

Rushcliffe Borough Council – Scrutiny Request

Councillor Request for REPEAT Scrutiny	
Councillor Hetvi Parekh	
Proposed topic of scrutiny ...	MTVH: Follow-Up on 2025 Scrutiny Recommendations, Progress Update and Service Performance Review
<p>I would like to explore ...</p> <p>It is helpful to include why you feel this topic requires scrutiny, what concerns you, what concerns are being raised with you, and how scrutiny will lead to better outcomes or services to residents.</p>	<p>Following the Communities Scrutiny Group meeting held on 24 July 2025, members would like to invite Metropolitan Thames Valley Housing (MTVH) to return to provide a further update on the areas discussed at that session.</p> <p>Members welcomed the information provided in 2025 and appreciated MTVH's engagement. However, given the scale of MTVH's presence in the Borough and the importance of ensuring high-quality services for residents, the Group wishes to review progress against the issues raised last year.</p> <p>In particular, Members would welcome an update on progress against the areas discussed in 2025 including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements in repairs and maintenance performance, including timeliness, quality, and communication with residents • Actions taken to address long-standing or complex repair cases • Strengthening of complaints handling, including responsiveness and learning from complaints • Enhancements to communication and customer service, as highlighted during the 2025 meeting • Evidence of improved partnership working with the Council, including homelessness prevention, allocations, and local service delivery • Any changes to performance monitoring, including clearer reporting of repairs, satisfaction, and service standards <p>Additional updates requested by Councillors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case studies illustrating the complexity of repairs and complaints raised with MTVH, to support Members' understanding of the challenges and how they are being addressed • An update on MTVH's decarbonisation strategy, including indicative timescales and planned works for properties within Rushcliffe.

	<p>The Scrutiny Group would be grateful to receive a written update in advance of the meeting, followed by attendance from appropriate MTVH representatives to present the information and respond to Member questions.</p>	
<p>I think this topic should be scrutinised because ... (please tick)</p>	✓	<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>
		<p>Other (please state reason)</p>
<p>What outcomes are you seeking from this scrutiny?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear evidence of progress since the 2025 scrutiny session, particularly around repairs, complaints, and communication. • Assurance on current performance, including transparency in data and service standards. • Understanding of complex cases, through case studies showing how difficult repairs and complaints are being managed. • Clarity on MTVH’s decarbonisation plans, including timescales and works planned for Rushcliffe properties. • Improved partnership working between MTVH and the Council. • Commitment to ongoing engagement with Scrutiny. 	

<p>Collaboration</p>	
<p>Matrix developed in conjunction with officers?</p>	<p>No</p>

Rushcliffe Borough Council – Scrutiny Request

Councillor Request for REPEAT Scrutiny		
Councillor Tina Combellack		
Proposed topic of scrutiny ...	East Midlands Freeport	
<p>I would like to explore ...</p> <p>It is helpful to include why you feel this topic requires scrutiny, what concerns you, what concerns are being raised with you, and how scrutiny will lead to better outcomes or services to residents.</p>	<p>Scrutiny of the East Midlands Freeport was undertaken in July 2025 by the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group. A written update was also provided in October 2025.</p> <p>The Growth and Development Scrutiny Group request that this item returns to the Group so that further progress and outstanding actions can be updated upon.</p> <p>Additional questions from the Group include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Securing electricity demand connections to be resolved 2026 - any progress? • LDO transport cap - is this being addressed? • Indicative timescale - is this being met? • Future focus plans including decommissioning this year - are they being met? • Junction 24 modelling - what is being done? • Transport restrictions to be lifted 2027/28 – what is the latest position? • Skills plans focus – what does this mean in real terms ie jobs for local people? 	
<p>I think this topic should be scrutinised because ...</p> <p>(please tick)</p>	<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)
<p>What outcomes are you seeking from this scrutiny?</p>	<p>Greater understanding of the Freeport and its governance structure, impact of the development locally and timescales.</p>	

Collaboration

Matrix developed in conjunction with officers?

No

DRAFT

Rushcliffe Borough Council – Scrutiny Request

Councillor Request for Scrutiny

Councillor Chris Grocock

Proposed topic of scrutiny ...

Council's Strategic Growth Board

I would like to explore ...

It is helpful to include why you feel this topic requires scrutiny, what concerns you, what concerns are being raised with you, and how scrutiny will lead to better outcomes or services to residents.

To request further details on the review of the Council's Strategic Growth Board, including the reasons for this review following the cessation of what was a quarterly meeting, last held in March 2025.

A review of the functions of Strategic Growth Board may well be appropriate, but at no point has there been any formal discussion amongst members that the Board should cease meeting whilst the review is ongoing. Nor does it appear to have been discussed at cabinet.

How and why was the decision taken to review the function of Strategic Growth Board?

Key activities relating to Strategic Growth are clearly still ongoing (the decision to purchase land for a new woodland for example) so it is unclear as to why the review necessitated the cessation of the Board's meetings.

Why does this review entail and why does it necessitate the cessation of the Strategic Growth Board meeting?

The Labour Group is aware of changes in the senior officers responsible for Strategic Growth, particularly

	<p>with the departure of the Service Manager for Economic Growth, so if this is a question of officer capacity that should have been clearly communicated openly and honest, with a contingency plan in place for at least providing reports to the members of Strategic Growth Board even if the meetings couldn't be held. The Strategic Growth Board has done excellent and important work and was, for example, the genesis for cross-party action on assessing the role of Housing Management Companies and taking a several actions to address the challenges in this area.</p> <p>So given the suspension of its functions:</p> <p>In the absence of Strategic Growth Board meeting, how have the topics it discusses and the decisions it takes been made?</p> <p>How have these activities been communicated to members of Strategic Growth Board (if at all)?</p>												
<p>I think this topic should be scrutinised because ... (please tick)</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="679 1234 759 1294"></td> <td data-bbox="759 1234 1501 1294">Poor Performance Identified</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="679 1294 759 1355">✓</td> <td data-bbox="759 1294 1501 1355">Change in Legislation or Local Policy</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="679 1355 759 1415"></td> <td data-bbox="759 1355 1501 1415">Resident Concern or Interest</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="679 1415 759 1476"></td> <td data-bbox="759 1415 1501 1476">Cabinet Recommendation</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="679 1476 759 1536">✓</td> <td data-bbox="759 1476 1501 1536">Links to the Corporate Strategy</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="679 1536 759 1601"></td> <td data-bbox="759 1536 1501 1601">Other (please state reason)</td> </tr> </table>		Poor Performance Identified	✓	Change in Legislation or Local Policy		Resident Concern or Interest		Cabinet Recommendation	✓	Links to the Corporate Strategy		Other (please state reason)
	Poor Performance Identified												
✓	Change in Legislation or Local Policy												
	Resident Concern or Interest												
	Cabinet Recommendation												
✓	Links to the Corporate Strategy												
	Other (please state reason)												
<p>What outcomes are you seeking from this scrutiny?</p>													

<p>Collaboration</p>	
<p>Matrix developed in conjunction with officers?</p>	<p>No</p>

Rushcliffe Borough Council – Scrutiny Request

Councillor Request for Scrutiny

Councillor Penny Gowland

Proposed topic of scrutiny ...

Road sweeping.

I would like to explore ...

It is helpful to include why you feel this topic requires scrutiny, what concerns you, what concerns are being raised with you, and how scrutiny will lead to better outcomes or services to residents.

How effective this is.

Many residents complain that road sweeping is ineffective and a waste of money as nothing is done to ensure that parked cars are removed prior to arrival of staff. This means that many roads effectively never get swept, leading to a mess but more importantly maybe, blocked gutters and drains.

I would like to know what is done and what can be done to ask for cars to be moved, work at times where there are less cars parked (which can be day or evening depending on location) or work around parked cars.

I think this topic should be scrutinised because ... (please tick)

<input checked="" 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)

What outcomes are you seeking from this scrutiny?

Cleaner streets, particularly in areas where there are lots of cars regularly parked during the day.

Collaboration

Matrix developed in conjunction with officers?

No

Rushcliffe Borough Council – Scrutiny Request

Officer Request for Scrutiny	
Leanne Ashmore – Director of Development and Economic Growth	
Proposed topic of scrutiny ...	Article 4 Direction – Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMOs)
<p>I would like to explore ...</p> <p>It is helpful to include why you feel this topic requires scrutiny, what concerns you, what concerns are being raised with you, and how scrutiny will lead to better outcomes or services to residents.</p>	<p>On 10 February 2026 Cabinet received a report stating that there was currently insufficient evidence to support the implementation of an Article 4 Direction covering the entire Borough. Cabinet resolved to refer the matter to Communities Scrutiny Group in July 2026 to scrutinise the following key lines of enquiry:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a robust evidence base demonstrating harm or risk of harm? • What are the likely impacts – intended and unintended – of introducing an Article 4 Direction to remove or restrict permitted development rights for HMOs? • Is making a Direction proportionate, enforceable and aligned with local and national policy?
<p>I think this topic should be scrutinised because ...</p> <p>(please tick)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor Performance Identified
	<input type="checkbox"/> Change in Legislation or Local Policy
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resident Concern or Interest
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cabinet Recommendation
	<input type="checkbox"/> Links to the Corporate Strategy
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please state reason)
<p>What outcomes are you seeking from this scrutiny?</p>	<p>A better understanding of the evidence base and potential impact of introducing an Article 4 Direction to guide a future decision on this matter by Cabinet.</p>