

Cabinet Responses to Scrutiny recommendations

03 October CABINET

Floyds Row

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
<p>1) That Cabinet consider ways to streamline the project gateway process in cases where grant funding deadlines require the truncation of regular project planning timescales to enable successful bids to be made without the risk of similar cost escalations in the future.</p>	Yes	<p>That officers will be asked to consider lessons learnt from the project in the Project Management Office, including approaches to streamline the Gateway process, especially for grant funding applications that require processing in often very compressed timescales.</p>
<p>15</p> <p>2) That under the contract St Mungo's be required to provide additional information to the Council, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reasons for clients' engagement or failure to engage - Number of engagements per client - Staff turnover - Data be collected, anonymised and shared about how homeless people support their lifestyles, which will in turn inform how best to address their needs and provide information on the wider benefits of reducing the number sleeping on the streets. 	Yes	<p>These can be incorporated into new commissioning arrangements.</p> <p>Officers will review data issues in relation to assessing how homeless persons may financially support a street lifestyle with partner organisations. It should be noted though that OxSPOT staff do report illegal activity which they are made aware of to the police – whether someone is street homeless or otherwise. However the primary aim of the service is to support clients into accommodation and improve their welfare, which involves building and maintaining trust with vulnerable people. Therefore it would not be in line with the purpose of the service, to place a requirement on OxSPOT to seek information on illegal activities and to pass this information on.</p>
<p>3) That Cabinet consider the possibility of in-house provision when it comes to market testing.</p>	Yes	<p>This can be considered as an option in future commissioning and procurement, notwithstanding any issues that this option may present, as identified in the report and Scrutiny meeting</p>

10 October CABINET

Modernising Leisure Concessions

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
<p>1) That Cabinet i) identify the precise number of current over 60 members who will be due to lose their existing discount by the proposed rise in age-related concessions and will not qualify for an alternative concession, ii) to give careful consideration to whether it wishes to implement this change, and if so, iii) to consider ways of mitigating the impact, such as phasing the increases or exploring whether Fusion would honour existing age-related concessions.</p>	Partially	<p>Following discussion with Fusion, current 60-65 year old members paying via direct debit will be eligible to retain their existing rate, subject to annual indexation. Further, new members of the Hinksey-only membership between the ages of 60 and 65 will be eligible to join for one season at the lower rate up until April 2020.</p>
<p>16 2) That Cabinet i) ascertain whether Employment Support Allowance is a category grouped by Fusion into another category, and if not, to identify the number by alternative means ii) estimate the number of current concessionary members on Employment Support Allowance, Job Seekers Allowance or Income Support who are liable to lose their eligibility for concessionary rates under the proposed changes, and iii) pending other factors, consider whether to remove these categories as eligibility criteria, or alternatively, to delay their removal so as to enable the transition to alternative qualifying benefits to be more advanced.</p>	Partially	<p>Employment Support Allowance will remain a qualifying benefit for concessions. There will be further opportunity to consult on concessionary eligibility within the fees and charges as part of the budget setting process for 2020/2021.</p>

Performance Monitoring Q1

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
1) There should be clarification about which, if any, of the corporate performance indicators include data from Oxford Direct Services or Oxford City Housing Limited and the way in which these were used, particularly in reference to whether under measure B1001 (percentage of Council spend with local businesses) Oxford Direct Services is recorded as a recipient of Council spend, a contributor to Council spend or both?	Yes	
2) That the wording of measure ED002 (Implementation of measures to reduce the City Council's carbon footprint by 5% each year) should be reviewed and that information on the methodology for calculating the Council's anticipated carbon footprint be made available to members of the Scrutiny Committee.	Yes	
3) That indicator LP220 (The number of people from the Council's target groups using its leisure facilities) be supplemented with two further measures: i) revenue vs previous periods, and ii) progress against maintenance targets.	Yes	
4) That measure CoS031 (Effective delivery of the capital programme) be changed to either i) disbursements, or ii) contractual commitments as a percentage of budgetary targets.	Yes	
5) That in light of the challenges facing the Welfare Reform team, WR001 (Number of people moved into work by the Welfare Reform Programme) is no longer realistic and that a revised target be agreed.	Yes	
6) That in light of the growth of Universal Credit and the increasing influence factors external to the Council have on the delivery of this criterion that Cabinet considers whether indicator CS054 (Time taken to determine DHP applications) remains fit for purpose.	Yes	

Air Quality Monitoring Report 2018

Recommendation	Agree?	Comment
1) Further consideration be given to measures to control emissions arising from the exemption of trains and canal boats from the Clean Air Act, particularly with regard to boats at non-permanent moorings close to residential areas.	Yes	Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford will continue to lobby central government on the need for comprehensive Clean Air legislation. As has been highlighted rail and waterways are currently exempt from any local authority ability to take action.
2) The County Council be encouraged to consider implementing parking exclusion zones close to schools in the city	Yes	This will be suggested to relevant colleagues and officers at County Council
<p>3) The Council seeks in every way to ensure that it is empowered in the forthcoming Environment Act to take enforcement action against idling vehicles.</p> <p>18</p>	Yes	<p>Central Government recognise that current legislation is not working. As such, in June 2019, a bill to increase penalties for stationary vehicle idling offences; to grant local authorities increased powers to issue such penalties was submitted to the House of Commons.</p> <p>In July 2019, Transport Secretary Chris Grayling made the commitment to launch a public consultation in 2019, looking at increasing local authorities' powers and guidance to local authorities on their anti-idling powers, enabling them to enforce the law more effectively.</p> <p>Oxford City Council is waiting for the outcomes of the public consultation and for a future anti-idling bill to become an Act of Parliament. In addition, the Cabinet Member for Zero Carbon Oxford has met with DEFRA civil servants in a meeting organised by UK100 to explicitly lobby on this issue.</p>