee and Member Services Officer

Also present:

Councillor Andrew Gant

Apologies:

Councillors Linda Smith and Turner sent apologies.

49. Declarations of Interest

None.

50. Addresses and Questions by Members of the Public

None.

51. Councillor Addresses on any item for decision on the Board's agenda

None.

52. Councillor Addresses on Neighbourhood Issues

None.

53. Items raised by Board Members

None.

54. Scrutiny Committee Reports

Councillor Gant, speaking in his capacity as Chair of the Scrutiny Committee, spoke to the Committee's report on Monitoring the Community Grants Programme (item 9 of the agenda). He was grateful for the Cabinet's agreement to the Committee's two recommendations. He noted that the Cabinet report's reference to 448 Oxford Lottery tickets sold was in fact a reference to the number of lottery transactions, a point which had been clarified during the Committee's discussion. The Cabinet agreement to find ways of encouraging a wider range of organisations to benefit from the grants programme was particularly welcome.

Cllr Gant said Scrutiny Committee had, at its last meeting, considered recent Cabinet responses to previous Scrutiny recommendations and asked for its views to be passed on.

- a) Performance. In view of the improved PMO function, quarterly reports on the capital programme should now be possible.
- b) Seacourt Park & Ride. Notwithstanding that this project was underway and Cabinet's previous response, the Committee wanted to reiterate its view that the business case for the scheme was not viable.
- c) Safeguarding. The Committee had asked for the number of children and young people in the City who had had face to face safeguarding training. The Committee had not asked the Council to collect this data, rather to see if it was available from partner organisations. The Committee had also asked for an update on progress following the Guest House review.

The Chair agreed that the proposal in a) above was sensible and should be pursued. Councillor Nigel Chapman, Cabinet Member for Safer Communities and Customer Focused Services, said obtaining data about the number of children referred to in b) above was likely to be difficult. He would enquire about progress with the Guest House review but noted that this might also be difficult given the amount of time which had elapsed since the review.

55. Consultation on proposals for a revised Council Tax Reduction Scheme 2020/21

The Head of Financial Services had submitted a report to seek approval for proposals for consultation on changes to the Council's Council Tax Reduction Scheme (CTRS) for 2020/21.

Marie Tidball, Cabinet Member for Supporting Local Communities, introduced the report which set out the basis for consultation on the CTRS for 2020/21. Reduction of the Revenue Support Grant to zero meant there was, now, no government funding to support the scheme. The estimated cost of the scheme for the Council in 2020/21 was £1.7m. The report detailed a number of minor changes for 2020/21, which would benefit a number of applicants for relatively little cost.

Laura Bessell, Benefits Manager, noted that the Council was one of only 30 in the country which continued to offer the opportunity for a discount of 100%. The Chair noted the continuing importance of the scheme as part of the Council's commitment to supporting those on low incomes.

Cabinet resolved to:

1. **Agree** that the proposals for the 2020/21 Council Tax Reduction Scheme outlined in the report be subject to consultation for an 8 week period from 23rd September 2019; and
2. **Instruct** the Head of Financial Services to bring a further report to Cabinet in January 2020 to outline the outcome of the consultation process and make proposals for the 2020/21 Council Tax Reduction Scheme.

56. Monitoring the Community Grants Programme - Report for 2018/19

Marie Tidball, Cabinet Member for Supporting Local Communities, introduced the report. She was proud to see the scale and breadth of the programme illustrated by the report and its undoubted positive social impact. She drew attention to the fact that while the investment cost of the programme to the Council was £1.5m, that, in turn, secured a further £4.2m, or almost £3 for every £1 spent. Innovation has been an important element of the programme, with, for example, the introduction of the Oxford Lottery, and use of "The Good Exchange" fundraising platform.

Cabinet members were appreciative of the value added by the programme. It was agreed that the use of case studies in these reports was helpful in bringing the programme to life.

Cabinet resolved to:

Note the results of the grant monitoring and the positive impact the community and voluntary sector is making in the city.

57. Joint Municipal Waste Plan

The Transition Director had submitted a report to:

1. Provide an update on the Oxfordshire Environment Partnership (OEP) which convenes the City, District and County Councils in Oxfordshire to share best practice and agree actions;
2. Seek support for the Resource and Waste Strategy for Oxfordshire (Appendix 1) which sets out how the City Council will work with others to deliver sustainable waste management services as part of our response to the climate emergency. It runs until 2023 and focuses on local authority collected waste; and

3. Reconfirm support for the reintroduction of joint working across Oxfordshire in the form of a partnership. Including reinstating a dedicated officer post to take forward county-wide waste management, following the declaration of a climate emergency.

Councillor Tom Hayes, Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford, introduced the report saying it was timely given the current enthusiasm in the wider community for tackling a range of issues related to the climate emergency. The proposal would reinstate the Countywide Partnership on Resources and Waste Management and commit the Council to sharing the cost of an associated officer post with the other councils in the Partnership. The Resource and Waste Strategy was ambitious and the Partnership would facilitate good countywide political working to help achieve those ambitions.

It was noted that this would provide an excellent example of the merits of a partnership approach as opposed to delivering a programme via a single service countywide. The waste and recycling challenges in the City, for example, were different from those of a rural district and a partnership approach enabled those differences to be reflected in delivery of the programme.

Councillor Hayes concluded by noting the need to acknowledge all that had been done by Councillor Tanner in his previous role as the Executive Member for “A Clean & Green Oxford”.

Cabinet resolved to:

1. **Adopt** Oxfordshire’s Resources and Waste Strategy for Oxfordshire 2018-2023, in response to the Climate Emergency;
2. **Agree** support for reinstating a Countywide Partnership on resources and waste management;
3. **Support** the principle of the reintroduction of an Officer post to advance the shared goals of all Oxfordshire councils to effectively manage waste arising in the county, subject to City Council’s budget process for 2020/2021; and
4. **Delegate** authority to the Transition Director in consultation with the Section 151 Officer, Monitoring Officer and Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford to conclude the negotiation and agreement of a Memorandum of Understanding with all other relevant councils in Oxfordshire concerning the partnership and shared post across the proposed reformed Waste Partnership.

58. Treasury Management: Annual Report and Performance 2018/19

The Head of Financial Services had submitted a report which set out the Council’s Treasury Management activity and performance for the financial year 2018/2019.

Councillor Alex Hollingsworth, Cabinet Member for Planning and Sustainable Transport introduced the report. In the present political and economic climate, returns on investments were generally low. The overall financial position of the Council was however sound.

Nigel Kennedy, the Head of Financial Services, said that the requirements of all the Prudential Indicators had been met. The majority of the sum invested with the two

failed Icelandic banks had been recovered but the outstanding balance was now considered to be irrecoverable and had, therefore, been written off in accounting terms.

Cabinet resolved to:

Note the report.

59. Minutes

Cabinet resolved to APPROVE the minutes of the meeting held on 10 July 2019 as a true and accurate record.

60. Dates of Future Meetings

Meetings are scheduled for the following dates:

- 03 October 2019
- 09 October 2019
- 13 November 2019
- 11 December 2019

All meetings start at 6pm.

The meeting started at 6.05 pm and ended at 6.40 pm

Chair

Date: Thursday 3 October 2019

This page is intentionally left blank