

Scrutiny recommendation tracker 2018/19 – May 2019

Total recommendations	83
Agreed	58 (70%)
Agreed in part	11 (13%)
Not agreed	14 (17%)

10 April CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD

Fusion Lifestyle

<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Agree?</i>	<i>Comment</i>
Recommendation 1: That further work is undertaken to accelerate the consistent scheduling of time appropriate female only pool sessions in Blackbird Leys, and that a date is provided for when this will be done.	Yes	Fusion are very aware of the need and benefits of adding a further ladies only session and they are now finalising how they can adjust the swimming programme accordingly. We expect that this new session will start in the next few months.

171

Oxford Living Wage

<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Agree?</i>	<i>Comment</i>
Recommendation 1: That the Council continues to seek out ways to incentivise local businesses to become Oxford Living Wage accredited employers.	Yes	We will explore best practice and consider what ways businesses can be incentivised to ensure positive social and environmental impact through initiatives such as the Oxford Living Wage
Recommendation 2: That the Council's promotional activity around the Oxford Living Wage incorporates customer facing marketing, which encourages conscience driven spending with Oxford Living Wage accredited shops and services.	Yes	We will consider ways to incorporate this into the annual programme of activity.
Recommendation 3: That the Council engages with trade unions, campaign groups, parish councils and other community groups to broaden the pool of pressure groups in the City and better coordinate the local Oxford Living Wage campaign.	Yes	Officers will work alongside the Living Wage Champion who already undertakes this work

Floyd's Row

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
1. That the Council continues to encourage the Government to provide funding to plug the capital shortfall while also exploring opportunities to draw on other local and national funding streams for specific purposes.	Yes	<p>Council Officers (including the Head of Housing and Assistant Chief Executive) met with the Council's MHCLG Specialist Rough Sleeping Advisor on 9th April 2019 to further highlight the merits of the Oxford bid in the Rapid Rehousing Pathway (RRP) funding round currently being evaluated by the MHCLG.</p> <p>We will also make representations at senior level in CLG and the LGA and ask the other Oxfordshire authorities to do likewise to further support this bid and stress the importance of this funding opportunity to deliver a project to significantly address and reduce rough sleeping across Oxfordshire.</p>
<p>2. That the Council builds on the successful service user engagement activities that have taken place by:</p> <p>a) Ensuring (through the contract with the service provider) that a culture of service user participation will be maintained at Floyd's Row.</p> <p>b) Taking a similar approach to service user participation and co-production in future projects.</p>	Yes	<p>Officers will seek to embed the practice of service users engagement in the service delivery of this new service, recognising that this can be best achieved through various measures, including pro-active participation and co-design; organisational culture and staff attitudes; using volunteers and persons with lived experience in the mainstream delivery of services, etc. This approach can be underpinned through requirements in the service specification and contracts.</p> <p>Officers will disseminate the approach used in this design exercise through the Project Management Office and seek to co-produce other services based on these principles and lessons learnt, to maximise the user voice in service delivery.</p>

172

Breaches in Building Control

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
1. That consideration is given to how to ensure that high quality delivery and best value will be secured when the Council (or its housing company) will be taking ownership of multiple new build properties, for example by employing or insisting on the employment of a Clerk of Works to oversee the quality and safety of the building work.	Yes	<p>The Council already employs a clerk of works for the more complicated projects an example being the towers refurbishment. The latter also included the funding of a full time building control officer with a specific focus on fire safety. Smaller projects will have internal project management that has a quality control function but this is usually in tandem with ODSL as contractor. The Housing Company also employs a clerk of works function for their developments and will consider the use of OCC building control subject to a procurement process. The Council also employs a CoW for the Council/OCHL units coming from the BOLLP on Barton Park. This is in addition to an exacting design and quality specification established by BOLLP.</p>

2. That the Council continues to prioritise the successful practice of employing and training apprentices within the Building Control Service, giving particular emphasis to the need to ensure that an appropriate level of training and mentoring is provided by permanent staff.	Yes	
---	-----	--

13 March CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD

Street art

<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Agree?</i>	<i>Comment</i>
<p>Recommendation 1: That the Council considers how best to define 'larger commercial ventures' when requiring such private land owners to pay for the removal of graffiti, to ensure the policy is applied consistently.</p> <p>673</p>	YES	<p>Larger Commercial Ventures are any business that has more than one premises. For smaller businesses Oxford City Council would seek to remove graffiti of up to 4m².</p> <p>Any racist, obscene, homophobic or hate related graffiti in the public domain will be removed or obscured on all businesses (but only the graffiti that fall into one of the aforementioned categories). All remaining graffiti will be charged as above.</p>

<p>Recommendation 2: That the Council engages more widely with residents and other stakeholders (for example through an appreciative enquiry) concerning the use of Street Art in deterring graffiti in and around Meadow Lane.</p> <p>174</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>We currently satisfy this recommendation—the Council engages as widely as possible. We have officers who have strong relationships with community figures and manage street art projects inclusively, and this is an asset to the Council and one we should recognise.</p> <p>As with previous street art projects (for example, at the Murco site) Council officers will continue to engage widely and intensively with residents and all those with a direct interest in the proposal to have street art. So far City officers from the Community Response Team have met with Local Councillors for the Meadow Lane project along with the Chair of Iffley Fields Residents Association (IFRA). The Board Member has been in contact with Local Councillors and interested residents. Officers and Ward Councillors have scrutinised the proposed art project for the Meadow Lane site and an officer has met twice with the Sisters at the convent (they own the wall and have sought street art for it). An officer has met with the artist in residence at local primary school, St Mary and St John to discuss the community project; designed a consultation document approved by the Public Involvement Project Briefing; and is arranging to carry out the consultation. An officer is attending the IFRA AGM to speak to local residents and introduce the consultation document before carrying out consultation.</p>
<p>Recommendation 3: That the City Executive Board considers how the Council can be creative in deterring graffiti on the commercial security shutters of retail units owned by the Council, to improve the public realm. This could be achieved through the use of street art projects, for example.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>As we were referring to Council-owned properties within the meeting, I would welcome local Councillors identifying the premises that would benefit from street art. We would then seek funding for street artwork and link up with local street artists to arrange projects.</p> <p>Any significant intensification of the street art programme would require financial support and further support by all City Councillors. It would be welcome to the CRT to have this funding and support.</p>
<p>Recommendation 4: That the Council ensures that decision making processes relating to the delivery of services through Council-owned companies remain open to pre-decision scrutiny, where those matters are reserved for decision making within the Council.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>The City Executive Board supports the principle that any substantive change to Council policy, whether delivered directly through the Council or commissioned through its wholly-owned companies, remains open to pre-decision scrutiny.</p>

Social value

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
Recommendation 1: That CEB considers introducing a 5% social values weighting for all non OJEU procurement requirements within the Council, which should be reviewed annually (and reported to Finance Panel) to consider whether subsequent increases are appropriate. This change should be subsequently recommended to Council for incorporation in the next Constitution review.	Yes	This will require a change in the Contract Rules within the Councils Constitution but once this is done then appropriate awareness and training can be undertaken with Managers to implement this recommendation.
Recommendation 2: That the Council sets a target of paying contracted small and medium size enterprises and voluntary community sector organisations within 14 days of the contract being agreed, where it is requested.	Yes	This policy can be implemented relatively quickly
Recommendation 3: That the Council should seek to apply the Green Public Procurement Policy on all of its future contracts, and that these requirements are highlighted to all prospective tenders seeking to bid for a Council contract.	Yes	A number of our contracts already incorporate elements of the Green Public Procurement Policy in relation to some specific items e.g paint. The Procurement Team can introduce this requirement into all tenders that the council is seeking bids for.

Acceptable behaviours consultation

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
Recommendation 1: That the Council ensures that the consultation on acceptable behaviours in the City Centre actively seeks out the views of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) People who sleep rough and related third sector support organisations, as well as other vulnerable groups and their associated bodies. b) Thames Valley Police. c) People who are likely to oppose the introduction of PSPOs. 	Yes Yes Yes	The consultation will be delivered by an independent organisation who will be tasked with speaking to vulnerable people and rough sleepers. In line with Home Office guidance, the consultation will hear views of all people, some of whom will oppose the introduction of a PSPO. There are some organisation actively campaigning for the abolition of PSPOs – they will be contacted and again if there is a subsequent PSPO consultation.
Recommendation 2: That the consultation on acceptable behaviours presents information objectively, and that questions are phrased in an open way.	Yes	No Comment

Recommendation 3: That any subsequent City Executive Board report concerning PSPOs discusses alternative approaches to managing unacceptable behaviours, and the benefits and limitations of such approaches. This report should also set out a list of consultees the Council has approached as part of the acceptable behaviours consultation.	Yes Yes	No Comment
Recommendation 4: That consideration is given to how the Council could better protect people sleeping rough from violence and abuse.	Yes	Rough sleepers have the right to the same protections as anyone else. Wherever crimes or abuse against rough sleepers is reported, the full weight of the law must be used to bring the perpetrators to justice.

12 February CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD

Rent Guarantee Scheme

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
<p>Recommendation 1: That the City Executive Board:</p> <p>a) Notes that the Rent Guarantee Scheme applies to <u>families</u> only; not single people or couples, who are most <u>risk</u> at risk of rough sleeping.</p> <p>b) Considers how the Council might extend the Scheme so that it applies to at-risk single people and couples, and that this expansion is integrated in with the Lord Mayor's Deposit Guarantee Scheme, which performs a similar function but applies to single people and couples.</p>	Partially	<p>The Lord Mayor's Deposit Scheme provides help with a deposit and rent in advance for people who find their own private rented sector property. Anyone is able to apply for this scheme.</p> <p>The Home Choice and Rent Guarantee Schemes are quite different. These are schemes which enable the Council to fulfil its statutory duty towards households that it must accommodate. Prior to the introduction of the Homelessness Reduction Act (2017), this was entirely made up of families. The Council recognises that there is a need to provide a similar service for individuals, and has recently submitted a bid into the government to run a pilot scheme to support this group into the private rented sector.</p>

Budget 2019/20

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
Recommendation 1: That Council Tax is increased by 2.99% in 2019/20.	Y	Agree
Recommendation 2a: That the Council maintains its current level of funding to support international twinning links.	N	The budget proposes increased core funding for town twinning. It does not quite reach the level of funding of this budget year, but that is because the Council included one-off funding to support

<p>Recommendation 2b: That the Council drafts a vision document for its twinning work to guide future funding decisions, to be presented to the City Executive Board for agreement in 2019/20.</p>		<p>the establishment of its link with Wroclaw. We will monitor whether funding proves sufficient to support its activities and make recommendations about future years as appropriate.</p>
<p>Recommendation 3a: That the Council makes available appropriate resources to support the establishment of a citizen's assembly, in line with the climate change motion passed on 28 January 2019.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The proposal came too late to be included in this year's budget planning. However, we will talk with partners about how to establish this process, and if funding is required will attempt to respond positively in year.</p>
<p>Recommendation 3b: That future budget proposals feature independent officer comment on the impact that the Council's plans may have on the environment, and how closely aligned the proposals are to the Council's broader environmental ambitions.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>The Council will look to include an overview of the impact of the Council's Budget proposals on the Environment in future Budget Setting reports. We will look at how this can be resourced over the coming months.</p>
<p>Recommendation 4: That the Council carries out a full assessment of the impact made by its funding towards the Joint Taskforce to tackle open drug dealing and drug taking in the City, before a decision is taken on its future funding.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Indications are that the Drug Task Force is having some impact on the level of drug dealing and drug misuse in public spaces. It is understood that Thames Valley Police will undertake this work for next financial year; this represents a "vote of confidence" in this work, but given this is now being funded by TVP, it would be for them rather than the City Council to assess the full impact. This project has been a welcome illustration of how one-off Council support can shape priorities in partnership with other agencies.</p>
<p>Recommendation 5: That the Council, through its Housing Company, should seek to develop a longer term view of its development plan. This should include establishing a broad programme of property and land acquisitions to be supported by a standalone funding pot provided by the Council for purchases.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>The Council will be considering its policy position and strategic direction of OCHL over the next 3 months</p>
<p>Recommendation 6: That the Council makes strong representations within its response to Central Government's Fairer Funding Consultation ending on 21 February 2019 to the effect that:</p> <p>a) Council Tax Reduction Schemes should not be taken into account when assessing a local authority's available resources and calculating its baseline funding level. This is to avoid effective double taxation.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>I strongly agree with this recommendation. This Council is one of a handful of authorities across the country that have maintained the Council Tax Reduction Scheme to the same requirements that existed when the scheme was first introduced in 2013. The Council sees this scheme as a key priority, protecting the more vulnerable in society. To 'penalise' the Council for making this choice seems extremely unfair.</p> <p>In respect of car parking charges and fees and charges, the Government themselves do not believe this is a good idea, given</p>

<p>b) Income from car parking, fees and charges should not be taken into account when assessing a local authority's available resources and calculating its baseline funding level.</p>		<p>the volatility of these income streams which would place further financial risk and exposure on local authorities, so it is uncertain why it is included in the consultation.</p>
<p>Recommendation 7: That the Council writes to Central Government, making the case for greater local discretion to increase Council tax premiums on second homes. The case should also be made for these premiums to come into effect earlier (i.e sooner than the current two year threshold). This could alternatively feature in a consultation response to Central Government if appropriate.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>The two year threshold refers to homes that have been empty (unoccupied and unfurnished) for two years or more where a 50% premium is charged (with a recommendation to change to 100% with effect from 1-4-2019) on top of the normal council tax. Furnished second homes are charged in accordance with the normal council tax for the band of property i.e there is no premium or discount. The Council will lobby Government to request a change to allow an additional premium to be placed on second homes in line with the recent changes for empty homes.</p>
<p>Recommendation 8: That the Council seeks to revive its joint working with Oxfordshire County Council to carry out an investigative review of Council Tax discounts offered to students and single persons.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>The County Council have made contributions to single person discount review although this has not been forthcoming for this year. This Council will continue to press for a contribution since the majority of the financial benefit accrues to the County Council.</p>
<p>Recommendation 9: That the Council ensures any revisions to Oxford City Housing Limited's business plans receive appropriate pre-decision scrutiny, and that any broader changes to Shareholder governance arrangements remain open to Scrutiny.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Agreed. Changes to the business plan is a reserved matter for the shareholder and as such can be subject to scrutiny by the companies panel</p>
<p>Recommendation 10: That the Council seeks opportunities to support high profile events in the region, for example, the 2022 Commonwealth Games in Birmingham.</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>We already plan our work so it links with national campaigns and we will endeavour to do the same for 2022 Commonwealth Games. Where possible we do this by working with partners and within current budgets.</p>
<p>Recommendation 11: That the Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Seeks to promote demonstrator or concept modular housing developments within the City, as potentially quick construction models, whilst seeking to secure external investment in such innovative developments. b) Undertakes a comparative costing of different construction approaches across typical small and large development sites, which includes information on the lower financial contingencies necessary with modular builds, and the financial benefits accruing from more rapid construction. 	<p>Y</p>	<p>The Council and OCHL will continue to review options for procurement and method of construction in order to deliver overall value for money. Experience so far with regard to off- site construction is showing in order for this to deliver speed of delivery and value for money then this would need to be done at scale. This is something we are also looking to pursue with our Growth Deal partners County wide</p>

Recommendation 12: That the Council establishes a target higher than 80% for capital delivery against the budget in 2019/20, which should feature in the Council's Capital Strategy going forward.	Y	We agree with this recommendation as it aligns with the new processes being put in place and the work of the new Programme Management Office (PMO) regarding prioritisation and implementation of capital spend. Potential targets would be 80% in 2019/20 rising to 90% from 2020/21. This is subject to the completion of the review work.
Recommendation 13: That the Board Member for Finance and Asset Management reviews the four year budget allocation for maintenance and repairs (£2m per annum) to ensure it represents the optimal level of investment for the Council, in light of the £2.6m backlog of works that will remain after year four.	Y	This is a matter that will be reviewed on an annual basis as the effects of our planned maintenance programme are better understood in comparison to the future investment needs of the stock.
Recommendation 14: That the Council keeps under close review the use of its Homelessness Reserves, and presents a longer-term plan in 2020 which is less reliant on reserves for future revenue expenditure for these services. Appropriate contingency plans should also be developed in light of the uncertainty around long term Central Government funding. 179	Y	A number of current activities in this area are currently funded from government grants and also funding from the County Council, other districts and the Clinical Commissioning Group. Whilst there is some certainty in the short term over the medium term the position is less certain. The Council is mindful of the need to ensure the sustainability of future plans around homelessness expenditure and will continue to keep this area under review.
Recommendation 15: That future budget proposals benchmark Oxford City Council's Staff Pay Deal against other national and local wage indicators, to put the Council's pay bill into the wider context, and assist in forecasting future.	Y	The Council is about to enter the second year of the existing 3 year pay deal. For future years inflation rates forecasts have been used as an indicator of likely pay inflation. The Council will look at indicators of local and national pay rates when it commences its pay negotiations in the ensuing months.

22 January CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD

Joint Statutory Spatial Plan

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
Recommendation 1: That the Council works with the five Oxfordshire districts to incorporate minor amendments to the Regulation 18 Consultation Document, to strengthen the Plan's ambitions to address climate change and provide truly affordable housing (consistent with other long term national and local policies and targets). These themes should be considered the basis for the Council's response to the consultation.	Yes	The City Council will work with the other Local Planning Authorities to make minor textual amendments along the lines suggested by the Scrutiny Committee, though as the Committee noted during its discussion, the requirement for unanimity means that we cannot guarantee that each and every suggestion will be adopted. I want to thank the Committee for an extremely useful discussion, and to thank them for framing their recommendations in a way that gives

		the greatest chance of a successful negotiation with our partner authorities.
--	--	---

18 December CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD

The Westgate Centre

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
Recommendation 1: That CEB considers what further opportunities are available to promote and encourage the take up of the Oxford Living Wage among employers located in the Westgate Centre.	Yes	Agree that it would be wrong simply to focus on Westgate and that there should be a campaign to promote the OLW across Oxford and across a range of employment sectors.
Recommendation 2: That CEB carries out a survey of the 125 retailers in the Westgate Centre to understand how many are paying the Oxford Living Wage as a minimum to all their staff.	No	Recommendation 1 is a higher priority and we need to promote good practice amongst employers first of all. Surveys can be costly and may not achieve anything given that the City Council has no powers of enforcement.
Recommendation 3: That CEB engages with local retailers in the wider city to understand where improvements to the public realm are most needed, and that these are incorporated into the City Council's scheme of works.	Yes	This has already started to happen through the City Centre Taskforce. We are looking to strengthen our City Ambassadors team and their enforcement powers. Improved public realm is also likely to be a key feature of a BID, if this comes forward.
Recommendation 4: That CEB carries out a survey of retailers in secondary retail areas in the City (outside of the city centre) to understand what impact the redevelopment of the Westgate Centre has had on local businesses.	In part	It would be useful to have this information, and to look at ways in which we can boost secondary shopping centres in the way we have supported Covered a Market traders. However, it will be difficult to establish exactly what the impact of Westgate is on the shopping areas given that each is affected by a variety of different factors, such as roadworks and car parking which will be different in each area. Officers have very recently undertaken a shopfront frontage survey of occupancy levels in the district centres (November 2018) so recent data is available. This information could be supplemented by discussion with any local or neighbourhood trading associations to get an understanding of how trading conditions in those locations are evolving.

The Severe Weather Emergency Protocol

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
That the City Executive Board introduces a brief exit survey for all SWEP users to gather feedback on how they were made aware of SWEP, and their experience of accessing the service.	Yes	No comment

14 November CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD

Workplace Equalities

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
Recommendation 1 - That the Council does not differentiate between Catholics and Christians in its workforce equalities data	Yes	The technical aspects of changing the categories available for applicants to select from will be explored with the platform provider and the data reported going forwards relating to religious belief will be amended accordingly.
Recommendation 2 - That the Council explores opportunities to improve its engagement with the BAME population within Oxford, through existing means such as recruitment fairs, for example.	Yes	This will be taken forward as part of the action plan for 2018.
Recommendation 3 - That the Council ensures it has robust processes in place to gather feedback from employees who are leaving the organisation, and whether their treatment in relation to any protected characteristics was a factor in their decision to leave. Consideration should also be given to facilitating a 'safe space' where current employees can feedback about sensitive employment matters, such as barriers experienced by under-represented groups.	Yes	A revised exit interview process, based on a face to face discussion with a member of the HR team, will be implemented in the New Year. Feedback on the data trends from the new exit interview process will form part of the update to Scrutiny next year. Current policies and procedures provide a confidential pathway for staff to raise such concerns, either through trade union representatives or to HR directly, in a supported and safe environment. In addition a Staff Reference Group will be established shortly where such feedback and perceived or actual barriers can be discussed.

No Local Connection Review Group

Recommendation	Accept	CEB Comment
Part 1: Redefining the Local Connection		
<p>Recommendation 1: That the Council extends the exemption criteria within the Local Connection Policy to provide a more comprehensive narrative and make clear that discretion may be used to offer a local connection to a person in circumstances where:</p>	<p>Yes to a more comprehensive narrative and more clarity on how discretion is currently used to apply exemptions to NLC rules.</p>	<p>I agree that changes should be made to provide much more clarity and transparency about how officers use the discretion granted to them to apply exemptions to NLC rules. Exemptions are an important tool in the box for this authority to provide support and assistance where it is needed. Discretion is important as individuals affected by homelessness do not always fall into neat boxes and officers need to be allowed to use their professional opinion and their commons sense in order for the best result to be obtained. However, examples of how this discretion is applied and case studies of exemptions should be publically available in order to increase transparency around the process and assist those advocating on behalf of individuals trying to access the pathway.</p>
<p>a) They are known by the Council to have slept rough or 'sofa surfed' in Oxford for a continuous period in excess of 6 months, with no clear prospect of reconnection to another local authority area.</p>	<p>Yes, in part.</p>	<p>If someone has slept rough on the streets of Oxford and has been known to OXSPOT throughout this period then they should be considered as having a local connection for the purposes of the Adult Homeless Pathway. We should always have due regard to with the Code of Guidance HA 1996 and apply the principles to each case on their own merit.</p>
<p>b) Their long term physical or mental health condition (including substance misuse) poses a significantly elevated risk to that person's health and safety, beyond that experienced by other rough sleepers.</p>	<p>No.</p>	<p>Priority access to suitable services should always be afforded to those who are especially vulnerable because of health issues.</p> <p>The Oxfordshire Mental Health Pathway does not require a local connection (other than being registered with a local GP) and may be the most suitable option.</p> <p>Options for reconnection to a home district should be explored first while clients are assessed and given a safe place to stay such as sit-up. This is an area where the importance of officer judgement on when to apply an exemption is especially relevant.</p>
<p>c) They are known by the Council to be fleeing violence from another area within the UK, with no clear prospect of reconnection to another council area that is considered safe.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>This is already done through an exemption. This is an example of where better information about how exemptions are applied is needed.</p>

<p>Recommendation 2:</p> <p>That the Council grants a lifetime local connection to people who were born in Oxford, where no period of absence from the City would invalidate their connection, except in circumstances where they have a more appropriate local connection to another Oxfordshire district.</p>	<p>No.</p>	<p>Oxford Hospitals provide maternity services for a very wide area, we also have a relatively transient population with many people coming to Oxford to study or work for a fixed period before moving on. It would make no sense to grant children born within the city boundaries lifetime rights to housing services provided by the council. This is another key area where officers need the flexibility to apply a common sense approach to the granting of exemptions as no two people will have identical connections to the city, again, published examples of exemptions which have been granted will help future clients to make their case and produce more confidence in the system.</p>
<p>Recommendation 3:</p> <p>That the Council grants a local connection to people confirmed as sustaining a contracted voluntary role within the City for a period of 6 months.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>More work will need to be done on this to make sure that any changes will not be open to abuse. The council would need to be confident that despite being unpaid and voluntary the work is not casual, short term, marginal or temporary. I would also want to be sure that any local employer is not exploiting unpaid labour at the expense of providing paid jobs. However I agree with the principle in relation to the adult homeless pathway.</p>
<p>Recommendation 4:</p> <p>That the Council extends the close relatives connection criteria to include first cousins, grandparents and grandchildren. Deceased family members in the immediate family (mother, father, brother, sister or children) should also be explicitly referenced in the policy as providing a connection.</p>	<p>Yes, in part.</p>	<p>The nature of the relationship with family members should be the primary determinant of whether they are 'close' or not, not the strength of blood ties. Deceased relatives should not be considered as they no longer form part of a family support network which this policy aims to protect.</p>
<p>Recommendation 5:</p> <p>That a person's stay into institutions such as hospital, prison or rehab should not invalidate their local connection. Specifically, time spent in these institutions should not affect a person's residency connection time (six out of the last twelve months or three out of the last five years), and entry and exit into these institutions should 'freeze' the accounting period.</p>	<p>Yes in part.</p>	<p>This is already the case for the AHP.</p> <p>The provision for special circumstances means that in practice the recommendation is already normally followed under Part 6 and Part 7</p>

<p>Recommendation 6:</p> <p>That the Council negotiates terms with neighbouring district councils to grant an Oxford local connection to people with a connection to areas adjoining, or very close to, the city boundary such as Botley and Kennington, where it is requested.</p>	<p>No.</p>	<p>The council will always support efforts to reconnect rough sleepers to their home district, so that the cost of their support is borne by that authority. When individuals are 'reconnected' it is always to an actual available bed space.</p> <p>20% of the people sleeping rough in Oxford have a proven connection to one of our neighbouring districts and those councils need to step up the level of services they provide in their area to cope.</p> <p>We are continuing to work with two of our neighbouring councils to try and support winter night shelters in their area using some of the RSI funds successfully obtained by Oxford City Council.</p> <p>We have a funding mechanism already in place under the pooled budget arrangement where District beds are provided in the City e.g. O'Hanlon house serves all Districts in the County. (27 for OCC, 11 CDC, 6 VWDC, 6 SODC and 6 WODC) and future plans for Rymers Lane (in partnership with WODC)</p>
<p>Recommendation 7:</p> <p>That where any changes to the Local Connection Policy (set out in recommendations 1-6) are not amenable to the City Executive Board on a permanent basis, a 12 month pilot should be taken up to provide insights into the level of demand, cost and effectiveness of introducing such changes.</p>	<p>No.</p>	<p>It would not be responsible to pilot major changes without first assessing the potential impact on costs and the impact of such changes on the availability of beds within the adult homeless pathway.</p> <p>Widening eligibility without any corresponding increase in capacity will not lead to any more people being helped off the streets.</p> <p>Monitoring of the RSI beds is part of the programme on an ongoing basis with learning being captured along the way.</p>
<p>Recommendation 8:</p> <p>That the Council partners with Crisis and other partners (e.g the City Conversation) to undertake a full assessment of the social and economic impact of any changes to the Local Connection Policy after 1 year of implementation (or piloting). The outcome of the assessment should be reported to the Scrutiny Committee and the City Executive Board, and should include data and conclusions concerning:</p>	<p>No.</p>	<p>We will not be piloting changes.</p> <p>A full assessment of the recommended or adopted changes would be a major piece of work which would probably need to be commissioned from consultants.</p> <p>However, some of this information can easily be made available to CEB or the Scrutiny Cttee i.e. the number of occupied/unoccupied spaces with the AHP; the proportion of people sleeping rough with an oxford connection; the sex of rough sleepers and those within the AHP;</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The demand for bed spaces within the pathway b) The proportion of people rough sleeping with a connection to Oxford c) The estimated savings and expenditure for other public services d) Any impact on equalities, with a specific focus on gender and sexuality e) How any changes have impacted on neighbouring district councils 		
<p>Recommendation 9:</p> <p>That the Council makes representations to the other Oxfordshire District Councils to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Increase their funding for bed spaces in O’Hanlon House, particularly for those individuals with complex needs. b) Adopt any changes agreed to Oxford’s Local Connection Policy, and that any agreed changes be updated in the Oxfordshire Adult Homeless Pathway Common Operational Protocol. c) Collectively review the system for allocating bed spaces to remove procedural barriers to ‘lending’ beds between the Oxfordshire District Councils, to adjust for varying demand between the localities. 	<p>Yes, in part.</p>	<p>We will absolutely continue to make representations to our neighbouring district councils and the county council to maintain or increase their funding for homelessness services. See the officer advice on a,b,c.</p>
<p>Part 2: Reconnecting People</p>		
<p>Recommendation 10:</p> <p>That an individual’s refusal to engage with the Council, or to reconnect to another area, should not restrict their access to the sit-up service, except in circumstances where they pose a risk to the safety or progress of other people using the service.</p>	<p>Yes, in part.</p>	<p>Current capacity in sit-up is limited (even with the RSI funded expansion to 20 places), so it is right that priority is given to those willing to engage with services and so have the prospect of moving on, freeing up their sit-up place as they do so. Longer term and subject to resources, officers are working on proposals which would allow for an expanded sit up service and/or a night shelter service which could take people of the street with only a minimal level of engagement.</p>

<p>Recommendation 11: That the Council trials a reconnection log for 12 months to monitor the outcomes and effectiveness of reconnections to other areas. The reconnection log should be presented to the Housing Panel when there is sufficient data to draw conclusions.</p>	Yes	<p>OXSPOT have a dedicated reconnection service. A report of their work could be made available to the Housing Panel.</p> <p>Efforts will be made to attempt this, bearing in mind some of the difficulties in keeping in touch once people have moved out of area, and moved on with their lives.</p>
<p>Recommendation 12: That the Council commissions a report to be brought forward in 2019 setting out options for establishing a county wide reconnection service having regard to lessons that can be learnt from the London-wide reconnection service.</p>	Yes, in part.	<p>Oxford City Council will continue to work to reconnect rough sleepers in the city to their home district, who are the body with responsibility to support the individual, whenever this is possible. Officers will be asked to look at what improvements can be made to make reconnections more successful. This should include dialogue with neighbouring districts and the county council. This could be the subject of a report to the Housing Panel if required.</p>
Part 3: Allocating Housing		
<p>Recommendation 13: That the Council revises the Housing Allocations Scheme to:</p>	No.	<p>CEB will not be revising the Housing Allocation Scheme as a result of this review panel report.</p> <p>Oxford's Allocations scheme is already far less strict than Government guidance which recommends a two year residence criteria but we treat permanent residence of a minimum of 6 months as sufficient for local connection</p> <p>See Officer comments.</p>
<p>a) Accept any person who qualifies for a local connection under any accepted recommendations in this review onto the Housing Register.</p>		
<p>b) Ensure that time spent in prison, hospital or rehab does not affect a person's residency connection time (six out of the last twelve months or three out of the last five years), and entry and exit into these institutions should 'freeze' the accounting period.</p>		
<p>c) Accept any person onto the Housing Register who is confirmed as having lived in supported</p>	Yes, in part	<p>Officers should explore reviewing some supported accommodation in the city, to determine whether residence of greater than two years, should be</p>

<p>accommodation continuously within Oxford for more than 6 months, including accommodation services that are recognised but not directly funded by the Council.</p>		<p>considered 'settled' including Emmaus, some Response accommodation, and some other provision (inc ACT). 6 months would not be considered a significant enough stay.</p>
<p>Part 4: Commissioning and Budget Setting</p>		
<p>Recommendation 14: That the City Executive Board commissions a report to be brought forward in 2019 setting out options for the Council entering into arrangements with colleges, registered social landlords and private landlords to take over and refurbish sub-standard and empty properties. The Council would then sublet the refurbished properties, at a minimum rent, to priority homelessness cases before returning the properties to their owners after a mutually agreed period.</p>	<p>No.</p>	<p>We already have £20million (which received a further £5million of social investment) invested in local properties which we use as temporary and emergency housing. These are let at LHA rates and the scheme is already saving the council money as use of PRS and B&Bs has dropped.</p> <p>Our priority must remain the building of more homes available at social rents, including increasing our council stock.</p> <p>Where properties are sub-standard we will take enforcement action whenever appropriate, we also already have an empty homes officer who has been successful at reducing the number of empty homes in the city in recent years.</p>
<p>Recommendation 15: That the Council continues to commission at least one female only overnight accommodation provider in the Adult Homeless Pathway and keeps demand for this provision under review. Opportunities should be sought to extend this provision for women with no local connection where possible, if further spaces are needed to meet demand.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>It will be important to learn from the experience of the women only house we are currently piloting to see if this is a service which should continue. If there is demand for it then it should.</p> <p>All provision within the AHP, including that accessible to people without a local connection should take into account the needs of female service users.</p>
<p>Recommendation 16: That the City Executive Board, as part of its budget setting process, identifies provision for: a) Free room hire and refreshments for a female homelessness forum. The Council should also ensure these women's views are represented within the Council's decision making process on homelessness issues.</p>	<p>A) Yes. B) Yes.</p>	

<p>b) Free sanitary products to be available for women experiencing homelessness 24 hours a day. The location of distribution for these products should be agreed in liaison with women currently experiencing homelessness.</p>		
<p>Recommendation 17: That the Council makes on site provision for domestic pets a material consideration as part of the supported accommodation commissioning process.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>The demand for accommodation with capacity for pets should be kept under review and provided where possible.</p>
<p>Recommendation 18: That the Council engages with Crisis and the City Conversation to see what further opportunities exist for piloting innovative Housing First and Critical Time Intervention programmes, given their rates of success and relative cost-benefit ratios.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Recommendation 19: That the Council, as part of its budget setting process, gives consideration for contingency funds to be made available for the Council's commissioned outreach Service (OxSPOT) to be more flexible and reactive to changes in homelessness demand throughout the year. For example, extending shifts to meet spikes in the numbers of people sleeping rough.</p>	<p>No.</p>	<p>This does not require contingency funds. The OXSPOT team have already received a boost with three extra FTE for 18/19 and 19/20 and do not report any problems with capacity.</p>
<p>Recommendation 20: That the Council writes to Central Government to welcome the new funding made available through</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>The portfolio holder also welcomes this recommendation!</p>

<p>MHCLG this year, and lobby for greater assurance about the necessity of long term funding to sustain new support services which will help deliver their Rough Sleeping Strategy.</p>		
<p>Part 5: Communicating What We're Doing</p>		
<p>Recommendation 21: That all future Council policy documents referencing homelessness should recognise the net positive contribution that people experiencing homelessness can make (e.g. the skills, experience and diversity they bring). Homeless people themselves should not be framed in a negative light and this should be reflected in the Council's communication's plans.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>Positive stories should be shared whenever and wherever appropriate. Homeless people themselves should never be framed in a negative light.</p>
<p>Recommendation 22: That the Council recognises the value someone's homelessness experience can potentially bring to the employed officer workforce, and that it be given due weight in the recruitment process for staff supporting the homelessness function.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Recommendation 23: That the Council revisits its approach to communicating with people experiencing homelessness, local service providers and the public to better convey information about the Local Connection Policy, how it is applied, and what wider support services are available in the City. Any significant changes (e.g a new notice board or public leaflet) should be presented to the Housing Panel for comment prior to implementation.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>As set out earlier, the council should publish anonymised details of case studies where discretion has been used to grant an exemption to our local connection policies in relation to the AHP. This will increase transparency and confidence in our procedures and assist those working with rough sleepers to make their case for an exemption. Officers are working on a business card for public circulation to publicise the work of OXSPOT. I have also asked officers to commence work on a booklet which could be a resource for rough sleepers, those working with rough sleepers and concerned members of the public which sets out the wide range of support services available in the city.</p>
<p>Recommendation 24:</p>	<p>No.</p>	<p>This is a matter for the Leader. However, as I am a full-time councillor I don't believe that I lack the time to devote to this issue just because it is not</p>

That the Leader considers appointing a City Executive Board member with exclusive responsibility for Homelessness to provide public clarity on board member roles and raise the profile of the issue, given the increasing funding and support being offered in this area.		my only area of responsibility.
Recommendation 25: That the Board Member responsible for Homelessness considers attending the quarterly contract management meetings of the largest supported accommodation provider(s) commissioned by the Council.	Yes.	I will attend the next meeting that I am available for and will continue to attend if my attendance proves to be useful.

16 October CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD

Local Plan Environmental Standards

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
That as part of the Local Plan, the Council extends the requirement for an Energy Statement to be submitted for residential developments of less than 5 units.	Yes	<p>The policy applies to all new residential developments other than householder applications, and information would be needed to support this. Therefore, adding a requirement for an energy statement, proportionate in detail to the scale of development, would help to add clarity.</p> <p><i>Note, the Local Plan was agreed by Full Council on 17 October 2018, broadly including the changes proposed.</i></p>

18 September CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD

Fusion Lifestyle's Performance Reporting

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
That the Council commissions an audit of Fusion Lifestyle's financial and participation data, and the associated data collection methods, to assure itself of the reliability and accuracy of the quarterly	Yes	<p>We have looked into the points raised by scrutiny and have included Fusion's response below. We are though pressing Fusion to continue to improve their data accuracy and this will remain on the agenda for the client meetings until this has been done.</p> <p>Fusion's response: The income was up significantly at Ferry in Q1 2018/19 compared to Q1 2017/18 mainly due to the schools shared income being profiled into a different period from last year. This was further compounded by the fact that an accrual from 2016/17 was transferred into the 2017/18</p>

<p>performance information.</p> <p>191</p>		<p>accounts and placed in June 2018 with this year's income. Having the impact of two years payments in one year. Some of the other income lines such as memberships are down in Q1 year on year which is masked by the additional income in miscellaneous payments. This explains why there is not a direct correlation between the two figures during this period. Notwithstanding the accrual issue this will be 'ironed out' across the full year.</p> <p>Facility hire was up 21,916 year on year in July at Ferry, this is likely to be, in part due to the way the system works in relation to participation figures for block bookings and the fact participation is recorded within the system when the invoice is paid (if paid late) not when the activity takes place. Given the system set up and the seasonality of the Centres participation figures its more appropriate to review the year to date figures which as stated within the question were only 1,915 up year to date. Health and fitness was also up 9,108 year on year which we believe is an impact of improved gate control. In addition, the centre did have some good participation results, indoor activities were up 4,266 year on year and casual swimming was up 1,201 year on year.</p> <p><i>Extract from the draft 18 September CEB minutes: "Cllr Linda Smith gave an assurance that there would be an audit to cover the matters identified by the Scrutiny Committee. She also said that she would see what could be done to provide the data sought by the Committee, while noting that some of it might be commercially sensitive."</i></p>
--	--	---

2 August SHAREHOLDER

Recommendations from the Companies Scrutiny Panel to 2 August Shareholder Group meeting

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
<p>1. Councillor Community Infrastructure Levy projects, where appropriate, should use ODS as the preferred contractor to carry out the work. This should not however affect the Council's duty to secure best value from its contracts.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>It is within the gift of councillors to define which organisations (such as Oxford Direct Services) carry out CIL works as part of the CIL application process.</p>
<p>2. The Shareholder Group receives a more comprehensive scorecard of financial indicators as part of subsequent quarterly reports. This should include longer term projections for revenue and capital expenditure, including service level breakdowns with overhead costs, and progress updates on major contracts and projects</p>	<p>Yes</p>	

13 June CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD

Fusion Lifestyle Annual Service Plan and Performance Dashboard

<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Agree?</i>	<i>Comment</i>
1. That the overall visitor numbers target set for Fusion Lifestyle leisure centres is reviewed to take account of emerging market pressures. Despite previous years of success, consideration should be given to whether the 3% year on year increase remains realistic and achievable.	No	The new year has started positively and we are still ambitious for the contract so would want to stick with the current targets.
2. That an action plan is developed to address the decline in the total number of visits recorded and is made available to members for review.	Yes	The Annual Service Plan is very much this plan and all the actions are targeted are getting more people active in our centres.
192 3. That quarterly quantitative data is made available (which the Scrutiny Committee will monitor) to enable the Council to better understand Fusion Lifestyle's performance in additional key areas, such as the proportion of calls answered, trends in staffing numbers and turnover, and responsiveness to repairs.	In part	We will review what information can be added to the Council's quarterly performance report.
4. That further marketing, publicity and engagement activities are undertaken to raise awareness of swimming opportunities and concessions for u17s, older people, and members of the BAME community. Specifically, there should be more engagement at a local level, such as with schools and playgroups in the Hinksey Park area to promote learn to swim initiatives, and make better use of the outdoor pool.	Yes	We have a detailed marketing plan and the headlines are included in the Annual Service Plan. However, we will further review how we can increase attendance in target groups.

Safeguarding Annual Report 2017/18

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
<p>That the Council works with partners, such as the Oxfordshire Safeguarding Board, to gather data on the number of school aged children that receive face to face safeguarding awareness training, such as that delivered by the youth ambition team, to better understand the reach of safeguarding work in Oxford. Once collated, this should be shared with partners such as the Children's Trust, together with any evaluation and analysis.</p>	Yes	<p>The City Council will work with the Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) in the County Council to collate, evaluate and analyse data on safeguarding awareness training in Oxford City Schools, which can then be shared with partners as soon as it available later this year, and will be included in the 2019 Safeguarding Report for review by Scrutiny.</p> <p>Safeguarding in schools is addressed in the curriculum under PSHE (personal, social, health and economic education), and any additional safeguarding training and the focus of that training is down to the individual school to commission. A programme of protective behaviours work with schools is being developed by the Kingfisher Team for deployment in the 2018/19 academic year.</p> <p>Schools in Oxfordshire submit an annual safeguarding report to the LADO in which they are asked if safeguarding is covered in the curriculum. They can then add comments and provide further information on the training that has taken place.</p>

193

Modern Slavery Act Transparency Statement 2017/18

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
<p>That consideration is given to whether the Council's Modern Slavery Transparency Statement should be amended to include reference to the Council's wholly owned companies, highlighting that as separate entities they may also have their own statements.</p>	Yes	<p>Oxford Direct Services and Oxford City Housing Ltd – Oxford City Council's wholly owned companies have agreed to adopt Oxford City Council's Modern Slavery Transparency Statement within their policies once approved by their individual Boards through their own processes. Reference will be made to the Council's wholly owned companies in the Council's Modern Slavery Statement.</p>

22 May CITY EXECUTIVE BOARD

Discretionary Housing Payments Policy

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
<p>1. <i>That consideration is given to 'topping up' the DHP grant provided by HM Government, in order that the policy criteria can be broadened to include more residents who are in need of support. Consideration should be given to how this might be funded and to what extent, such as from the Homelessness Reserve.</i></p>	Not agreed	<p>Topping up the DHP would not necessarily reach the specific residents in need of support due to the restrictive nature of the DHP regulations. The biggest issue in terms of hardship occurs before people are in receipt of Universal Credit and you have to be in receipt of Universal Credit to be entitled to DHP. This is why the additional hardship fund was created as it provides flexibility to reach the people most in need.</p> <p>Whilst there are still funds available in the hardship scheme we anticipate there may be a bigger draw on it this year as an increasing number of people move onto universal credit. Therefore we will keep it under review and make more funds available if necessary.</p>

Oxford Town Hall

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
<p>16 That the charging schedule for rental facilities in the Town Hall is reviewed to ensure that it does not discriminate against any person with a disability or impairment. For example, there should be no charge on the use of voice enhancers.</p>	Yes	<p>We have a portable system which provides 2 different functions; it acts as a press to speak conference system and a hearing loop for people with hearing impairments.</p> <p>The system charge is £60+VAT, we do charge this when hirers are using it as a conference system, however if it is requested just for the hearing loop function we do waive this cost.</p> <p>We only have 3 of these portable systems and by applying a charge we ensure that each hirer considers whether they need the system or not, given that staff time is required to set them up, and also being wireless they have to be regularly charged. That said we will work with groups that can't afford the fee. For the larger events we outsource the Audio Visual systems out to local suppliers.</p> <p>The audio visual facilities and requirements in the Town Hall are currently being reviewed, recognising that the acoustics and audio visual facilities in some rooms are not ideal for all uses.</p>

<p>2. That data should be collected on the number, type and proportion of community groups using the Town Hall, relative to the number of private and council bookings. This data should be used to analyse what barriers might exist to different user groups, and targeted promotional activities should be undertaken to better engage with those underrepresented. This data should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The type of user groups that are using the Town Hall b) Where the user groups are geographically based c) How often each user group books rooms at the Town Hall 	<p>Yes</p>	<p>This data is built into the booking system the Town Hall uses. Officers will request a report to be written on this detail so it can be shared.</p> <p>We do run a monthly report on the number of community bookings that take place at the Town Hall but more work is needed to identify and remove barriers and promote the use of the Town Hall by diverse groups.</p>
<p>3. That consideration is given to how key public spaces within the Town Hall can be made equally accessible for all visitors.</p> <p>195</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>An access audit by Jane Toplis Associates Access Consultants Ltd was completed in March, with a follow up session in April with users. The finalised report is due by the end of May.</p> <p>It is expected that some identified improvements will be quick fixes but others will have to form longer term projects and will be dependent on resources.</p> <p>This report is part of a project with Gordon Mitchell and relevant colleagues on improving the accessibility of the Town Hall and working practices for Town Hall users and Councillors with disabilities.</p> <p>The Leader and the Board Member for Supporting Local Communities will bring forward a joint report to a future meeting of the City Executive Board to address the issues raised in more detail.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank