

Overview & Scrutiny Recommendation Response Pro forma

Under section 9FE of the Local Government Act 2000, Overview and Scrutiny Committees must require the Cabinet or local authority to respond to a report or recommendations made thereto by an Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Such a response must be provided within two months from the date on which it is requested¹ and, if the report or recommendations in questions were published, the response also must be so.

This template provides a structure which respondents are encouraged to use. However, respondents are welcome to depart from the suggested structure provided the same information is included in a response. The usual way to publish a response is to include it in the agenda of a meeting of the body to which the report or recommendations were addressed.

Issue: BMMR (with a focus on Public Health)

Lead Cabinet Member(s): Cllr Kate Gregory, Cabinet Member for Public Health & Inequalities

Date response requested:² 27 January 2026

Response to recommendations

Recommendation	Accepted, rejected or partially accepted	Proposed action (if different to that recommended) and indicative timescale (unless rejected)
1. That the Council clarifies its plan as to how it will lead on developing with system partners a shared understanding of and common approach to addressing local health inequality priorities.	Accepted	The council's commitment to the Marmot approach is being overseen by the HWB, to ensure this is aligned and embedded with other key system agendas. Systemwide partners are working together at a senior level through an advisory board, to agree key areas of focus. The Institute of Health Equity review

¹ Date of the meeting at which report/recommendations were received

² Date of the meeting at which report/recommendations were received

Overview & Scrutiny Recommendation Response Pro forma

		<p>of inequalities, initially focusing on CYP, is driving shared commitment to addressing the identified inequalities, and ensuring this is informed by the experience of residents.</p> <p>In addition, the council are driving a “social movement” approach, promoting, training, and mapping examples of work on health equity. This includes an ambition to build health equity into strategies and services at the start.</p>
<p>2. That the Council devises a relevant metric or metrics to enable it to understand vaping prevalence in the county, to allow it to take informed steps to reduce its harms.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>That the Council devises a relevant metric to enable it to understand vaping prevalence amongst young people in the county, to allow it to take informed steps to reduce its use amongst young people (acknowledging that smoking is more harmful than vaping and regulated vapes are a NICE recommended method for smokers to quit BUT vaping is not recommended for non smokers)</p>
<p>3. That the Council undertakes a review of the successes and areas for improvement of the Homes for Ukraine scheme to inform the types of support necessary to maximise the chances of arriving families integrating and thriving under Community Sponsorship</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>That the Council undertakes a review of the successes and areas for improvement of the Homes for Ukraine scheme to inform the types of support necessary to maximise the chances of arriving families integrating and thriving under Community Sponsorship (Accepted)</p> <p>The Homes for Ukraine (HfU) scheme enables UK hosts to accommodate Ukrainians in their own homes. Each arrival comes with an integration tariff of £5,900 per person that is paid to local authorities to undertake welfare, DBS and property checks, as well as provide a range of support to help them access services and integrate into the community over an initial 3-year period. This scheme is fundamentally different from the Community Sponsorship (CS) scheme which enables voluntary and community groups to sponsor refugees. There is no</p>

Overview & Scrutiny Recommendation Response Pro forma

	<p>funding for the local authority as the sponsor group provides the support function, including the provision of suitable accommodation and having to raise £9,000 to support the individual or family over a 2-year period. Local authorities are involved in the checking process to ensure sponsor groups have the appropriate safeguarding and safety processes in place. There have been very few families sponsored under CS nationally, with only 1 family in Oxfordshire – whereas there have been over 3,000 Ukrainians coming to stay in the county.</p> <p>The HfU scheme has highlighted the importance of local authorities being involved in the safeguarding, welfare and property checks, and the need for effective partnership working between central and local government, and between local authorities and the VCS. While CS offers a sustainable model of integration, it requires significant upfront planning, fundraising, and long-term commitment from community groups, as well as system level support from local authorities and other partners for longer-term stability.</p>
--	--