

# Rushcliffe Borough Council – Scrutiny Matrix

<b>Councillor Request for Scrutiny</b>	
<b>Proposed topic of scrutiny</b>	<b>Model for Provision of Social Housing</b>
<b>I would like to understand (key lines of enquiry)</b>	<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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?</i></p> <p><i>What are the pros and cons of the different models?</i></p> <p><i>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?</i></p> <p><i>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?</i></p> <p><i>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?</i></p> <p><i>Would Rushcliffe be able to provide a more supportive and responsive service with a different model?</i></p> <p><i>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?</i></p>

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

### Officer Consideration of Councillor Request for Scrutiny

<b>Officer Feedback (please tick)</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Officer Comment</b>
- Issue already being addressed	<input type="checkbox"/>	
- Issue has already been considered in the last 2 years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	
- Issue is a legal matter	<input type="checkbox"/>	
- Issue of a complaint investigation	<input type="checkbox"/>	
- Issue is a staffing matter	<input type="checkbox"/>	
- There is an alternative way of dealing with the issue	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Is there sufficient capacity</b>		
- Scrutiny Work Programme?	<input type="checkbox"/>	
- Officer Resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Recommendation</b>		
<b>Lead Officer</b>		
<b>Proposed Timescale for Scrutiny and Scrutiny Group</b>		