

Rushcliffe Borough Council – Scrutiny Request

Councillor Request for Scrutiny	
Councillor Tina Combellack	
Proposed topic of scrutiny ...	Park Homes
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.	The administration and management regulations for Park Homes. I am hearing concerns around ability to sell and site percentages added to sales prices, insurance concerns and regulations regarding greenhouses, outside planting containers, decorating etc. Also, I believe owners have to purchase utilities through the management meaning that any promotional discounts are not available to the owners. Similar concerns to those voiced regarding management companies for open spaces on housing developments.
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)
What outcomes are you seeking from this scrutiny?	Better understand and clearer regulatory agreements and a good practice guide put in place similar to the open space plan. Less imposition upon owner's freedoms.

Collaboration	
Matrix developed in conjunction with officers?	No

Rushcliffe Borough Council – Scrutiny Request

Councillor Request for Scrutiny	
Councillors Way and Thomas	
Proposed topic of scrutiny ...	Follow up - Management of Public Open Spaces on New Build Estates
<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>This was last scrutinised in March 2025, following an earlier meeting in Jan 2024 and Cabinet decision in May 2024 to support further work.</p> <p>The action plan in 24-25 included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Produce SPD, with guidance on open space provision, management and maintenance • Develop Good Practice Guide • Invite Management Companies to Growth Boards • Facilitate meetings between residents' groups and management companies • Make contact with other agencies, particularly re SUDS. <p>This scrutiny item will review work to complete these actions and their impact.</p> <p>Since 2025 the situation continues to cause concern for Rushcliffe residents, as more estates are completed and residents become aware of the unfair charges and the extent of their personal exposure. Councillors' and MP casework on this issue continues to grow.</p> <p>Further questionable practices have been uncovered, such as freehold residents having to pay management charges on behalf of homes operated by registered providers; residents in Fairham faced with two sets of</p>

charges (at settlement and estate levels); developers routinely not offering SUDs for adoption.

James Naish MP has been involved in progressing issues for several estates; Cllrs Thomas and Way have given evidence at a parliamentary Select Committee; residents have started forming associations to work productively with site managers and challenge bills. There is cross party acceptance in parliament that there is an issue; Government claims to be tackling the matter through Leasehold Legislation; national lobby groups are forming and gaining ground.

Scrutiny will review the changing situation and consider further actions for Rushcliffe to take to help empower residents already caught in this situation and to minimise issues in future new estates.

Rushcliffe's policy not to adopt open space will be re-examined, along with financial modelling (impact on budgets; commuted sums, option of RBC raising the charges itself; worked up illustrations e.g, Fairham)

The following will be invited, to answer questions and give evidence:

- Portfolio Holder
- James Naish MP (or his office)
- Lynne Twigg, Chair of a recently formed Residents' Association in East Leake
- Other resident groups' representatives to be determined
- Representatives of management companies, developers, and registered providers where there are known to be issues - selecting different companies from previous scrutiny

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representatives of other agencies involved in adoption, including Nottinghamshire County Council and Severn Trent Water. <p>Representatives of other councils (if LGR outcome is known when the item is scheduled) to determine how their policies and practice differ from Rushcliffe's.</p>	
<p>I think this topic should be scrutinised because ... (please tick)</p>	X	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)
<p>What outcomes are you seeking from this scrutiny?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of effectiveness of actions to date Review of relevant legislation changes Identification of further actions, e.g. to facilitate formation of residents' associations, and to influence the detail of charging models adopted in future estates. Reconsideration of current policy of non-adoption by Rushcliffe, for specific types of infrastructure on new estates (e.g. play areas, public open space, playing fields). Engagement with Town and Parish Councils re adoption of particular types of infrastructure, e.g. allotments, play areas Consideration of adoption of public open space on estates in the context of habitat preservation/generation and carbon capture, and in the light of recent land acquisitions by RBC. Review of existing policy and guidance documents, and possible addition to these. Gathering further evidence to submit to Government to support lobbying for changes at national level. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Alignment of policy and practice with other local councils and adoption of best practice in the run-up to LGR.• Recommendations to Cabinet
--	---

Collaboration	
Matrix developed in conjunction with officers?	No

DRAFT