

Scrutiny recommendation tracker 2017/18 – January 2018

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|----|-----|
| Total recommendations (year to date): | 44 | |
| Agreed | 39 | 89% |
| Agreed in part | 4 | 9% |
| Not agreed | 1 | 2% |

23 JANUARY 2018 CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD

Preventing elderly isolation – Executive Board Member for Culture and Communities

| Recommendation | Agree | Comment |
|--|--------------|------------------|
| 1: That consideration is given to how the Council could obtain a clearer view of how to identify and engage with older people who are isolated or at risk of isolation. The former should include the use of population data for different parts of the city to identify any geographical concentrations of older people and gaps in provision. | <i>TBC</i> | <i>To follow</i> |
| 2: That consideration is given to developing the role of local intelligence and local assets such as community centres, community newsletters, parish councils and food banks in identifying and supporting older people facing isolation. One option is to expand the reach of the national Older People’s Day, which is promoted locally by the Oxford 50+ Network, and seek to involve a wider range of stakeholders in it. | <i>TBC</i> | <i>To follow</i> |
| 3: That the Council explores joint working opportunities with the County Council and CCG on preventing elderly isolation and continues to make the case for dedicated resource and the wider use of social prescribing | <i>TBC</i> | <i>To follow</i> |
| 4: That the Council should encourage and prioritise targeted outreach work to BAME communities that can help to mitigate language and cultural barriers, including amongst older people who may be at risk of isolation. | <i>TBC</i> | <i>To follow</i> |
| 5: That the Council seeks to ensure that ‘fair share’ of OCCG funding is directed towards projects and services in the city, including where such resources could be focused on preventing elderly isolation. | <i>TBC</i> | <i>To follow</i> |

18 DECEMBER TRADING COMPANIES SHAREHOLDER MEETING

ODSL and ODSTL Business Plan – Leader of the Council

| <i>Recommendation</i> | <i>Agree</i> | <i>Comment</i> |
|---|--------------|---|
| 1. That the Oxford Direct Services companies should be encouraged to promote their corporate values (which should reflect those of the Council). The companies should also mention that they are social enterprises (if applicable). | Yes | ODS management are working on a mission and values statement in partnership with the staff and the trade unions. These will be discussed with the Board and with Scrutiny and will form the touchstone of how ODS operates |
| 2. The Council agrees some social value metrics with the Oxford Direct Services Companies and includes these within a balanced scorecard that is regularly monitored by the Council. These could include measures around local employment opportunities, for example. | Yes | The balanced scorecard will be informed by our mission and values so that everything points back to these. The table on page 50 of the Business Plan is a work in progress to allow for the mission and values to be reflected in the metrics |
| 3. That the presentation of net margins as well as gross margins would be helpful in future reports to the Shareholder. | Yes | The plan will be amended accordingly |
| 4. That a summary of other authorities' LATCos, the services they provide and their success or failure would provide a useful picture of the landscape and help to inform whether other Council services should be transferred to the companies in future. | Yes | This will depend on whether the data can be obtained. ODS management will contact Grant Thornton who work with a number of LATCos and understand the details of the landscape |
| 5. That as the companies develop they should do so in a way that does not prejudice the future of smaller local companies or stifle the local economy, and in fact serves to do the opposite. | Yes | Our strategy is geared towards larger works so we are likely to be operating in a different market to smaller local companies. |
| 6. That it would be helpful for a more detailed turnover analysis to be undertaken within each of the four key sectors in order to identify risks, such as those parts of the business that are reliant on a small number of customers. | Yes | As part of the evolution of the commercial arm of the company we will be undertaking more market analysis to further inform our understanding of the profitability and potential of our various service lines |
| 7. That consideration should be given in future to the distribution of a proportion of company profits to community projects or organisations as a tax efficient means of returning value to the city and the Council. | Yes | This is another opportunity to return increased value to the Council and the community and we will review the scope for doing this during 18/19 |
| 8. That measures of additional financial returns to the Council should distinguish between value created through efficiency savings and new revenues. | Yes | The efficiency savings are in Building Services. The other 3 main service lines (motor transport, highways & engineering and commercial waste) are all about growth. The additional £500k per annum by 21/22 is expressed as 'value' because it is a combination of profit and efficiency. Estimates of efficiency and growth are included under each service line but these cannot be predicted precisely. The focus will be on achieving £500k per annum as a minimum through a combination of efforts. |

21 NOVEMBER 2017 CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD

Review of Community Grants and Commissioned Advice Services - Executive Board Members for Culture & Communities and Customer & Corporate Services

| Recommendation | Agree? | Comment |
|---|---------------|---|
| 1. That the Council identifies a suitable means of building capacity within BAME communities that are underrepresented among open bidding and small grants recipients, perhaps by linking this objective to the priorities for community and voluntary sector infrastructure support going forwards. | Y | Within the papers inviting bids for the CVO infrastructure support a specific question has been included asking applicants to explain how they will support the BAME communities in building capacity. |
| 2. That a greater emphasis is placed on disseminating information about the grant application processes, together with advice about how to make a good application. This information should be generally available but also targeted at underrepresented groups and communities. | Y | As well as promoting the grant programme through our website and social media channels we will distribute leaflets through community centres and display through our noticeboards. Guidance notes include information on how to complete the application form and suggestions on what to consider to ensure they answer the questions fully, 4 workshops will be held when the open bidding grants programme is open for applications, 2 on bid writing and 2 on what makes a successful application. One of these will be held in East Oxford. |
| 3. That the Council ensures that there is a continuing dialogue with advice centres about the proposals, including specifically the proposal to make a 5% reduction to the direct funding that goes to each organisation and to pool that money with an additional £20k that advice centres can bid for to fund development work. | Y | The Revenues & Benefits Programme Manager met with the advice centres on 8th November to discuss the revised specification and the proposed new funding approach. It was a productive meeting, and all parties reaffirmed their commitment to act on the recommendations of the Advice UK report (this commitment had been made at a previous meeting on August 3rd). The advice centres made a request to defer the 5% reallocation of core funding to a new match funded development pot until April 2019, the second year of the new contract. Officers will hold a further meeting with the agencies in the new year following a decision by CEB. |
| 4. That consideration is given to whether there is a role for the Council in providing 'social grants' funding directly to social enterprise organisations. | Y | Through the open bidding grant programmes one of the things that we list as not wanting to fund are organisations making a commercial gain; however we do fund community interest companies and other none profit making organisations as long as |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | they can evidence there is more than one person running the organisation and they are not related. Through the Homelessness commissioning grant programme we fund The Big Issue and support Aspire who run social enterprises supporting homeless people change their lives. |
| 5. That further consideration is given to whether the proposed £200k income ceiling is the most appropriate means of limiting the size of groups that can apply for small grants. | Y | We will look into this. |

16 OCTOBER 2017 CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD

Financial Inclusion Strategy 2017-2020

| Recommendation | Agree? | Comment |
|---|---------------|--|
| That further funding is identified for emergency support if £50k is found to be insufficient to cover the essential living costs of people migrating to Universal Credit. | Y | I am happy to note the request for priority to be given to this if required. |

18

Recycling (Board Member for Climate Change and Cleaner Greener Oxford)

| Recommendation | Agree? | Comment |
|--|---------------|--|
| <p>Recommendation – That, alongside the previous recommendation about making every effort to continue to fund recycling incentive campaigns beyond October 2018, the work of the Recycling Team is broadened to build on the Team’s already impressive performance. This could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Expanding school visits to try to reach every school in the city; b) Co-ordinating volunteer recycling champions in schools and communities; c) Running an incentive scheme for students based on competition between campuses; d) Creating awareness videos, e.g. showing what happens to different materials once they have been recycled; e) Facilitating more trips to waste disposal facilities for members of the public, which are so popular they are booked up until April 2018; | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. We have a programme of contacting schools to increase our visits. Any links/contacts would be gladly received. We’ve also had 2 more recycling games made (from local social enterprise, RAW Workshop) b. This is something we will explore c. This is something we will explore d. This is something we’d like to do – watch this space! e. We currently offer almost monthly tours, which are fully booked until April next year! We will continue to offer these trips and signpost groups and schools to Ardley ERF (which offers free tours to anyone in Oxon) f. We’re presenting at the Landlord Information Exchange on Thursday 19th October and offer free recycling education to anyone in Oxford g. This is something we will explore. Officers will investigate the |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>f) Proactive engagement with landlords, both directly and through the forum;</p> <p>g) Trialling a 'moving out campaign' where the Council offers to collect waste at the end of students' tenancy for a one off fee, with a view to potentially rolling this scheme out to other residents, subject to capacity and demand;</p> <p>h) Improving the visual appearance of public bins, e.g., by using different colour schemes for recycling and other waste or installing recycling bins with holes the shape of drink cans, as is done in other countries, etc.;</p> <p>i) Considering how to communicate the issue of litter in the city centre to the public in a way that is sensitive to the fact that Oxford is a major tourist destination.</p> <p>j) Simplifying the message of what is and what is not recyclable, using images where possible.</p> <p>k) Reviewing good practices from other local authorities, especially well performing Welsh authorities.</p> <p>l) Considering the case for making the temporary British Heart Foundation bins installed around the city a permanent feature.</p> | | <p>feasibility and consider a financial appraisal of extending the proposed moving out campaign</p> <p>h. This is something we will explore and will be done in conjunction with Streetscene and Clean Green campaigns</p> <p>i. Agreed we should continue to offer bins in the city centre.</p> <p>k. We're always keen to learn best practice from others. Some of the team will be attending the LARAC Conference next month, which will provide an opportunity to learn from other council recycling teams</p> <p>l. BHF banks are well used. Where practicable and suitable we would support permanent siting of BHF banks.</p> |
|--|--|--|

Disabled impacts in planning (Board Member for Planning & Regulatory Services)

| Recommendation | Agree? | Comment |
|--|---------------|--|
| 1. That the Council consults with disabled users and organisations in the context of the emerging Local Plan. | Yes | The Council already has a number of organisations and community groups who are consultees for planning policy changes such as the Local Plan. Officers recently met with Unlimited Oxfordshire to discuss a range of issues including the Local Plan and are happy to increase consultation with disabled users and organisations. |
| 2. That the Council contacts the Department for Communities and Local Government asking them to: a) Review the application and impacts of part M of the Building Regulations and whether these regulations and optional standards go far enough in light of the latest demographic data; b) Promulgate good practice in terms of disabled access and inclusivity to local authorities. | Yes | |
| 3. That the Council makes representations to landlords, estate | Yes | This requires a broad approach across the Council, as these |

| | | |
|---|-----|--|
| agents and developers about the importance of creating an inclusive housing market. | | organisations are often dealt with by different departments and under different strategies. Officers will consider how best to have a single statement of best practice, charter or similar that can be used with these different groups. |
| 4. That as part of the Local Plan review the Council reviews whether planning policy HP2 requires that a sufficiently high proportion of new dwellings are either fully wheelchair accessible or easily adapted for full wheelchair use, in order to meet future housing needs in the city, or whether the 5% threshold should be raised. | Yes | This is best considered as an additional submission to the Preferred Options consultation, and will be considered alongside all other responses. |
| 5. That where possible, the Council monitors compliance with planning policy HP2 (or any equivalent policy that replaces it following the Local Plan review). | Yes | Where the Building Control Service are the inspecting authority they will ensure that new buildings comply with Part M of the Building Regulations, including where planning conditions have been imposed to comply with relevant planning policies relating to accessibility and adaptability. |
| 6. That the Council encourages higher standards of disabled access and inclusivity through HMO licencing. This could include capturing data from inspections and making recommendations to landlords on good practice. | Yes | The nature of a licence and the process of licensing is that the conditions for that licence only ensure compliance with housing legislation. It is not therefore possible to require something that cannot be used as a condition of the licence. This means that the statement of best practice – as described in answer to Q3 above – would be advisory only. However the regular contact between officers and HMO landlords and the educational work through Landlords Forums offers an opportunity to help promote best practice. The proposed new enhanced inspection scheme for the broader private rented sector (PRS) offers a similar opportunity in the rest of the PRS. |
| 7. That the Council continues to look at good practice from other local authorities to inform further improvements to planning and regulatory services, including with regards to disabled access and inclusivity. | Yes | The aim of the Planning, Sustainable Development and Regulatory Service is to be Best in Class and so benchmarking, innovation and seeking out best practice is carried out on a regular basis. This might also be done as part of a process of regularly reviewing the statement of best practice. |

Oxford Design Review Panel (Board Member for Planning & Regulatory Services)

| Recommendation | Agree? | Comment |
|---|---------------|---|
| 1. That the ODRP has (or has access to) on-going heritage | Yes | The Council and CABE will be reviewing this over the next |

| | | |
|---|---------|---|
| expertise where schemes are in conservation areas or adjacent to or affect listed buildings in order to better understand the local heritage context of development schemes, and that consideration is given as to how this can best be achieved. | | twelve months, looking at options and consequences. |
| 2. That consistency of the ODRP's membership is guaranteed as far as possible for repeat reviews. | In part | Agreed, but with the proviso that this is not wholly in the control of the Council as it depends on third parties and their availability. |
| 3. That proposals for a review of the effectiveness of the ODRP should be drawn up that includes a social impact element. | Yes | The next 12 months will be used to review the effectiveness and operation of the ODRP across a range of criteria |
| 4. That elected members are alerted to the fact that they may submit suggestions for review by the ODRP. | Yes | A guidance note will be sent to all members setting out the principles for design review and which type, scale and nature of schemes would normally go through a design review process; it will also make clear the independent position of the ODRP, and the relationship between the Panel, the Council and the developer/applicant. |
| 5. That a mechanism is established to alert Councillors to pre-application proposals in their Wards, recognising that pre-application discussions are normally confidential and that this notification may only happen with the prior-agreement of the scheme developer/promoter. | In Part | Pre-application proposals are confidential, and can only be made public with the prior agreement of the applicant. Officers will also need to consider how such proposals – which would sit outside the normal automated planning application notification workflow – could be notified to members without the need for a cumbersome or manual workaround. Any system that relied on individual officers having to notify members manually would be at risk of human error, and would likely be unsatisfactory. |
| 6. That the advisory status of the ODRP and its advice is made clear to planning committees, elected members and the public. | Yes | This would be covered by the same guidance note referred to above, which would be made publicly available. |

19 SEPTEMBER 2017 CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD

Grant monitoring (Board Member for Culture & Communities)

| Recommendation | Agreed? | Comment |
|--|----------------|---|
| 1. That the wording of future reports is be more nuanced to reflect the fact that monitoring relies to a significant extent on self-assessment, and perhaps comes with a 'health warning', notwithstanding the evidently positive overall picture. | Agreed | |
| 2. That consideration is given to including more qualitative data in future monitoring reports, a subset of which could be some form | Agreed | Case studies have always been included in this report, this year's are in appendix 2. There has been an Equalities Impact |

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| of equalities impact assessment. | | Assessment undertaken as part of the grant review report. |
| 3. That future monitoring reports include data on the 'spend per beneficiary' of individual grant awards. | Agreed | We can do this but must be read in conjunction with qualitative data as it is an unreliable measure of how effectively a funded project has performed or achieved. |

Brexit (Leader of the Council)

| Recommendation | Agreed? | Comment |
|--|----------------|--|
| 1. That the Council supports the Local Government Association in calling on the Government to grant local councils the £8.4bn they are due from the Structural Investment Fund between 2014 and 2020. | Y | Agreed. The Oxfordshire LEP, through which Structural Funds are now channelled, has already made the case for the current round to be guaranteed and the Chancellor has given that assurance in relation to the ESIF funds that are due to Oxfordshire. |
| 2. That the Council informs all staff who have been identified as possible non-UK EU citizens and who have not already taken up the Council's offer to reimburse the cost of applying for a UK Registration Certificate or Permanent Residence Card that the Council remains happy to reimburse these costs. | Y | Agreed. This has been done and will be reiterated over the coming year as necessary. |
| 3. That further consideration is given, in the light of Brexit, to the case for having a powerful advocacy role for the Oxford economy at national and international levels and how this could be achieved in the absence of a directly elected mayor for Oxfordshire. | Y | Agreed. The case for Oxfordshire is being made currently by the Growth Board to the National Infrastructure Commission, and to DCLG/BEIS. The Science Innovation Audit and the responses to BEIS on the Industrial Strategy have made similar cases. Our city MPs, Anneliese Dodds and Layla Moran, are strong advocates for the local economy and its vulnerability to the Tory Government's Hard Brexit policies. I think we can be confident that the absence of an elected Mayor will not be a significant weakness in pressing our point of view. |

22

Draft Housing and Homelessness Strategy (Board Member for Housing)

| Recommendation | Agreed? | Comment |
|--|----------------|--|
| That leaflets promoting the consultation are provided to elected members and that paper copies of the survey are also made available to members. | Yes | Publicity leaflets and copies of the survey questionnaire will be provided to Members as requested. |
| That consideration is given to how the Council engages with rough sleepers and service users on the strategy and other issues that affect them, including the option of forming a 'service | Yes | Consideration will be given to how the Council can further engage rough sleepers and service users to consult them on the strategy. The planned consultation activities include public drop- |

| | | |
|--|-----|--|
| user group’. | | in sessions and stakeholder workshops, both of which provide an opportunity for service users’ opinions to be presented. Existing networks with service users and support providers can help to promote the strategy consultation. Any formal ‘service user group’ will require the ongoing support of voluntary and community sector organisations. |
| That as part of Empty Homes Week the Council promotes the issue of empty homes and its online reporting tool. | Yes | The Council will be promoting the issue of empty homes and its online reporting tool as part of the National Empty Homes Week which will run from 16 October to 22 October 2017. |
| That the final documentation should include: a) Some explanation in the evidence base as to why 13 Council-owned dwellings were long-term empty as of 1 April 2017. b) Some recognition that combining the three strategies and holding one consultation saved officer time and some costs. c) Some mention of learning points from the previous strategies as well as successes. | Yes | Amendments to the final strategy will include these points. |

18 JULY 2017 CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD

Local Authority Trading Company – Progress report (Leader of the Council)

| Recommendation | Agree? | Comment |
|---|---------------|----------------|
| That the Council ensures that the very positive potential benefits the trading companies can generate for the Council and the wider community are communicated effectively to the public, elected members and other Council employees, as well as to Direct Services staff, through a robust communications plan. | Yes | |

Council Tax Reduction Scheme (Board Member for Customer and Corporate Services)

| Recommendation | Agree? | Comment |
|--|---------------|---|
| 1. That the Council consults on option 1 and perhaps makes it clear that this is a ‘preferred option’, giving reasons. | Yes | Option 1 will allow the Council to make efficiency savings as Universal Credit is more widely rolled out. It also provides greater flexibility to amend the support provided in the future. |
| 2. That the Council consults on options 2-7 & 9 as options that | Partly | The paper shows the full range of options that were available to |

| | | |
|--|------------|--|
| could form part of a package of measures to simplify the administration of the scheme and/or reduce costs. | | the council to consult upon. However, I would propose that when it comes to the consultation, we consult on options 1, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 9 and do not include options 2, 4, 8 and 10-12. For instance, option 2 could discriminate against people with larger families, who may already be affected by other benefit changes such as the Benefit Cap. |
| 3. That the Council does not consult on Option 8. | Yes | As with option 2, option 8 discriminates against larger families. |
| 4. That the Council consults on Option 10, 11 and 12 making it clear that these are not the Council's preferred options, giving reasons. | Not agreed | My preference would be to not include these in the consultation as these are not options that I would support. |

15 JUNE 2017 CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD

Local Plan Preferred Options (Board Member for Planning & Regulatory Services)

| Recommendation | Agree? | Comment |
|--|---------------|---|
| That consideration is given to the possibility and desirability of using planning policy to protect and control shopping frontages in smaller shopping areas that are not classified as local centres. | In part | <p>Local centres are considered in the Local Plan Preferred Options document as part of the hierarchy of centres for town centres uses. Town centres are where town centre uses should be directed. The definition of Town centres in the NPPF explicitly excludes neighbourhood centres.</p> <p>An option to include a lower tier of centres (below Local Centres) has not been put forward in the Plan, as this is not therefore considered to be compliant with the NPPF which sets out that small parades of shops are not classed as 'centres'. The proposed Local Centres are listed in the Options document, and if consultees consider further areas should to be identified as centres, they can be put forward during the consultation, and if it's considered that they do meet the NPPF definition then they can be included in the draft plan.</p> |