Public Document Pack

When telephoning, please ask for:

Direct dial Email Democratic Services 0115 914 8511

democraticservices@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Our reference: Your reference:

Date: Wednesday, 8 October 2025

To all Members of the Communities Scrutiny Group

Dear Councillor

A Meeting of the Communities Scrutiny Group will be held on Thursday, 16 October 2025 at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road, West Bridgford to consider the following items of business.

This meeting will be accessible and open to the public via the live stream on YouTube and viewed via the link: https://www.youtube.com/user/RushcliffeBC Please be aware that until the meeting starts the live stream video will not be showing on the home page. For this reason, please keep refreshing the home page until you see the video appear.

Yours sincerely

Sara Pregon Monitoring Officer

AGENDA

- 1. Apologies for Absence
- Declarations of Interest

Link to further information in the Council's Constitution

- 3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 24 July 2025 (Pages 1 10)
- 4. Flood Risk Update (Pages 11 18)

Report of the Director – Neighbourhoods

5. Work Programme (Pages 19 - 20)

Report of the Director – Finance and Corporate Services



Fmail:

customerservices @rushcliffe.gov.uk

Telephone: 0115 981 9911

www.rushcliffe.gov.uk

Postal address

Rushcliffe Borough Council Rushcliffe Arena Rugby Road West Bridgford Nottingham NG2 7YG



Membership

Chair: Councillor H Parekh Vice-Chair: Councillor L Plant

Councillors: L Plant, M Barney, J Billin, R Butler, C Grocock, R Mallender,

P Matthews and (vacant)

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 at the far side of the plaza outside the main entrance to the building.

Toilets: are located to the rear of the building near the lift and stairs to the first floor.

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.

Recording at Meetings

National legislation permits filming and recording by anyone attending a meeting. This is not within the Council's control.

Rushcliffe Borough Council is committed to being open and transparent in its decision making. As such, the Council will undertake audio recording of meetings which are open to the public, except where it is resolved that the public be excluded, as the information being discussed is confidential or otherwise exempt

Agenda Item 3



MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY GROUP THURSDAY, 24 JULY 2025

Held at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road, West Bridgford

and live streamed on Rushcliffe Borough Council's YouTube channel **PRESENT:**

Councillors H Parekh (Chair), L Plant (Vice-Chair), M Barney, J Billin, R Butler, C Grocock, R Mallender, D Soloman and G Williams (as a substitute)

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Councillor R Upton – Cabinet Member and Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

D Burch Head of Neighbourhoods
G Carpenter Head of Public Protection
D Dwyer Strategic Housing Manager
T Coop Democratic Services Officer

APOLOGIES:

Councillors P Matthews

1 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

2 Minutes of the Meeting held on 3 April 2025

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 April 2025 were agreed as a true record and were signed by the Chair.

The Head of Environment and Communities provided a verbal update in relation to the actions raised at the Communities Scrutiny Group meeting on 3 April 2025.

3 Metropolitan Thames Valley Housing

The Strategic Housing Manager welcomed the Scrutiny Request that had been submitted by Councillor Upton, Cabinet Member and Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing and the recent feedback from Councillors that had highlighted some of the concerns raised by residents in respect of the service and performance provided by Metropolitan Trent Valley Housing.

The Strategic Housing Manager explained that representatives from Metropolitan Trent Valley Housing (MTVH) had been invited this evening to address some of the concerns that have been raised and to provide members

with a greater understanding of the services MTVH provide within Rushcliffe.

Mr Andrew Reston – Director for MTVH Midlands Supported Housing introduced the Rushcliffe Local Team and highlighted their wealth of experience working within the affordable housing sector as follows:

- Ms Kelly Fox Head of Housing Midlands Housing Team,
- Ms Nichola Raffell Head of Home Ownership Operations Midlands Home Ownership Team

Mr Reston and his Team delivered a presentation and an overview of MTVH in relation to Rushcliffe.

Mr Reston advised the Group that MTVH is a national organisation with approximately 57,000 properties across London and the Midlands, with c4,000 properties within Rushcliffe.

The Group noted the recent feedback from the Regulator of Social Housing inspection that awarded MTVH V2 for Financial Viability, C2 for Consumer and G2 for Governance (1 being the highest award and 3 the lowest).

Mr Reston explained that feedback from the inspection had been valuable and MTVH had already taken action to continue to improve its business performance and operational efficiency. The Group were asked to note MTVH's most recent end of year financial position, including a total revenue increase to £454m compared to the previous year of £423m, residents being £3.4m better off due to MTVH money advice service and 544 new homes being built.

Councillor Soloman asked where, in relation to Rushcliffe were the new affordable houses being built. Ms Raffell advised that these were located in East Leake, Edwalton and Cotgrave. However, Ms Raffell highlighted that S106 development had stalled in recent times which is a challenge for all affordable housing providers.

Councillor Grocock and Councillor Barney asked whether it would be helpful for Councillors to know where the stock of social housing is within the Borough and whether more detail on the demographics of properties by ward could be provided.

Ms Fox highlighted MTVH's customer satisfaction in respect of Rushcliffe residents and explained to the Group that this was a snapshot and clearly shows that residents are generally happy with the services and support MTVH offer compared to other areas. With regards to complaints these were broken down into themes for the Group to consider, including anti-social behaviour, service delivery, missed appointments and incomplete work.

With regards to community safety and anti-social behaviour, Ms Fox explained that MTVH have adopted a joint agency approach with Police, Social and Mental Health Care or a more formal route, thus providing early intervention, support and mediation.

With regards to repairs and property repairs for 2024/25 Ms Raffel advised the

Group that MTVH have two repair officers and are looking to recruit a surveyor to specialise in the management of damp and mould complaints, supporting and educating residents and managing contractors.

Mr Reston highlighted some of the development and investment in Rushcliffe homes over the last decade including decarbonisation, investment in community-based programmes and referrals for support through MTVH's financial and tenancy sustainment assistance in goods, services and vouchers and support with rent related issues.

In concluding, Mr Reston presented MTVH's future investment programme which summarised their key areas for improvement and service delivery such as:

- Communication and Transparency
- Responsive Service Delivery
- Collaboration
- Accountability and Ownership

The Chair advised the Group that a number of questions from Councillor Plant and Councillor Butler had been received prior to the scrutiny meeting which she asked representatives of MTVH to answer in turn.

Councillor Plant asked the following questions in advance of the meeting:

If a MTVH tenant needs their house adapted and made accessible to their needs, how is that funded?

Mr Reston explained adaptations to a property are usually based on an occupational health referral and funded by the local authority through their Disabled Facilities Grants (DFG). The referral is then assessed by MTVH to see what work is required. It was noted in some cases MTVH may offer additional contributions.

Rushcliffe borough has an ageing demographic- what percentage of MTVH housing stock is M4(2) or M4 (3) compliant?

Mr Reston explained that he did not have the answer to this as MTVH are not aware whether properties are compliant until they become vacant. However, MTVH have started a process of doing home visits to establish a better understanding of what properties have been adapted and admitted there was a gap in the information supplied by MTVH. Members were surprised by this and the Chair asked when the work is likely be completed, which MTVH were not able to clarify.

Councillor Butler asked the following questions in advance of the meeting.

When members submit a query, usually on behalf of residents, what timescale is expected to get not just a holding response, but also a detailed/relevant answer which will, depending on what the query is, lead to action/resolution?

Would it be possible to have a dedicated contact for councillors to send their

case load queries to in the first instance (as opposed to if there has been no response or resolution in the first place) and even have some sort of "priority response"?

Mr Reston advised Councillors to use specific email addresses which he would share after the meeting. He also advised residents and Councillors to use the 'Service Improvement' email address which is tracked and recorded by MTVH. An acknowledgement is generally received within 5 days and a further response within 10 advising the enquiry/complaint has been dealt with. It was noted that if Councillors do not receive a response in the 10 days this may be escalated to senior colleagues.

The Strategic Housing Manager added that information and emails for MTVH is regularly shared on the Councillor Portal of the Council's intranet.

Can members be kept regularly informed/updated so that we know what progress is being made on queries?

Ms Fox explained that MTVH value the need for Councillors to be kept informed of the progress of queries and added that residents should be encouraged to log any complaints via the MTVH website where the complaint can be tracked and MTVH colleagues can reach out directly with the resident.

Some queries are as a result of effects of Metropolitan/their tenants are having on private neighbours. How do you respond and deal with such cases and do you allow for the fact that third parties (neighbours etc) need to know what is happening/that their complaints or queries are being treated as fairly as perhaps ones by Metropolitan tenants?

Ms Fox expressed that MTVH do understand the detrimental effect of antisocial behaviour on private residents and emphasised why it is important for private residents to report any issues via the MTVH website in order for such cases to be investigated and tracked. Ms Fox highlighted that not all cases are categorised as anti-social and as such MTVH as the landlord will work to support tenants so they can live in a safe home.

Mr Reston added that support is provided from a whole host of partnerships including the police, medical and mental health care which is why details of such cases cannot be shared widely due to personal and data protection. Mr Reston offered to share some case studies to provide a better understanding of the complexity of some tenants needs.

The Head of Service for Public Protection advised that the Council has a duty of care and a statutory responsibility to ensure the safety of all its residents.

The Chair opened the discussion to the rest of the Group and invited Councillors to ask further questions.

Councillor Grocock asked a specific questioned relating to MTVH's legacy assets around garages sites and land which has been left unused and derelict and whether MTVH had a policy to dispose of them. Councillor Grocock added that he had been approached by a Parish Council and residents in one of his

wards who might be interested in purchasing a site for private or community use. Mr Reston advised that the garage sites that were left could not be developed for residential use and therefore could potentially be disposed of for private/community use and that he would take this way from the meeting and find out what options are available.

The Strategic Housing Manager added that there is a garage redevelopment programme and grants available to develop sites for additional affordable homes, however, progress depends on MTVH identifying suitable sites through their garage asset review.

Councillor Billin asked whether information could be provided on garage sites in the Borough that had been developed for residential use.

Councillor Butler as an observation suggested if garage sites were not suitable for housing development could they be considered for residential parking.

Councillor Soloman expressed her concerns around the issues of damp and mould and the potential of severe health consequences if not dealt with quickly and effectively. She referenced the 119 ongoing cases MTVH currently have with tenants and asked what the timeframe is for solving these issues. Ms Fox advised that MTVH work with tenants immediately and where health and safety is concerned tenants will be moved to alternative accommodation. Ms Fox added that some cases can be more complex and more about educating tenants in the way they live. Mr Reston added that the organisation as a whole was reshaping how it works, including property team training and a new building surveyor to join the growing team to support and educate residents around the problems of damp and mould.

The Head of Service for Public Health advised that over the last couple of years there had been an increase in disrepair complaints. However, the Head of Service for Public Health reported that more recently numbers and resolutions of complaints have improved and relationships with the Council's Environmental Health Officers and MTVH has also greatly improved.

Councillor Billin commented on damp and mould and had lessons been learnt around the decarbonisation of properties in East Leake and how close are MTVH to completing the work. Mr Rosten advised that MTVH are applying for further grants to continue the work programme for those properties in East Leake.

Councillor Barney complimented the MTVH website and felt it was easy for residents to navigate. Councillor Barney asked a specific question around accommodation for over 55 year-olds stating there appeared to be an acute need of properties for older people. Mr Reston advised that MTVH are seeing a different type of older person wanting something different from their accommodation, however it was noted that MTVH are struggling to fill some of the existing property stock.

Councillor Williams asked a question relating to the repairs process and how repairs are signed off as completed, he provided an example in his ward where a repair was reported but a number of services were required to fix it and each time a tradesman came out the job was signed off when it had not been fully completed and the resident would have to log a further call out. Councillor Williams asked how MTVH would address such issues. Mr Reston explained MTVH operate a satisfaction survey for each repair, unfortunately some my slip through the process depending on the nature of the repair and whether the work is completed by MTVH or an external contractor. In most instances a surveyor would return to the property to check the quality of work. Mr Reston advised that MTVH have a call centre in Beeston where multiple tradesmen can be contacted quickly making their maintenance and repair services more efficient. Mr Reston invited the Group to see the call centre operation to give them a better idea of the type of calls they receive and how they are handled.

Councillor Williams asked a question relating to the additional £3.4m MTVH offer to tenants and how this is distributed and what support can it provide. Ms Fox explained this funding is used to support many initiatives that might help residents, for example 'Pocket Power' a money advisory service that tenants can access to help manage their finances, there is also a 'Tenant Welfare Fund' which can provide shopping vouchers for school uniform, beds, bedding as examples. Ms Fox explained that tenants are assessed on their particular needs and requirements providing a more tailored approach.

Councillor Billin commented on new builds and residents/tenants having to provide new furnishings, carpets, curtains etc and whether there is access to funding for such items. Mr Rosten explained that developers only have to provide the essential fixtures such as bathrooms and kitchens, any extra support could be provided by MTVH if the resident meets the assessment criteria.

Councillor Williams asked a specific question relating to compliance around M4(2) and M4(3) and could the Group be provided information from other social housing providers operating in the Borough. The Strategic Housing Manager explained that there are 20+ registered housing providers within the Borough. However, the Council does not have direct access to their details and offered to contact each provider via email to request their willingness to share this information.

Councillor Upton informed the Group that he had been a ward Councillor in Radcliffe on Trent for over 10 years and had built an excellent relationship with local MTVH officers and find contacting the relevant support officer to be the best route in resolving residents complaints adding that his dealings with MTVH have been positive.

With regards to damp and mould Councillor Upton explained this was a national topic and often down to lifestyle, how people live and old prefabricated properties and the logistics of managing mould and damp is challenging and there is no easy fix. Councillor Upton was pleased to see that MTVH were recruiting a specialist surveyor to address the problem.

Councillor Mallender agreed with Councillor Upton that there is a wide variety of social housing stock and asked whether MTVH were considering a decarbonisation and insulation programme for all of their properties. Mr Reston explained that there are a number of specialist teams and levels of investment

and improvements going forward and offered to share the company policy around investment and the businesses action plan.

Councillor Plant continued to express her concerns in respect of resident's complaints and the time it takes for work to be completed and explained that she appreciates the improvements that have been made to the complaints system, but Councillors need to be able to contact MTVH and receive a timely response. Councillor Plant was also surprised that it had been 7 years since the topic of social housing had come to scrutiny which may explain why Councillors have had so many questions. Councillor Plant asked whether a biannual report from MTVH should come to Communities Scrutiny Group as a way of an update on their level of service. Mr Reston informed the Group that MTVH issue a twice-yearly newsletter with information around the services they provide. He also offered Councillors to attend the MTVH call centre in Beeston to help them understand the operational side of the call handling and the type of calls they receive and how they are dealt with.

Councillor Plant commented on the availability of sheltered accommodation for residents who require extra care and support and how can this be best provided. Mr Reston explained mental health is an increasing problem, MTVH look at the suitability of properties and put in place a housing support scheme at the start of tenancy to work through any issues and develop a support network. He added this can often be challenging on and individual and the community with mental health problems and drug abuse.

Councillor Plant still felt that social housing was a topic that required regular scrutiny and asked if the item could be looked at by way of an update biannually. The Head of Environment and Communities suggested a further scrutiny request be submitted to the Corporate Overview Group requesting an annual review from Metropolitan Trent Valley Housing in line with the current process. Going forward the Strategic Housing Manager offered to circulate the MTVH newsletter to all Councillors.

The Group requested that more detailed information on the number of social housing properties within their wards would be helpful, including other social/affordable housing providers other than MTVH. They also asked if properties could be broken down their type for example sheltered housing. The Strategic Housing Manager advised there was not a live stock list or system available but would look to finding out as much information as possible for a future update. It was noted that there is some sensitivity around social housing data and the protection of individuals privacy.

I relation to earlier requests for property details from MTVH, the Head of Environment and Communities suggested that these be by numbers in wards rather than individual addresses.

It was **RESOLVED** that the Communities Scrutiny Group:

- a) considered the information provided in the report and the presentation by MTVH and provided feedback to support future working relationships
- b) the Chair to raise a further scrutiny request at the next meeting of the

Corporate Overview Group for MTVH to provide the Group with a further update on performance in 12 months time.

4 Work Programme

The Chair advised the Group that the work programme was light of items to be scrutinised and encouraged members to submit new items via the Council's Scrutiny Request form.

It was **RESOLVED** that the Communities Scrutiny Group approved the Work Programme as set out below:

16 October 2025

- Flood Risk Update
- Work Programme

22 January 2026

Work Programme

2 April 2026

- Carbon Management Plan Update
- Work Programme

Actions – 24 July 2025

| Minute No. | Action | Officer Responsible/update |
|------------|--|--|
| 3 | Officers to provide further detail of the number of social housing properties by all social housing providers | |
| 3 | MTVH to share some case studies to provide members of the Group with a greater understanding of the complexity of some of the complaints/cases MTVH receive | Information has been circulated to the Group |
| 3 | Councillor Grocock requested information from MTVH around garage sites in their ownership and the possibility of private residents or Parish Council's purchasing the sites | Information has been circulated to the Group |
| 3 | Councillor Mallender requested information around MTVH's plans to decarbonise their properties and how and when this is likely to be completed. MTVH offered to share their Investment Policy and Business Action Plan | |

| 3 | The | Group | requested | Social | The | Chair | of |
|---|--------|------------|---------------|----------|-----------|------------|-------|
| | Housi | ing be sci | rutinised ann | ually as | Communi | ities scru | itiny |
| | a revi | ew or upo | date | | Group t | o submit | а |
| | | | | | Scrutiny | request | to |
| | | | | | Corporate | e Over | /iew |
| | | | | | Group | | |

The meeting closed at 9.15 pm.

CHAIR





Community Scrutiny Group

Thursday, 16 October 2025

Flood Risk Update

Report of the Director - Neighbourhoods

1. Purpose of report

1.1. On 17 October 2020 the Communities Scrutiny Group received a report and series of presentations providing the latest picture on flooding events in the Borough, and the roles and responsibilities of a range of key agencies involved in flood assessment, drainage/mitigation work and how they respond to flooding incidents and work with communities. Since that report, and despite significant work being undertaken in a range of locations across the Borough to reduce the likelihood, the risk of flooding remains a concern for many households and local communities. This report and presentation by Nottinghamshire County Council, who are the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), will reflect on the latest flood risk data for the Borough including new data sources for mapping surface water flood risk as such incidents are becoming more prevalent.

2. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that the Communities Scrutiny Group:

- a) scrutinise the contents of the report and presentation; and
- b) provide feedback to the Lead Local Flood Authority on the latest flood risk profile for the Borough.

3. Supporting Information

Flood risk within Rushcliffe

3.1. The Borough is at risk from both fluvial river flooding and pluvial surface water flooding. The rivers, classed as 'main' rivers, that run through the Borough are the Trent, Soar, Smite and Devon. All of these rivers have Environment Agency flood alerts and warnings available on them. The flood warning service was created for the public to sign up to and have alerts and warnings directly text or phoned through to them 24/7. These rivers also have river gauge level readings available online via gov.uk. These give accurate daily readings and, in the case of the rivers Trent and Soar, also give a 24hr prediction of expected river levels.

3.2. However, a growing source of flooding in the most recent years has been pluvial surface water flooding. Such flooding is less easy to predict due to the nature of the weather systems that generally cause these events which can create heavy sudden downpours that can see a months' worth of rain fall in one day. Combined with often saturated or frozen catchments, this leaves the water with nowhere to go and excessive run off can occur in both urban and rural areas. Although predicting where the rain will fall can't be accurate, there are communities in Rushcliffe that we know from experience are more prone to surface water flooding issues. This can be due to several reasons including topography and geology. More recently, the Environment Agency have released a national searchable surface water flood risk map which show the areas that are at the greatest risk https://check-long-term-flood-risk.service.gov.uk/map In addition to using real life feedback, the mapping tries to identify areas that are naturally susceptible to water collecting as water often follows the natural flow path or low points in these areas. This information should allow residents and businesses to consider their flood preparedness measures and potentially make their properties more flood resilient and such action is further guided by the existing and broader post code flood risk tool https://check-long-term-floodrisk.service.gov.uk/postcode.

Significant recent flood incidents

- 3.3. Since the last scrutiny report in 2020, there have been a number of flood events which have had a significant impact on local communities, including:
 - a) 18 24 January 2021 Storm Christoph Prolonged heavy rain saw river levels rise with flood risks to riverside properties and communities on both the Trent and Soar. Communities affected included Barton, Thrumpton and Radcliffe on Trent
 - b) **20 25 October 2023 Storm Babet** Delivered 3- 4 days of continued heavy rain and severe flooding across parts of Nottinghamshire. This created saturated ground and full catchments. 9 communities were affected with internal flooding of at least 27 homes and 2 businesses in the following key areas Gotham, Edwalton, West Bridgford, East Leake, Ruddington, Tollerton, Cropwell Butler and Radcliffe on Trent
 - December 2023 Although not a named storm isolated heavy rain caused localised surface water flooding with impacts particularly seen in Cropwell Butler and Bingham
 - d) 2 January 2024 Storm Henk This storm had a significant impact on Nottinghamshire, causing widespread flooding and damage. Over 100 properties were evacuated due to flooding after a major incident was declared, many roads were closed and communities were cut off. The flooding was severe enough that the impact would be felt for many months afterwards. In Rushcliffe, 17 communities were affected by flooding which included 131 homes and 13 businesses in the following key areas Barton in

Fabis, Costock, Cotgrave, Cropwell Butler, East Bridgford, East Leake, Flawborough, Gotham, Normanton on Soar, Radcliffe on Trent, Ratcliffe on Soar, Shelford, Sutton Bonnington, Edwalton, Thrumpton, Tollerton and Zouch

e) January 2025 Operation Cleves – This was not a named storm however very heavy localised rainfall caused significant surface water flooding across north Leicestershire and Rushcliffe followed by elevated river levels on the Soar (causing Zouch to be cut off) and then the Trent. Once again, many homes were internally flooded particularly in the Zouch and East Leake areas and impacts were also seen in Sutton Bonnington, Thrumpton, Barton in Fabis, Kingston on Soar and Normanton on Soar.

Key stakeholders

- 3.4. The main risk management authorities involved in flood assessment and drainage work are as follows:
 - Nottinghamshire County Council (Lead Local Flood Authority)
 - Rushcliffe Borough Council
 - Environment Agency
 - Severn Trent Water
 - Internal drainage board(s).
- 3.5. The Flood and Water Management Act 2010 require these Risk Management Authorities to:
 - Co-operate with each other
 - Exchange information
 - Act in a manner that is consistent with the National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy for England and the local flood risk management strategies developed by Lead Local Flood Authorities.
- 3.6. The following provides a further brief summary of their roles and responsibilities.
- 3.7 **Nottinghamshire County Council** are the Lead Local Flood Authority. They have permissive powers and statutory duties to manage and co-ordinate local flood risk management activities in Nottinghamshire. Local flood risk means flooding from surface water, groundwater and smaller watercourses (known as Ordinary Watercourses).
- 3.8. Under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, they are required to publish a Local Flood Risk Management Strategy including an action plan and to report on flooding incidents under Section 19.
- 3.9. A Section 19 Report outlines what happened during a flooding incident and whether the relevant Risk Management Authorities have exercised or will exercise their responsibilities, but it does not identify specific measures to prevent future flooding. A Section 19 report is initiated when there have been

- five or more properties internally flooded in any one area. Many of the storm events detailed in paragraph 3.3 resulted in Section 19 reports being prepared.
- 3.10. As the Highways Authority Nottinghamshire County Council also have responsibility for the public highways including highway drainage assets.
- 3.11. Nottinghamshire County Council are also a category one responder under the Civil Contingencies Act. This means they must have plans in place to respond to emergencies, and control or reduce the impact of an emergency. They deliver this responsibility through their emergency planning team.
- 3.12. Rushcliffe Borough Council carry out flood risk management works on minor watercourses in their ownership (outside of Internal Drainage Board areas). They work in partnership with Lead Local Flood Authorities and other Risk Management Authorities to ensure risks are managed effectively. This also includes taking decisions on development in their area. Rushcliffe, as with the County Council, has an emergency planning responsibility under the Civil Contingencies Act. This is delivered under a service level agreement with the County Council. The most obvious example of this activity is the targeted delivery of sandbags to home owners at risk of flooding and the provision of temporary accommodation for those made homeless.
- 3.13. The **Environment Agency** are responsible for flood and coastal erosion risk management activities on main rivers and the coast, regulating reservoir safety, and working in partnership with the Meteorological Office to provide flood forecasts and warnings.
- 3.14. The Internal Drainage Board operate within a defined area, which is known as a drainage district. They are responsible for managing water levels in low lying areas. They are the land drainage authority within their districts and their functions include supervising land drainage and flood defence works on ordinary watercourses.
- 3.15. **Seven Trent Water** manage the risk of flooding to water supply and sewerage facilities and flood risks from the failure of their infrastructure.

Partnership working to manage Flood Risk

- 3.16. All these organisations work together through the Local Resilience Forum and, during the planning phase of flooding, they sit on a formal Flood Board which is chaired by the LLFA. Specific flood plans are in place, including for high risk locations such as reservoirs. There is a Rushcliffe Local Flood response plan which is an operational document that focuses on the details of flood risk communities.
- 3.17. In the stage before flooding occurs, all partner agencies receive Meteorological Office weather updates, flood guidance statements and flood alerts and warnings as well as having access to the river gauge level readings. This data

allows all agencies to have accurate information and be in a position to effectively plan and prime resources to be ready to tackle any flooding. If an alert is issued at amber level, then the Environment Agency hold a flood advisory service teleconference to update partner agencies on the situation and to facilitate the exchange of information. The Borough Council is represented on this through the Nottinghamshire County Council emergency planning team.

- 3.18. It may become necessary, due to the scale or impact of the flooding, for the police to chair a multi-agency Tactical Coordinating Group. This facilitates information exchange and provides access to multi agency support and resources.
- 3.19. Unfortunately, in the case of surface water flooding, it is often the problem that heavy rain is predicted for the region but the certainty of where it will occur is low. As a result, the flooding event can happen rapidly in a very isolated and concentrated manner with little time for communities to prepare as they would for fluvial events which was the case with Operation Cleves as set out in paragraph 3.3.

Working with Communities

- 3.20. For those communities at risk of flooding there are several engagement projects undertaken by partner agencies to help communities prepare and be resilient.
- 3.21. Nottinghamshire County Council and the Environment Agency run a Flood Warden Scheme for communities in both main river and surface water communities at risk of flooding. This scheme also links into a community road closure initiative that allows communities under permission to close designated roads in times of flood to help protect properties from further damage from bow waves from passing traffic. Most recently during Operation Cleves the A6006 through Zouch was quickly closed by wardens and this helped to protect some homes from bow wave flooding.
- 3.22. Nottinghamshire County Council and Rushcliffe Borough Council emergency planning staff work with communities to encourage them to have community emergency plans in place for their highest risks. This allows for key community representatives to be identified, along with resources and those who are vulnerable and more likely to require support.
- 3.23. In addition to providing a range of advice and information on Rushcliffe's website covering flooding risks and resilience, the Council also administer a grant scheme, created in 2015, to assist communities to have flood resources directly in their communities. The flood resilience store grant allows for up to £2,000 to pay for a suitable store and flood protection equipment. Allowing the community to self-help and deploy flood equipment quickly when needed.

4. Implications

4.1. Financial Implications

The Council has a Service Level Agreement with Nottinghamshire County Council for a shared Emergency Planning Officer (at a cost of £31k per annum) who deals with and coordinates the Council's response to such events.

Due to the unknown nature and frequency of flood events, the Council does not provide specific budgets for flood recovery activity. Staffing, temporary accommodation and equipment costs incurred during flood recovery are generally contained within existing budgets. In some circumstances if the Government activates the Bellwin Scheme, the Council could recover 100% of eligible costs above a set threshold. Any capital expenditure related to flood prevention will be incorporated into the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

The Council has provided additional funding from the Flood Grant and Resilience Reserve for the Flood Resilience Store grant scheme which can accessed by parish and town councils to support the creation of flood resilience stores. The balance on this reserve was £22k at 1 April 2025.

4.2. Legal Implications

There are no direct legal implications arising from this report.

4.3. Equalities Implications

There are no specific equalities implications arising from this report.

4.4. Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 Implications

The Council will work closely with the Police through the Local Resilience Forum to ensure any community safety issues are addressed before, during and after a flooding event.

4.5. Biodiversity Net Gain Implications

There are no direct implications arising from this report.

5. Link to Corporate Priorities

| The Environment | It is widely acknowledged that climate change is having an |
|-----------------|--|
| | impact on the frequency and nature of weather events that can |
| | cause flooding. It is therefore vital that we understand the |
| | changing nature of flood risk and continue to support the |
| | development of flood resilient communities through the work of |
| | all key agencies |

| Quality of Life | The creation of flood resilient communities is an important factor which underpins the maintenance of a high quality of life within the Borough |
|-----------------------|--|
| Efficient Services | A number of services contribute to the delivery of flood prevention and response services and it is important that each are delivered in an efficient and effective manner |
| Sustainable Growth | Provision of effective drainage systems to minimise surface water flood risk is an important requirement through the planning and building control regulatory frameworks |

6. Recommendations

It is RECOMMENDED that the Communities Scrutiny Group:

- a) scrutinise the contents of the report and presentation; and
- b) provide feedback to the Lead Flood Authority on the latest flood risk profile for the Borough.

| For more information contact: | Dave Banks |
|---------------------------------|---|
| | Director – Neighbourhoods |
| | 0115 9148438 |
| | dbanks@rushcliffe.gov.uk |
| | Chevalier Douglas |
| | Emergency Planning Officer |
| | 0115 9148399 |
| | CDouglas@rushcliffe.gov.uk |
| Background papers available for | Report to Community Scrutiny Group - Flooding |
| Inspection: | and Drainage Wednesday, 7 October 2020 |
| | |
| List of appendices: | None. |
| | |





Communities Scrutiny Group

Thursday, 16 October 2025

Work Programme

Report of the Director of Finance and Corporate Services

1. Summary

- 1.1. The work programmes for all Scrutiny Groups are created and managed by the Corporate Overview Group. This Group accepts and considers Scrutiny Matrices from both officers and councillors which propose items for scrutiny. If those items are accepted following discussion at the Corporate Overview Group, they are placed on the work programme for one of the Council's Scrutiny Groups.
- 1.2. The work programme is also a standing item for discussion at each meeting of the Communities Scrutiny Group. In determining the proposed work programme due regard has been given to matters usually reported to the Group and the timing of issues to ensure best fit within the Council's decision-making process.
- 1.3. The work programme is detailed in this report for information only so that the Group is aware of the proposed agenda for the next meeting. The work programme does not take into account any items that need to be considered by the Group as special items. These may occur, for example, through changes required to the Constitution or financial regulations, which have an impact on the internal controls of the Council.
- 1.4. The future work programme was updated and agreed at the meeting of the Corporate Overview Group on 2 September 2025, including any items raised via the scrutiny matrix.

Members are asked to propose future topics to be considered by the Group, in line with the Council's priorities which are:

- The Environment;
- Quality of Life;
- Efficient Services; and
- Sustainable Growth.

2. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that the Group agrees the work programme as set out below:

22 January 2026

- Asylum Dispersal and Contingency Accommodation including HMO's
- Work Programme

2 April 2026

- Carbon Management Plan Update
- West Bridgford Contact Point
- Work Programme

xx October 2026

- Review of debt collection agents by RBC in line with the outcome of the Government's consultation on Council Tax and Enforcement
- Work Programme

3. Reason for Recommendation

To enable the Council's scrutiny arrangements to operate efficiently and effectively.

| For more information contact: | Pete Linfield |
|---------------------------------|--|
| | Director of Finance and Corporate Services |
| | 0115 914 8349 |
| | plinfield@rushcliffe.gov.uk |
| Background papers Available for | None. |
| Inspection: | |
| List of appendices (if any): | None. |
| | |