

Rushcliffe Borough Council – Scrutiny Matrix

Councillor Request for Scrutiny	
Councillor Carys Thomas	
Proposed topic of scrutiny ...	Accessible housing
I would like to understand ... (key lines of enquiry)	<p>Consider demand v supply of adapted and adaptable housing in all tenures, in both existing and new housing stock.</p> <p>Rushcliffe’s 24-25 budget proposes to remove the subsidy that augments the Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG), which helps residents whose homes need to be adapted. The result will be an increase in waiting list time. The cumulative impact of the proposed budget cut year on year needs to be understood before budget setting for 25-26.</p> <p>Aid councillor understanding of the DFG system and any pressures on it, and look at some case studies. Explore other grants available and other measures available to help people with health and/or mobility challenges live independently and safely in their homes. Understand any government funding changes being proposed; how grants are distributed; and how we work with other councils and bodies to deliver support.</p> <p>How are adapted homes allocated in the choice based lettings system, and is there sufficient supply from housing associations? Are there pressures? How are adaptations to housing association stock funded?</p> <p>How are landowners other than housing associations supported to adapt properties for their tenants?</p> <p>A closely related issue is what is being built. I would prefer the two issues to be considered together as they relate strongly to each other. But linked “part 1” and “part 2” scrutiny items</p>

	<p>could be considered, ideally going to the same scrutiny group and with the same officers present.</p> <p>What national planning standards, guidelines and voluntary codes are there about building adaptable and adapted homes.</p> <p>What are the current targets in Rushcliffe's local plan in terms of percentages of new homes (market and affordable) that are adapted and adaptable? Are the targets being achieved? If not, what are the barriers? Should this be increased in the next version of the local plan to meet projected demand?</p> <p>Is there any potential for topping up the DFG via strategic CIL contributions, new homes bonus or any other development related funds?</p> <p>How many purpose-built facilities for the elderly with reduced mobility and other groups with special needs are included in the local plan? Where within Rushcliffe are these facilities needed? How many have been delivered in recent years compared to the demand in Rushcliffe and national averages? What percentage of these units are affordable and how do they feed into choice based lettings? What provision should be included in the next version of the local plan?</p>												
<p>I think this topic should be scrutinised because ... (please tick)</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="762 1335 842 1373"></td> <td data-bbox="842 1335 1463 1373">Poor Performance Identified</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="762 1373 842 1411">x</td> <td data-bbox="842 1373 1463 1411">Change in Legislation or Local Policy</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="762 1411 842 1449">x</td> <td data-bbox="842 1411 1463 1449">Resident Concern or Interest</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="762 1449 842 1487"></td> <td data-bbox="842 1449 1463 1487">Cabinet Recommendation</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="762 1487 842 1525">x</td> <td data-bbox="842 1487 1463 1525">Links to the Corporate Strategy</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="762 1525 842 1583"></td> <td data-bbox="842 1525 1463 1583">Other (please state reason)</td> </tr> </table>		Poor Performance Identified	x	Change in Legislation or Local Policy	x	Resident Concern or Interest		Cabinet Recommendation	x	Links to the Corporate Strategy		Other (please state reason)
	Poor Performance Identified												
x	Change in Legislation or Local Policy												
x	Resident Concern or Interest												
	Cabinet Recommendation												
x	Links to the Corporate Strategy												
	Other (please state reason)												

Collaboration

Matrix developed in conjunction with officers?

Yes

Officer Consideration of Councillor Request for Scrutiny

Officer Feedback (please tick)

- Issue already being addressed		Issue of a complaint investigation	
- Issue has already been considered in the last 2 years?		Issue is a staffing matter	
- Issue is a legal matter		There is an alternative way of dealing with the issue	
Is there sufficient capacity ...			
- Scrutiny Work Programme?			
- Officer Resources?			
Recommendation			

Consideration of Request for Scrutiny at COG

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

Appendix

Rushcliffe Borough Council – Scrutiny Matrix

Councillor Request for Scrutiny	
Councillor Lesley Way	
Proposed topic of scrutiny ...	Management Charges Actions Review
I would like to understand ... (key lines of enquiry)	Progress made on the action listed in Appendix B at Growth and Development Scrutiny meeting on 3 rd January 2024
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Links to the Corporate Strategy. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of Life • Sustainable growth
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (please state reason) Continued review of actions	

Collaboration	
Matrix developed in conjunction with officers?	No

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

Consideration of Request for Scrutiny at COG

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

Appendix

Rushcliffe Borough Council – Scrutiny Matrix

Councillor Request for Scrutiny	
Councillor Keir Chewings	
Proposed topic of scrutiny ...	Management of open spaces within new developments
I would like to understand ... (key lines of enquiry)	<p>Rushcliffe Borough Council's Growth and Development Scrutiny Group convened on Wednesday 3rd January 2024 to discuss the management of open spaces within new housing developments. This meeting arose from concerns expressed by councillors, particularly regarding the inconsistency in resident fees for maintaining these spaces, the lack of control over fee inflation, and the fairness of residents paying for the maintenance of public spaces.</p> <p>The key discussions and outcomes were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stratford Upon Avon's Approach: The group noted Stratford Upon Avon District Council's use of parish councils and non-profit groups for managing open spaces, contrasting with the prevalent use of private companies. The lack of comprehensive details led to a consensus that further exploration was needed. 2. Past Practices and Legal Feasibility: It was highlighted that until 2011, RBC managed open spaces directly, charging developers with a 15-year maintenance cost. The meeting discussed the reluctance of developers towards this system and raised questions about the legal possibility of enforcing such a condition. Officers were uncertain about the legal viability, prompting a need for definitive legal advice on this matter and whether any other Council's were taking this approach. 3. Financial Analysis of Fairham Pastures: Fairham Pastures was examined as a cost model, including SUDS maintenance, without considering the extra revenue from increased council tax. The group expressed the need for a detailed breakdown of costs and revenues for a comprehensive financial comparison over

a 15-year period.

4. SUDS Maintenance Costs A significant point was the upcoming legislative change - Schedule 3 to the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, which would transfer SUDS maintenance to local authority responsibility, potentially reducing costs and risks for managing open spaces.

Subsequently the following amended recommendations were accepted by the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group:

- Acknowledges the complexities of the management of open spaces and the multiple factors at play leading to no simple solution;
- Supports the proposal for the Council to take a more active role working with developers at the Planning stage to establish the Council's expectations regarding the service expected for its residents;
- Supports officers continuing to work through the emerging issues with developers, management companies and residents, with the aim of providing greater transparency and governance for future homeowners of new estates, whilst recognising the Council has no authority over the operation of management companies;
- Seeks to raise the general issues and concerns raised by residents on new housing estates with developers and management companies to raise the profile of the issues being experienced.
- Investigate the legal position on whether a commuted sum to cover maintenance for 15 years could be legally enforced for RBC.
- Investigate the work carried out by Stratford council and invite a guest speaker to a Growth and Development Scrutiny Group to scrutinise alternative actions.
- Detail forecasted revenue from an example development for RBC for a 15 year period, for example Fairham Pastures so RBC can compare revenue raised and cost implications.

Councillors would therefore like to understand:

1. Stratford Upon Avon District Council's

	<p>Approach Analysis: An in-depth examination of their strategy for managing open spaces, including inviting an officer from the council to speak at a governance meeting.</p> <p>2. In-Depth Financial Analysis of Fairham Pastures: The councillors request a comprehensive financial analysis of the 15-year maintenance plan for Fairham Pastures. This analysis should itemise each aspect of the maintenance costs, providing a detailed breakdown that led to the estimated £8 million figure. It should specifically detail the expenses related to Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS). Additionally, this analysis needs to include a comparison with the additional tax revenue generated from the development. The goal is to clearly outline the net financial impact on the council's budget, identifying the potential surplus or deficit after accounting for the additional council tax revenues against the maintenance expenses.</p> <p>3. Legal Feasibility of Enforcing Commuted Sums: A professional legal opinion on whether RBC can legally enforce a 15-year commuted sum on developers for the upkeep of open spaces, as previously practiced and whether other council's do so.</p> <p>4. Tax Band Exploration for Additional Funds: Investigating the potential use of a "special expense" arrangement to generate additional funds from residents of new estates for estate management, akin to how certain areas pay extra for specific services like graveyard maintenance (for example in Keyworth and Ruddington).</p>												
<p>I think this topic should be scrutinised because ... (please tick)</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="761 1525 842 1568"></td> <td data-bbox="842 1525 1463 1568">Poor Performance Identified</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="761 1568 842 1610"></td> <td data-bbox="842 1568 1463 1610">Change in Legislation or Local Policy</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="761 1610 842 1653">X</td> <td data-bbox="842 1610 1463 1653">Resident Concern or Interest</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="761 1653 842 1695"></td> <td data-bbox="842 1653 1463 1695">Cabinet Recommendation</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="761 1695 842 1738"></td> <td data-bbox="842 1695 1463 1738">Links to the Corporate Strategy</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="761 1738 842 1776"></td> <td data-bbox="842 1738 1463 1776">Other (please state reason)</td> </tr> </table>		Poor Performance Identified		Change in Legislation or Local Policy	X	Resident Concern or Interest		Cabinet Recommendation		Links to the Corporate Strategy		Other (please state reason)
	Poor Performance Identified												
	Change in Legislation or Local Policy												
X	Resident Concern or Interest												
	Cabinet Recommendation												
	Links to the Corporate Strategy												
	Other (please state reason)												

Collaboration	
Matrix developed in conjunction with officers?	No

Officer Consideration of Councillor Request for Scrutiny

Officer Feedback (please tick)

- Issue already being addressed		Issue of a complaint investigation	
- Issue has already been considered in the last 2 years?		Issue is a staffing matter	
- Issue is a legal matter		There is an alternative way of dealing with the issue	

Is there sufficient capacity ...

- Scrutiny Work Programme?			
- Officer Resources?			

Recommendation

Consideration of Request for Scrutiny at COG

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