

Rushcliffe Borough Council – Scrutiny Matrix

Councillor Request for Scrutiny	
Councillor C Thomas	
Proposed topic of scrutiny	Housing density in new housing sites
I would like to understand (key lines of enquiry)	<p>How the number of homes a site will provide is estimated in the SHLAA and what assumptions are made about housing density to do this</p> <p>Why the number of homes often increases during the course of the application</p> <p>The difference between gross and net density as used in this process</p> <p>How the amount of open space and unusable space on a site is determined</p> <p>How density relates to the housing mix proposed/expected/required</p> <p>What policies apply</p> <p>What housing densities already exist in different areas of Rushcliffe</p> <p>Emerging government policy on housing density as a material consideration and on densification</p>
I think this topic should be scrutinised because (please tick)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poor Performance Identified
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change in Legislation or Local Policy
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident Concern or Interest
	<input type="checkbox"/> Cabinet Recommendation
	<input type="checkbox"/> Links to the Corporate Strategy

		Other (please state reason)
--	--	-----------------------------

Officer Consideration of Councillor Request for Scrutiny

Officer Feedback (please tick)

- Issue already being addressed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue of a complaint investigation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
- Issue has already been considered in the last 2 years?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue is a staffing matter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
- Issue is a legal matter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	There is an alternative way of dealing with the issue	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Is there sufficient capacity ...

- Scrutiny Work Programme?		
- Officer Resources?		

Recommendation

Briefing note in the first instance – this is fact-based information. If the Briefing Note prompts further questions, then a matrix can be reconsidered.

Consideration of Request for Scrutiny at COG

Public Involvement / engagement?	
Expert witnesses?	
Portfolio holder?	
Lead Officer?	
Proposed Timescale for Scrutiny and Scrutiny Group	

Rushcliffe Borough Council – Scrutiny Matrix

Councillor Request for Scrutiny	
Councillor C Thomas in conjunction with officers following a motion at Council	
Proposed topic of scrutiny	Management of open spaces within new developments
I would like to understand (key lines of enquiry)	<p>There is concern from Councillors about the current arrangements for the management of Open Spaces within new housing developments. This has been considered by Growth and Development scrutiny but based on recent concerns raised it is time to review this again. Concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of consistency with regards to resident fees for maintaining open spaces • Lack of control over fee inflation year on year. • Concern over the perceived fairness of residents paying for the maintenance for public spaces, accessible to everyone. <p>Councillors would therefore like to understand:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current position in Rushcliffe with regards to management of open spaces within new housing developments. Including where there is good practice/frameworks in place. • The scope of 'open spaces' within new housing developments e.g. private gardens, parks, allotments. • The current government legislation with regards to open spaces within new housing development and the associated fees levied on residents. • Understanding what, if anything, other local authorities do. • Is there a role for Council with regards to Management of open spaces within new developments and what the implications of that are?
I think this topic should be scrutinised because (please tick)	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor Performance Identified
	<input type="checkbox"/> Change in Legislation or Local Policy
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident Concern or Interest
	<input type="checkbox"/> Cabinet Recommendation
	<input type="checkbox"/> Links to the Corporate Strategy
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state reason)
Officer Consideration of Councillor Request for Scrutiny	

Officer Feedback (please tick)			
- Issue already being addressed	x	Issue of a complaint investigation	x
- Issue has already been considered in the last 2 years?	x	Issue is a staffing matter	x
- Issue is a legal matter	x	There is an alternative way of dealing with the issue	x
Is there sufficient capacity ...			
- Scrutiny Work Programme?	✓		
- Officer Resources?	✓		
Recommendation		Schedule for scrutiny	
Consideration of Request for Scrutiny at COG			
Public Involvement / engagement?			
Expert witnesses?			
Portfolio holder?			
Lead Officer?	Leanne Ashmore		
Proposed Timescale for Scrutiny and Scrutiny Group	January 2024 – Growth and Development Scrutiny Group		

Rushcliffe Borough Council – Scrutiny Matrix

Officer Request for Scrutiny

Darryl Burch – Service Manager for Neighbourhoods

Proposed topic of scrutiny	Streetwise In-Sourcing		
I would like to understand (key lines of enquiry)	<p>In February 2022 Cabinet made the decision to in-source the Streetwise service effectively bringing it back under wholly Council control. This decision came into effect in September 2022.</p> <p>Officers are keen to ensure there is adequate scrutiny of this decision and the first year of operation of the Streetwise service since its in-sourcing.</p> <p>A presentation from the Streetwise team will cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background for Councillors • Purpose and remit of the Streetwise team • Operational parameters and scope • Performance Information • Financial Information • Customer Satisfaction • Future Plans. 		
I think this topic should be scrutinised because (please tick)		Poor Performance Identified	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Change in Legislation or Local Policy	
		Resident Concern or Interest	
		Cabinet Recommendation	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Links to the Corporate Strategy	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other (please state reason)	
	Significant change in Council operations in a crucial customer facing service.		

Officer Consideration of Request for Scrutiny

Officer Feedback (please tick)

- Issue already being addressed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue of a complaint investigation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
- Issue has already been considered in the last 2 years?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue is a staffing matter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
- Issue is a legal matter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	There is an alternative way of dealing with the issue	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is there sufficient capacity ...			
- Scrutiny Work Programme?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

- Officer Resources?	✓	
Recommendation	Schedule for scrutiny	
Consideration of Request for Scrutiny at COG		
Public Involvement / engagement?		
Expert witnesses?		
Portfolio holder?		
Lead Officer?	Luke Colaluca	
Proposed Timescale for Scrutiny and Scrutiny Group	March 2024 for Communities Scrutiny Group	

Appendix

Rushcliffe Borough Council – Scrutiny Matrix

Officer Request for Scrutiny

Charlotte Caven-Atack – Service Manager for Corporate Services

Proposed topic of scrutiny	Corporate Strategy		
I would like to understand (key lines of enquiry)	<p>The Council's current Corporate Strategy is due to expire later this year. Work has commenced on a new Corporate Strategy including a report outlining the process due to be considered at Cabinet in June.</p> <p>The Cabinet report recommends consideration of a draft strategy and the outcomes of a public consultation exercise by Corporate Overview Group in September with further scrutiny of the final draft of the Corporate Strategy in November.</p> <p>The tasks contained in the Corporate Strategy Action Plan and performance measures linked to these are monitored by the Corporate Overview Group for the next four years and, therefore, involvement at this stage helps the Group to shape its future work programme as well as the direction of the Council overall.</p>		
I think this topic should be scrutinised because (please tick)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Poor Performance Identified	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Change in Legislation or Local Policy	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Resident Concern or Interest	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cabinet Recommendation	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Links to the Corporate Strategy	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (please state reason)	

Officer Consideration of Request for Scrutiny

Officer Feedback (please tick)

- Issue already being addressed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue of a complaint investigation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
- Issue has already been considered in the last 2 years?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue is a staffing matter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
- Issue is a legal matter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	There is an alternative way of dealing with the issue	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is there sufficient capacity ...			
- Scrutiny Work Programme?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
- Officer Resources?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

Recommendation	Schedule for Scrutiny
Consideration of Request for Scrutiny at COG	
Public Involvement / engagement?	Public engagement via June 2023 Rushcliffe Reports will feed into the development of the Corporate Strategy
Expert witnesses?	
Portfolio holder?	
Lead Officer?	Charlotte Caven-Atack
Proposed Timescale for Scrutiny and Scrutiny Group	September and November for Corporate Overview Group

Appendix

Rushcliffe Borough Council – Scrutiny Matrix

Councillor Request for Scrutiny

Councillor C Thomas

<p>Proposed topic of scrutiny ...</p>	<p>East Midlands Airport - impacts of future flight path changes and aircraft noise in general</p>	
<p>I would like to understand ... (key lines of enquiry)</p>	<p>EMA is currently in a lengthy consultation and design process to review airspace. i.e. flight paths. Parts of Rushcliffe are already heavily impacted by aircraft noise and changes to the airspace has the potential to improve or worsen the situation for residents currently affected and those elsewhere in Rushcliffe.</p> <p>This scrutiny item would invite EMA to explain the process, members to question, and Rushcliffe to influence the outcome for the benefit of residents. This is an ongoing process and more than one discussion might be helpful over the period of the review.</p> <p>Looking at the aircraft noise problem in general for communities and homes already affected, there could be consideration of noise insulation standards to feed into planning when it comes to new builds. For existing homes there could be advice and exploration of measures and any grants available. Similarly for community buildings like village halls and churches adversely affected by noise.</p> <p>The issues linking to the corporate strategy are health and wellbeing and quality of life.</p>	
<p>I think this topic should be scrutinised because ... (please tick)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Poor Performance Identified</p> <p>Change in Legislation or Local Policy</p> <p>Resident Concern or Interest</p> <p>Cabinet Recommendation</p> <p>Links to the Corporate Strategy</p>

		Other (please state reason)	
Officer Consideration of Councillor Request for Scrutiny			
Officer Feedback (please tick)			
- Issue already being addressed	x	Issue of a complaint investigation	x
- Issue has already been considered in the last 2 years?	x	Issue is a staffing matter	x
- Issue is a legal matter	x	There is an alternative way of dealing with the issue	x
Is there sufficient capacity ...			
- Scrutiny Work Programme?	✓		
- Officer Resources?	✓		
Recommendation	Schedule for Scrutiny		
Consideration of Request for Scrutiny at COG			
Public Involvement / engagement?			
Expert witnesses?	Officers will try to engage a representative from the airport to come and participate		
Portfolio holder?	Cabinet member nominated to Nottingham East Midlands Airport Independent Consultative Committee – Outside Body		
Lead Officer?	Geoff Carpenter		
Proposed Timescale for Scrutiny and Scrutiny Group	January 2024 – Communities Scrutiny Group		

Rushcliffe Borough Council – Scrutiny Matrix

Councillor Request for Scrutiny

Councillor C Thomas, P Gowland and L Way

Proposed topic of scrutiny	Model for Provision of Social Housing
<p>I would like to understand (key lines of enquiry)</p>	<p>Rushcliffe no longer owns social housing, having disposed of it about 20 years ago, but is the “Housing Authority” for Rushcliffe, responsible for allocation of social housing and homelessness, working with Metropolitan Thames Valley Housing (MTVH) and other Registered Providers who own the social housing stock and operate the rental service. Many councils like Rushcliffe are registered providers themselves, rather than working only through third parties.</p> <p>After 20 years, is it time to review the model and consider whether Rushcliffe should once again become a registered provider to own and operate some housing?</p> <p>What are the pros and cons of the different models?</p> <p>With the current cost of living increases and high interest rates, is demand for social housing increasing, and if so is the current model able to respond? Are there currently financial pressures on the third party providers?</p> <p>New housing developments are providing “affordable” housing but this includes options like shared ownership. Does Rushcliffe currently have sufficient social housing for rent to meet demand? If not, would a change of model alter the situation?</p> <p>Are there specific types of social housing where there is a particular shortage? For instance: homes for single person households, bungalows, accommodation adapted for mobility issues, warden assisted homes for older people, homes for young families. Would a change of model give flexibility to develop options for this?</p> <p>Would Rushcliffe be able to provide a more supportive and responsive service with a different model? Rushcliffe currently has over £5M of ringfenced capital budgeted for the provision of affordable housing. Some of this dates back to sale of council houses before 2003, and the rest has been contributed by developers in lieu of providing affordable housing in situ on new housing estates, i.e. so that the homes can be built elsewhere. Would the option of using this funding directly be of benefit to residents?</p>

I think this topic should be scrutinised because (please tick)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Poor Performance Identified
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Change in Legislation or Local Policy
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Resident Concern or Interest
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cabinet Recommendation
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Links to the Corporate Strategy
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (please state reason)

Officer Consideration of Councillor Request for Scrutiny

Officer Feedback (please tick)

- Issue already being addressed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue of a complaint investigation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
- Issue has already been considered in the last 2 years?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue is a staffing matter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
- Issue is a legal matter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	There is an alternative way of dealing with the issue	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is there sufficient capacity ...			
- Scrutiny Work Programme?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
- Officer Resources?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Recommendation		Schedule for scrutiny	

Consideration of Request for Scrutiny at COG

Public Involvement / engagement?	
Expert witnesses?	
Portfolio holder?	
Lead Officer?	Donna Dwyer
Proposed Timescale for Scrutiny and Scrutiny Group	October 2023 – Communities Scrutiny Group