When telephoning, please ask for: Member Services Direct dial 0115 914 8481

Email memberservices@rushliffe.gov.uk

Our reference: Your reference:

Date: 24 December 2014

To all Members of the Partnership Delivery Group

Dear Councillor

A meeting of the PARTNERSHIP DELIVERY GROUP will be held on Thursday 8 January 2015 at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Pavilion Road, West Bridgford to consider the following items of business.

Yours sincerely

4

Executive Manager Operations and Corporate Governance

AGENDA

- 1. Apologies for absence.
- 2. Declarations of Interest.
- 3. Notes of the Meeting held on Wednesday 15 October 2014 (pages 1 7).
- 4. Healthwatch

The report of the Executive Manager - Communities is attached (pages 8 - 9).

5. Waterloo Housing Group Annual Partnership Review

The report of the Executive Manager - Neighbourhoods is attached (pages 10 - 13).

6. Choice Based Lettings Update

The report of the Executive Manager - Neighbourhoods is attached (pages 14 - 15).

7. Work Programme

The report of the Executive Manager - Operations and Corporate Governance is attached (pages 16 - 17).

Membership

Chairman: Councillor Mrs J A Smith

Vice-Chairman: Councillor J E Greenwood

Councillors Mrs D M Boote, H A Chewings, J E Fearon, E J Lungley,

Mrs M Stockwood, T Vennett-Smith, J G A Wheeler

Meeting Room Guidance

Fire Alarm Evacuation: in the event of an alarm sounding please evacuate the building using the nearest fire exit, normally through the Council Chamber. You should assemble in the Nottingham Forest car park adjacent to the main gates.

Toilets are located opposite Committee Room 2.

Mobile Phones: For the benefit of others please ensure that your mobile phone is switched off whilst you are in the meeting.

Microphones: When you are invited to speak please press the button on your microphone, a red light will appear on the stem. Please ensure that you switch this off after you have spoken.



NOTES

OF THE MEETING OF THE PARTNERSHIP DELIVERY GROUP WEDNESDAY 15 OCTOBER 2014

Held at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Pavilion Road West Bridgford

PRESENT:

Councillors Mrs J A Smith (Chairman), Mrs D M Boote, H A Chewings, J E Fearon, J E Greenwood, E J Lungley, B Tansley (substitute for Councillor J A Wheeler), T Vennett-Smith, D G Wheeler (substitute for Councillor Mrs M Stockwood)

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Councillor S J Boote

M Clifford Positive Futures Co-ordinator

T Francis Head of Community Sport –Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club

R Walker Metropolitan Regional Director North

OFFICERS PRESENT:

D Dwyer Strategic Housing Manager

K Marriott Executive Manager - Transformation
C Taylor Community Development Manager
E Walters Democratic Services Assistant

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

Councillors Mrs M Stockwood, J G A Wheeler

7. Declarations of Interest

There were none declared.

8. Notes of the Previous Meeting

The notes of the meeting held on Tuesday 8 July 2014 were accepted as a true record.

An update was given on the actions arising from the previous meeting. The issues regarding the East Midlands Ambulance Service had been raised at the Scrutiny Chairmen and Vice Chairmen's meeting on 28 July 2014. Health Watch had been invited to give an update to the Partnership Delivery Group on 8 January 2015.

With regards the incidents of roadkill in relation to badgers, Streetwise Environmental Ltd had agreed to notify the location to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust of any badger road kills that they picked up.

9. Review of Metropolitan Housing Partnership

The Strategic Housing Manager introduced Richard Walker who gave a presentation on the key achievements of Metropolitan Housing during 2013/14 and the direction the organisation was heading. He informed Members that there were some further changes to the Executive Management Team structure. This included the appointment of a new Director of Asset Management Strategy who would be joining the organisation on 17 November 2014 and a newly created post entitled Director of Customer Insight. The Chief Executive, Brian Johnson, had set out a vision to improve performance and services over a 2 year period. There was a need to acknowledge past failings and this had been done and many issues had been addressed. The recent changes at Executive Management level should provide a positive outlook for the future. Richard Walker had met with the Director of Development at Metropolitan Housing to stress the importance of Rushcliffe as a key area to invest in housing to meet local need and had received a positive response. The Chief Executive and Director of Development would be contacting the Chief Executive of Rushcliffe Borough Council to discuss ways to build on existing partnership working in this area.

Richard Walker informed Members of some of the work undertaken by the Data Team over the previous year which involved reviewing the figures of rent arrears which identified a trend of increased arrears during the Christmas period. As a result, potential hotspots were targeted by Metropolitan staff, reducing over half the number of tenants falling into arrears compared to the previous year.

Metropolitan had introduced 'patch working' which meant a more joined up approach to discuss key issues affecting customers in a geographical location to avoid teams working in silos. This had some positive results, for example, improvements in safety for gas access.

Another initiative which Metropolitan was involved with was the METTS scheme which provided intensive support to 33 tenants in Rushcliffe.

Metropolitan Housing had been working with Rushcliffe Borough Council on launching a direct payment pilot whereby customers could have their housing benefit paid directly to them. So far there had not been a large amount of tenants using this scheme. Councillor Fearon asked whether this was due to tenants not having bank accounts and the answer given was that 90% of tenants did have bank accounts. A discussion ensued about whether the problem related to tenants' mistrust of bank accounts and tenants' preference to withdraw their money and pay direct themselves. Richard Walker confirmed this would be an area that they would continue to review in preparation for the introduction of Universal Credit.

Metropolitan were the first housing provider in Nottinghamshire to run sector based work academies. As part of this scheme there was a guaranteed job interview for the apprentice and of the 7 persons on the scheme 100% had been able to get jobs either with that employer or another company. The highest achieving employee was a Rushcliffe tenant.

In answer to a question about Universal Credit, Members were informed that the Government had not yet announced the full roll out plan. The Department for Work and Pensions had announced a two tier system where in 2015 Universal Credit would be open to all new claimants and existing claimants would be part of a subsequent roll out. In response to a question regarding whether the legislation allowed the money to be deducted at source if rent arrears had accrued Richard Walker referred to the switchback scheme where payments can be paid directly to Metropolitan Housing if rent was in arrears for more than 8 weeks.

Richard Walker gave an update on Asset Management and stated that a new programme of planned maintenance had been approved comprising spending £12.2 million over the next 5 years. In the past year the maintenance contractor had changed from the Mears Group to Kier Building Maintenance which had resulted in improved performance, fewer complaints and more satisfied tenants although the changeover had caused some delays at the outset. A full repair and maintenance options appraisal was planned for 2015.

Richard Walker discussed the level of customer satisfaction and stated that this had improved compared to previous years. 108 complaints were received compared to 205 the previous year. Only 1 of those complaints had progressed to stage 2 as opposed to 9 the previous year. There had been 155 cases of anti-social behaviour and 154 of those cases had subsequently been closed. The customer contact opening hours had reduced due to low demand. The new opening hours would be from 8am to 6pm. In the previous 12 months 91% of calls were answered against a target of 95%. The reason why this target had not been reached was the change in repair and maintenance contractor as mentioned above. It had been decided to have a maximum of 3 automated tiers for answering the call before the customer spoke to a live person. In answer to a question Members were informed that it took 1 minute to listen to the automated message and then 20 seconds for the call to be answered. Repeat calls had previously been a large amount of the overall total however a dedicated team had been created for dealing with repeat calls and a concerted effort had been made to lower the amount of calls that needed to be made by tenants for the same problem.

There was a robust quality assurance system in place where complaints were logged on a computer database and not closed until the customer had stated that they were satisfied. Richard Walker informed that he also undertook a further quality assurance check of a sample number of complaints letters each week to make sure they had been satisfactorily dealt with and the promises made to tenants had been delivered as part of their 'Promise Guarantee'.

Richard Walker informed the Group that there was a10.3% property turnover rate. In answer to a question regarding the reason for this, he explained that it could be due to abandonment, death, evictions or the option of better quality stock elsewhere. Stock condition in the Rushcliffe area was good but due to an older population profile, it was likely that property turnover would occur due to death. Demand for housing in Rushcliffe was high and therefore re-lets were not considered to be an issue.

The Chairman asked about the average void time which a property would be vacant whilst it was awaiting a new tenant. Richard Walker stated that for

Metropolitan North a property was empty for an average of 79 days however these figures included the Derby area where the Mears Group previously had the repairs and maintenance contract. Richard Walker agreed to find out the exact figure for Rushcliffe and inform Councillors at a later date. He was able to inform Members that the new contractors, Kier Building Maintenance, had reduced the amount of properties in Rushcliffe awaiting repair work to 40. This had considerably improved the backlog of properties awaiting repairs and maintenance which had increased under the old contractors due to an ongoing dispute.

As a result in the change in funding for the home alarm support provision for older and vulnerable tenants Metropolitan had ceased provision of the home alarm service to tenants in group linked properties in April 2014. A number of existing Metropolitan tenants were assisted to change providers and out of 300 tenants, 75 had transferred to the Rushcliffe home alarm service. A further review of the support and care provision for tenants in sheltered housing schemes would be undertaken in the New Year following the outcome of the Nottinghamshire County Council budget review. In the future Metropolitan would be looking at ways to further promote the independence of the tenants through existing and new support mechanisms, rather than create a culture of Metropolitan considered this approach would set them apart dependency. from other housing associations. Councillor Fearon asked a question regarding the exact nature of the housing related support provided by Metropolitan and in answer Richard Walker referred to traditional warden type work. This prompted a comment that some tenants did not wish to pay for warden service which had historically been tied to the property rather than the individual and the new approach would provide greater choice.

Councillor Vennett-Smith congratulated Metropolitan Housing on a positive report and stated it filled him with confidence for the future.

Councillor Mrs Boote also praised Metropolitan for their work and asked for clarification regarding service charges. Richard Walker confirmed that there were 3 types of service charge; monthly, one offs (such as replacing a roof) and annual charges, though he would obtain more detail on this and report back to Councillors. He was able to inform Members that Metropolitan had previously been calculating the service charges incorrectly but an audit process had been completed for calculating service charges which would explain why they had increased recently.

Metropolitan Housing was developing a tenant loyalty scheme linked into promoting positive behaviours and reducing dependency. This could involve a tiered management service offering a gold, silver, and bronze standard. Tenants who paid their rent on time and adhered to their tenancy agreement would receive a gold standard service with the opportunity of receiving rewards. Tenants who had rent arrears but were adhering to payment plans would qualify for a silver standard service. Tenants who had breached their tenancy agreement, or were not adhering to a payment plan to reduce rent arrears would receive a bronze service. Councillor Mrs Boote expressed a concern that those tenants categorised as bronze standard could be people with mental health issues and wanted clarification on how Metropolitan Housing would deal with this. Richard Walker informed that an equality impact assessment had been done and vulnerability had been identified as a key

issue. If a vulnerable tenant was not able to modify their behaviour then no additional sanctions would be applied and they would receive the normal service. The METTS scheme was available for those tenants who need additional support and a large amount of housing officers were on hand to help. There was a clear launch strategy for the scheme and Metropolitan had already identified which tenants might benefit from this service and were working closely with them. Metropolitan were planning to repeat this process in 3 months time.

Councillor D Wheeler requested to know where the housing stock was located in Rushcliffe and Richard Walker offered to provide the Partnership Delivery Group with a map showing the sites.

Councillor Fearon asked for some preliminary information about the Choice Based Lettings Scheme as it would be considered at the meeting of the Partnership Delivery Group on 8 January 2015. The Strategic Housing Manager was able to inform Members that the Choice Based Lettings Scheme was working well and achieving its objectives. Metropolitan Housing had committed to 100% of its properties being let through the Choice Based Scheme. Each tenant was entitled to make 3 bids a week. Councillor Fearon asked a follow up question about tenants who under-occupy properties, and the Strategic Housing Manager stated that priority, under the current Housing Allocations policy banding system, was awarded to people who requested a move to a smaller property. The Housing Allocations policy also allowed single people to bid for 2 bedroom flats due to the current shortage in smaller accommodation, although this was being addressed on new developments where a range of property types was being negotiated to meet both current and future need. She stated that the issue of under-occupation was under constant review to ensure best use of stock within the Borough.

The Vice Chairman complemented Metropolitan Housing on the work they had done at Leys Court in Ruddington and requested that the three Ward Members be able to visit the property when it opens. The Strategic Housing Manager informed that they would be invited to the opening ceremony.

The work of the partnership was endorsed by the Partnership Delivery Group.

10. Review of Positive Futures

The Community Development Manager explained the background to the extension of Positive Futures outside the Cotgrave area and that a series of targets have been set for a period of 4 years in respect of the transfer of £90,000 per annum loan to grant. He introduced Tracey Francis and Mark Clifford from Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club who gave a presentation on the key achievements during 2013/14 against the outcome targets and how the scheme was moving forward. Mark Clifford informed Members that there was still a skeleton programme in Cotgrave even though the scheme had been rolled out to Keyworth, Bingham and Radcliffe on Trent. Many of the children from Cotgrave attended schools elsewhere and were able to go to the after school clubs.

Information was given about the cohort targeted by the scheme which consisted of those in school years 6 and 7. Originally the scheme targeted

those involved with anti-social behaviour (ASB) though it had moved onto preventing youngsters getting involved with ASB in the first place. NEET engagement targeted those Not in Education, Employment or Training. Tournaments continued to be organised which gave people the opportunity to try different sports.

Metropolitan Housing had part funded a Peer Mentoring scheme where those who had turned their lives around could give their insight back to other young people. Positive Futures also provided funding for young people to obtain a First Aid qualification. Mark Clifford gave examples of the Community Pride initiative such as the Cotgrave Santa's Grotto, the World War Memorial, and the Welcome to Keyworth mural.

Tracey Francis concluded by stating that calculations using the National Sportworks data management system estimated that the annual savings to the Rushcliffe area as a result of Positive Futures was £2,215,850.

Councillor D Wheeler stated that he was delighted that the partnership has worked and was very complementary towards the scheme. Councillor Tansley praised the partnership between Positive Futures and Rushcliffe Borough Council and hoped it would be as successful in Bingham, Keyworth and Radcliffe on Trent as it had been in Cotgrave.

Councillor Mrs Boote also expressed how impressed she had been; informing that she had attended one of the Positive Futures events and met people who had their lives transformed. She asked what percentage of the cohort had vulnerability issues. Mark Clifford informed that the majority of young people that Positive Futures dealt with came from vulnerable homes or had Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder.

Councillor Fearon asked how far the Positive Futures scheme had expanded into other areas of the country. Tracey Francis provided some detail on the work of Positive Futures in Newark which targeted a younger cohort of 8-12 year olds of which 98% were on the register in terms of vulnerability. Many of the young people in Newark came from a travelling background.

The Partnership Delivery Group unanimously endorsed the work of Positive Futures.

11. Work Programme

Councillor Vennett-Smith stated that the meeting on 12 March 2015 would be his last as he was not standing for re-election in May 2015.

Councillor Mrs Boote asked for an explanation of the Garage Co-operation Agreement which would be covered at the July 2015 meeting of the Partnership Delivery Group. The explanation was provided by the Executive Manager – Transformation.

The meeting closed at 9.00 pm.

Action Sheet PARTNERSHIP DELIVERY GROUP - WEDNESDAY 15 OCTOBER 2014

Minute Number	Actions	Officer Responsible
9 Review of Metropolitan Housing	a) Richard Walker to find out how long properties in Rushcliffe wait for new tenants.	Strategic Housing Manager
Partnership	b) Richard Walker to provide a map of the housing stock in Rushcliffe.	

Responses

Minute Number	Actions	Officer	Response
		Responsible	·
9 Review of Metropolitan Housing Partnership	a) Richard Walker to find out how long properties in Rushcliffe wait for new tenants.	Strategic Housing Manager	The average turnaround time for Rushcliffe stock 1 April 2014 to present is 57 days (40 days in maintenance)
	b) Richard Walker to provide a map of the housing stock in Rushcliffe.		Metropolitan does not have access to up to date maps of the housing stock This is an area of work that the Council are hoping to progress in the future to develop a live stock data map. Whilst this information will not be available publically it will enable us to provide more general data around concentrations of stock in particular geographical locations, size and type if tenure. Ward profiles are available on the Rushcliffe website at http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/housing/housingdevelopment/wardprofiles. These provide general information on the ward stock profile. The
			development of the livestock profile will enable us to manage accurate and up to date information.



8 January 2015

Healthwatch



Report of the Executive Manager - Communities

1. Summary

- 1.1. Healthwatch Nottinghamshire is one of 152 Healthwatch organisations across England. The statutory role and function of Healthwatch was laid down in the NHS and Social Care Act of 2012, but local areas have discretion about how their local Healthwatch delivers its service.
- 1.2. Claire Grainger, Chief Executive of Healthwatch Nottinghamshire will give a short presentation detailing their work.

2. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Members received the presentation from Healthwatch Nottinghamshire and consider how the work carried out links to priorities in Rushcliffe.

3. Background information

- 3.1. Healthwatch is the consumer champion for health and social care which was created to gather and represent the views of the public/users of services and ensure these views are heard by decision makers.
- 3.2. Nationally the Healthwatch model includes a number of functions, all of which contribute to the overall aim of empowering individuals and groups to influence the health and social care services they receive. Healthwatch covers all statutory health and social care services and services for adults and children.
- 3.3. The range of functions that can be delivered by local Healthwatch are:
 - 3.3.1. Providing information and signposting about health and social care services
 - 3.3.2. Monitoring concerns and complaints
 - 3.3.3. Enabling people to feedback about their experiences of health and social care services
 - 3.3.4. Collating information and compiling reports about people's experiences and views
 - 3.3.5. Providing independent advocacy for people who want to make a complaint about NHS services.
- 3.4. Examples of work Nottinghamshire Healthwatch has completed include:
 - 3.4.1. Providing service users/patients with the opportunity to 'have your say' about local services via the website and feeding back to service providers and commissioners
 - 3.4.2. 'Coffee with Healthwatch' in various locations across Nottinghamshire an open forum for opinions on health and social care. In Rushcliffe

these are being delivered in partnership with Rushcliffe Community and Voluntary Service (RCVS) and NHS Rushcliffe Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG).

- 3.4.3. Young Carers Conference
- 3.4.4. Carers Conference.
- 3.5. Upcoming work for Healthwatch Nottinghamshire includes a research project on transport services for renal dialysis patients, a survey on mental health services, and raising its profile among care homes in the area.

4. Implications

4.1. Finance

There are no financial implications.

4.2. **Legal**

There are no legal implications.

For more information contact:	Name Craig Taylor
	Community Development Manager
	0115 914 8345
	email ctaylor@rushcliffe.gov.uk
Background papers Available for	Nil
Inspection:	
List of appendices (if any):	N/A



8 January 2015

Waterloo Housing Group Annual Partnership Review



Report of the Executive Manager – Executive Manager - Neighbourhoods

1. Summary

- 1.1 This report will provide Members an opportunity to review the partnership with Waterloo Housing, the second largest provider of affordable housing in the Borough.
- 1.2 The Council has worked closely with Waterloo Housing Group as part of the Trent Valley Partnership in enabling the development of rural affordable housing. De Montfort Housing Association (one of three local housing associations across the Group) own and manage properties in Rushcliffe and assist in meeting local housing need through participation in the Council's Choice Based Lettings Scheme.
- 1.3 Neil Adie, Group Head of Development, and Marion Duffy, Director of Communities and Neighbourhoods, will provide a presentation to Members on performance across key services on behalf of Waterloo Housing Group and outline future plans to deliver local services
- 1.4 The partnership with Waterloo Housing was last scrutinised in January 2014. At the meeting it was agreed that the work of the partnership with Waterloo Housing Group be endorsed. Members are requested to comment on performance to date and any areas where the partnership could be strengthened to achieve joint priorities.

2. Recommendation

2.1 It is RECOMMENDED that Members consider and make comments on the presentation made by Waterloo Housing and endorse the work of the partnership

3. Reasons for Recommendation

- 3.1 Waterloo Housing Group is made up of three local housing associations and Waterloo Homes which is responsible for the sales of shared ownership homes, leasehold and market rent homes. De Montfort Housing Association own and manage properties in Rushcliffe and assist in meeting local housing need through participation in the Council's Choice Based Lettings Scheme. The Group is working towards becoming one single housing association which will enable them to improve services and meet current economic challenges.
- 3.2 The main benefit of the partnership is the provision of rural affordable housing in Rushcliffe. The partnership is committed to carrying out further rural housing needs surveys to ascertain whether there is a continued need for affordable

housing in rural areas, however, future delivery will be dependent on the continued support of parish councils and the availability of acceptable sites. Continued partnership working with Waterloo Housing Group will strengthen the existing partnership and maximise the opportunities available to develop affordable housing in rural locations.

4. Supporting Information

- 4.1 While some affordable housing is delivered in rural parts of the Borough on developer led schemes (Section 106 Agreements) it can be more challenging to provide new affordable housing in rural areas. There are significant issues of rural housing need around affordability and the inability of local families to access housing in their own communities. Lack of employment opportunities, school closures and poor access to local services are contributing to this problem.
- 4.2 To help address this need, the Council has developed a rural exception site programme in partnership with Midlands Rural Housing and Waterloo Housing (the Trent Valley Partnership) to identify and meet local housing needs. Since the partnership's inception in 2005, 7 affordable housing sites have been completed delivering in total 53 homes at Aslockton, Cropwell Bishop (phases 1 & 2), East Bridgford (phase 1 & 2), Kinoulton and Tollerton. In total, the completed schemes will have provided 30 rented and 23 shared ownership affordable homes in rural villages attracting over £1.45m Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) funding and £456,000 Rushcliffe Capital Grant (through s106 monies).
- 4.3 Over the last year, 12 affordable units have been completed on the second phase of Cropwell Bishop with housing needs surveys also being carried out in Whatton and Orston, identifying a need for 6 affordable units in total. Discussions are currently underway with the Parish Council to identify suitable sites to develop a scheme to meet the identified need.
- 4.4 Waterloo Housing Group representatives will provide Members with a presentation covering partnership working and key services across the Group, including:
 - Development of affordable housing
 - Voids and allocations
 - Stock improvements and responsive repairs
 - Tackling anti-social behaviour
 - Income recovery
 - Sheltered and supported housing
 - Performance on complaints and customer care
 - Communications and resident involvement
 - Welfare Reform Update
- 4.5 In addition to their presentation to Members, Waterloo Housing Group will take questions on the above and other matters as requested.

5. Risk and Uncertainties

- 5.1 During the past year the partnership has undertaken extensive work on strengthening key processes and procedures, including the development of a Section 106 rural exception site template. This work not only addresses the concerns raised by parish councils in ensuring that the rural exception site developments continue to meet local housing need but also provides a strong foundation to progress schemes and maximise external funding opportunities. This approach should provide all partners with the confidence to support future rural exception site schemes which are granted planning permission by exception to meet local housing need.
- 5.2 The partnership meets at regular intervals to ensure that any strategic and operational risks are minimised.

6. Implications

6.1. Finance

There are no direct financial implications arising from this report. The current capital programme has provisions to support the delivery of affordable housing until 2019/20, working in partnership with Registered Housing Providers. Sums are therefore available for rural exception sites although, in reality, grants required for such schemes tend to be minimal.

Any future delivery of affordable homes will result in additional New Homes Bonus payments to the Authority over a period of six years. Additional Council Tax receipts will also accrue from the new properties.

6.2. Legal

None

6.3. Corporate Priorities

Supporting economic growth to ensure a sustainable, prosperous and thriving local economy – Effective partnership working to increase the supply of affordable housing will meet a range of needs across the Borough which in turn will generate economic growth and deliver other significant benefits (New Homes Bonus).

Maintaining and enhancing our resident's quality of life — Strong partnership working will enable residents to have safer, healthier and live longer lives in which they are able to fulfil their aspirations. The continued supply of affordable housing, particularly in rural locations, will reduce the instability caused to families and communities by preventing homelessness and creating more sustainable communities.

6.4. Other Implications

None

For more information contact:	Donna Dwyer Strategic Housing Manager 0115 914 8275 email ddwyer@rushcliffe.gov.uk
Background papers Available for Inspection:	None
List of appendices (if any):	None



8 January 2015

Choice Based Lettings Update



Report of the Executive Manager - Executive Manager - Neighbourhoods

1. Summary

- 1.1. Choice Based Lettings (CBL) has been used to allocate social housing in Rushcliffe since April 2011. In November 2013, a new Housing Allocations Policy was put into practice, which reduced by half the number of people who qualified to join the scheme, to around 500.
- 1.2. The Strategic Housing Manager, will give a presentation describing the current operation of the scheme, how it has changed over the first three years, and how it contributes towards the Council's objectives.
- 1.3. The report on the draft Housing Allocations Policy was considered by the Community Development Group on 6 December 2012 and approved by Cabinet on 12 February 2013.

2. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that

- a) the Partnership Delivery Group consider and comment on the report and presentation, and make any recommendations for change or further development to the scheme
- b) The Partnership Delivery Group undertake a bi-annual review of Choice Based Lettings

3. Supporting Information

- 3.1. The Council operates the "Homesearch" Choice Based Lettings scheme with Broxtowe and Gedling Borough Councils. Although the Councils share a website and supporting infrastructure, they now have separate allocations policies, and there is restricted mobility between the Boroughs.
- 3.2. Housing Associations advertise their vacant properties on the website. Customers who have registered can then "bid" for up to three properties per week. At the end of the week, bids are ranked in a "shortlist", using the following criteria:
 - 1. Whether they have a local connection to Rushcliffe
 - 2. Priority band (1, 2 or 3)
 - 3. Date they were placed in this band
 - 4. Date they first joined the scheme
- 3.3. A new allocations policy was approved by Cabinet in February 2013 and put into practice in November 2013. This restricted who qualified to join the scheme. Under the new policy, people generally qualify only if they have both a recognised

need for housing and a local connection to Rushcliffe. We do not accept applications if these conditions are not met.

- 3.4. There are several exceptions to this, the principal one being that people aged 50 or over, with no children, may qualify even if they have no housing need or local connection. However, these people will only qualify to bid for sheltered housing.
- 3.5. The new policy has resulted in a much smaller housing register. This allows the team to manage it more effectively, make sure that people in high priority are bidding on suitable properties, and support people who are not bidding to make sure they can use the system.
- 3.6. Further detail will be given in the presentation, including:
 - Numbers of applications registered and properties let
 - How customers use the system
 - Equality of access and equality of outcomes
 - Role in preventing homelessness
 - Challenges addressed
 - Has the new policy been successful?
 - Possible future developments

4. Implications

4.1. Finance

The 2014/15 gross expenditure budget for Choice Based Lettings is £94,500 offset by a partner contribution of £12,000, reducing the net budget to £82,500. This income pays for the CBL website and infrastructure, as well as contributing towards staffing resources at the Council to maintain the scheme.

4.2. **Lega**l

There are no legal implications arising from the report

4.3. Corporate Priorities

Transforming the Council to enable the delivery of efficient and high quality services.

4.4. Other Implications

None

or more information contact:	Donna Dwyer Strategic Housing Manager 0115 914 8275 Email ddwyer@rushcliffe.gov.uk
Background papers Available for Inspection:	None
List of appendices (if any):	None



8 January 2015

Work Programme



Report of the Executive Manager - Operations and Corporate Governance

1. Summary

1.1. The work programme is a standing item for discussion at each meeting of the Partnership Delivery Group. This report presents the work programme for 2014/15.

2. Recommendation

2.1. It is RECOMMENDED that the Partnership Delivery Group agrees the proposed work programme for 2014/15

3. Reasons for Recommendation

Date of Meeting	Item	
8 January 2015	Choice Based Lettings	
	Update on Work of Health Watch Nottinghamshire	
	Annual Review of Waterloo Housing	
	 work programme, including capturing questions for 	
	the South Notts Community Safety Partnership	
12 March 2015	South Notts Community Safety Partnership -	
	update	
	Review of Streetwise Environmental Ltd	
	work programme	
July 2015	Garage Co-operation Agreement	
	Rushcliffe Business Partnership	
	work programme	
October 2015	Annual Review of partnership with Metropolitan	
	work programme	

For more information contact:	Member Services
	0115 914 8481
	email memberservices@rushcliffe.gov.uk
Background papers Available for	Nil
Inspection:	
List of appendices (if any):	Nil