

Scrutiny Streets, Environment & Homes Sub- Committee Agenda



To: Councillors Councillor Leila Ben-Hassel (Chair), Councillor Kola Agboola (Vice-Chair), Adele Benson, Simon Brew, Amy Foster, Christopher Herman and Luke Shortland

Reserve Members: Samir Dwesar, Sean Fitzsimons, Simon Fox, Mohammed Islam, Eunice O'Dame, Ellily Ponnuthurai and Nikhil Sherine Thampi

A meeting of the **Scrutiny Streets, Environment & Homes Sub-Committee** which you are hereby summoned to attend, will be held on **Tuesday, 4 October 2022** at **6.30 pm** in **Council Chamber, Town Hall, Katharine Street, Croydon CR0 1NX**

Katherine Kerswell
Chief Executive
London Borough of Croydon
Bernard Weatherill House
8 Mint Walk, Croydon CR0 1EA

Tom Downs
tom.downs@croydon.gov.uk
www.croydon.gov.uk/meetings
Monday, 26 September 2022

Members of the public are welcome to attend this meeting, or you can view the webcast both live and after the meeting has completed at <http://webcasting.croydon.gov.uk>

If you would like to record the meeting, we ask that you read the guidance on the recording of public meetings [here](#) before attending.

The agenda papers for all Council meetings are available on the Council website www.croydon.gov.uk/meetings

If you require any assistance, please contact Tom Downs as detailed above.

AGENDA – PART A

1. **Apologies for Absence**

To receive any apologies for absence from any members of the Committee.

2. **Minutes of the Previous Meeting** (Pages 5 - 20)

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 20th July 2022 as an accurate record.

3. **Disclosure of Interests**

Members and co-opted Members of the Council are reminded that, in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct and the statutory provisions of the Localism Act, they are required to consider **in advance of each meeting** whether they have a disclosable pecuniary interest (DPI), an other registrable interest (ORI) or a non-registrable interest (NRI) in relation to any matter on the agenda. If advice is needed, Members should contact the Monitoring Officer **in good time before the meeting**.

If any Member or co-opted Member of the Council identifies a DPI or ORI which they have not already registered on the Council's register of interests or which requires updating, they should complete the disclosure form which can be obtained from Democratic Services at any time, copies of which will be available at the meeting for return to the Monitoring Officer.

Members and co-opted Members are required to disclose any DPIs and ORIs at the meeting: -

- Where the matter relates to a DPI they may not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not stay in the meeting unless granted a dispensation.
- Where the matter relates to an ORI they may not vote on the matter unless granted a dispensation.
- Where a Member or co-opted Member has an NRI which directly relates to their financial interest or wellbeing, or that of a relative or close associate, they must disclose the interest at the meeting, may not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not stay in the meeting unless granted a dispensation. Where a matter affects the NRI of a Member or co-opted Member, section 9 of Appendix B of the Code of Conduct sets out the test which must be applied by the Member to decide whether disclosure is required.

The Chair will invite Members to make their disclosure orally at the commencement of Agenda item 3, to be recorded in the minutes.

4. Urgent Business (if any)

To receive notice of any business not on the agenda which in the opinion of the Chair, by reason of special circumstances, be considered as a matter of urgency.

5. Housing Needs Transformation Plan (Pages 21 - 26)

To receive an update on the development of the Housing Needs Transformation Plan and to examine how this is going to be delivered against the pressures of delivering in-year savings. The Housing Needs Service is undergoing a transformation as part of a longer-term plan for full transformation for the whole Department. This transformation will look at Homelessness Services and Temporary Accommodation.

6. Healthy Streets and Active Travel (including Healthy Neighbourhoods, School Streets, Vision Zero, Cycling and Walking Strategy) Update (Pages 27 - 34)

This report provides an update on the Healthy Streets / Active Travel Programme including (Healthy Neighbourhoods, School Streets, Vision Zero, Cycling and Walking Strategy).

7. Cabinet Response to Scrutiny Recommendations (Pages 35 - 44)

The Streets, Environment & Homes Sub-Committee is presented with an up to date list of responses from Cabinet to recommendations made by the Sub-Committee for review.

8. Scrutiny Work Programme 2022-23 (Pages 45 - 52)

The Streets, Environment & Homes Sub-Committee is asked to: -

1. Note the most recent version of its Work Programme, as presented in the report.
2. Consider whether there are any other items that should be provisionally added to the work programme as a result of the discussions held during the meeting.

9. Exclusion of the Press and Public

The following motion is to be moved and seconded where it is proposed to exclude the press and public from the remainder of a meeting:

“That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act, 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt

information falling within those paragraphs indicated in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended.”

PART B

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 2

Scrutiny Streets, Environment & Homes Sub-Committee

Meeting held on Wednesday, 20 July 2022 at 6.30 pm in Council Chamber, Town Hall, Katharine Street, Croydon CR0 1NX

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Councillor Leila Ben-Hassel (Chair), Councillor Kola Agboola (Vice-Chair), Adele Benson, Simon Brew, Amy Foster, Christopher Herman and Nikhil Sherine Thampi.

Also Present: Councillor Jeet Bains (Cabinet Member for Planning and Regeneration), Councillor Scott Roche (Cabinet Member for Streets and Environment) and Councillor Lynne Hale (Statutory Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Homes).

Apologies: Councillor Luke Shortland

PART A

1/22 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 15th March 2022 were agreed as an accurate record.

2/22 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Luke Shortland, who sent Councillor Nikhil Sherine Thampi as a substitute.

3/22 Disclosure of Interests

There were none.

4/22 Urgent Business (if any)

There were no items of urgent business.

Sustainable Communities, Regeneration & Economic Recovery Directorate Overview

The Sub-Committee considered a report set out on pages 15 to 22 of the agenda, along with a supplement, which provided an overview of the Sustainable Communities, Regeneration & Economic Recovery Directorate to inform the development of the Committee's work programme for the coming year. The report was introduced by the Corporate Director, Sustainable Communities, Regeneration & Economic Recovery by way of a short summary.

The Cabinet Member for Streets and Environment thanked the emergency services and officers for their response across the borough and in difficult circumstances in the last few days. The Cabinet Member for Streets and Environment went through their initial priorities in post including Graffiti Removal, working with community groups, residents' associations, and parks Friends Groups. This work was to identify these groups' priorities and to rebuild trust and relationships with the Council. Work had begun on 'Clean Up Croydon' and the Veolia contract to identify issues and develop plans with officers.

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Regeneration introduced themselves and stated that they were looking at improvements that could be made in the Planning Service with the Planning Advisory Service review due to be published imminently. The Sub-Committee heard that the Town Centre Regeneration plan was being updated to bring it in line with current circumstances.

The Chair stated that they would not be focussing on a number of areas as these would be substantive items at future meetings of the Sub-Committee or Scrutiny and Overview Committee. The Sub-Committee had attended an officer briefing on Grounds Maintenance and a summary of this had been published in the Supplementary Agenda as an Appendix to this item.

The Chair asked about departmental priorities and why these were so high level and lacked outcome focus; it was asked whether a business plan would be developed to focus these with concrete objectives. The Corporate Director of Sustainable Communities, Regeneration & Economic Recovery agreed that these were high level but that more detailed Service Plans had been produced by Heads of Service and these would all be reviewed as part of the business planning process to ensure these were in line with the emerging priorities of the Elected Mayor.

The Sub-Committee directed questions on 'Clean up Croydon' and asked when copies of the Service Improvement Notice and Plan for Veolia would be provided and were informed that these would be provided following the meeting. The Improvement Notice had been delivered in February 2022 and focussed on three key areas which were missed collections, repeat missed collections and delivery of containers; these had been a point of contention

and the notice was in line with the contract as part of the escalation process which had triggered the production of a Service Improvement Plan. There had been a 45-50% improvement in missed collections, although this did fluctuate, but was travelling in the right direction and regular conversations were taking place with Veolia. There were challenges in the industry around staff recruitment and retention as well as recruitment of HGV drivers. Incentives were in place to attract staff with bonuses and provision of HGV driver training. The Sub-Committee asked how performance data was verified and were informed that the data was reliant on the number of reports received and a small contract monitoring team who checked random samples to ensure Veolia were logging data correctly.

Members asked about false reports of bins 'not being presented' when collections were missed and heard that the reporting system had migrated away from 'My Account' to make reporting easier and included the option to make an enquiry which would lead to an investigation. The Sub-Committee were of the view that it was too difficult to report missed collections in some cases and that this should be improved. On narrow streets, Members heard that Garden Waste collection trucks were wider and could sometimes not access the same streets that other waste collection vehicles could, but additional measures were being considered for these streets on a case-by-case basis.

The Chair asked how sanctions were applied in the Veolia contract and heard that there were performance indicators linked to a performance bond which was paid to the Council at the beginning of the year and was paid back over the year to Veolia if performance monitoring targets were met. The Chair asked how many times the provision of the contract had been increased in proportion with the number of houses served and was informed that there was an annual review process built into the contract that took account of property growth.

Members asked about the commissioning strategy being developed for the new waste contract and whether there was consideration of bringing the contract in house; Members heard that this option was being appraised by the South London Waste Partnership and the commissioning strategy could be brought to the Sub-Committee in October/November 2022.

On Street Cleansing, the Sub-Committee asked whether there was a litter strategy and whether poor waste collection for flats above shops had contributed to a greater amount of litter on high streets and in district centres. Members heard there was not a litter strategy, but that expectations were covered in the contract. Flats above shops were a challenge, particularly in regard to storage of waste, and special collections for flats above shops had been looked at but had been paused due to COVID. This would be resumed to look at the best approach to waste collection for these flats and to combat residents putting out waste every day. The Chair stated that the issue is further exacerbated by permitted development rights leading to units above shops with inadequate waste collection facilities and asked if there were any plans to address this. The Cabinet Member for Streets and Environment

responded that these issues were being discussed with Veolia and would be fed into the retendering process to improve collections and reduce contamination of waste. In response to questions from the Chair, the Cabinet Member for Streets and Environment responded that they were open to trials for collection of waste for flats above shops as suggested by local community groups.

The Chair asked whether the street cleansing schedule would be reviewed to take into account the waste collection schedule as better co-ordination of this could lead to a better perception of street cleanliness, and the Cabinet Member for Streets and Environment responded this could be picked up in the new contract. On ward councillor visits to check the grading of street cleansing, the Cabinet Member for Streets and Environment stated that they would look into reinstating this. The contract set a cleaning standard defined as 'State A' with no litter or detritus and for this to be maintained to 'State B'; the Director of Sustainable Communities offered to share guidance with photos to assist with the Sub-Committees' understanding of the grading. Street cleansing was monitored by officers, but Members and residents were encouraged to report areas where they felt grades were not being met. Large sweepers were still being used for A and B roads alongside smaller sweepers in local areas, as well as on foot litter pickers in district centres.

Members asked about the expiry of Parking Strategy; the Director of Sustainable Communities explained that the current parking policy had been formed around emissions, pay and display, and permitting – this needed to be evolved to take into account behaviour changes following COVID and to encourage residents away from using cars for shorter journeys. The new policy needed to be right for the Council and to drive the right behaviours around climate goals as well as dovetailing with development opportunities. The Head of Highways & Parking Services explained that data analysis was taking place to understand the current position and trends in Croydon and to align parking policy with these. On emissions-based charges and the adoption of Electric Vehicles (EV), Members heard the trend in lower emission vehicles would be accounted for in the strategy and electric vehicle charge points were being rolled out across the borough to ensure Croydon was ready for the future. The draft parking policy would be ready before the end of 2022 and it was hoped that this would be scrutinised by the Sub-Committee.

On Healthy Neighbourhood Schemes and plans to increase 'Healthy Travel', the Cabinet Member for Streets and Environment stated the details of the programmes were being reviewed. The Chair asked whether bidding for the Department for Transport (DfT) Capability Fund had been made and was informed that this would be checked but was likely for boroughs outside of London, as London boroughs would receive similar funding through Transport for London schemes. The Corporate Director, Sustainable Communities, Regeneration & Economic Recovery informed Members that the Council would be seeking to secure funding from DfT and TFL, such as the recent Active Travel funding programme, as well as any other available funding programmes including the Levelling Up Fund for which a bid had been submitted.

Members asked for information on the large backlog of highways repairs and how these works would be prioritised within the capital budget. The Director of Sustainable Communities stated that there was a highway asset management plan that produced a state of the highway report which mapped where roads were in need of an intervention using a Red Amber Green (RAG) rating system to create a forward works programme. There was work ongoing to make a proactive preventative strategy that was not simply reactive, and that took accident statistics into account; a business case for highway investment was developed every year and the size of Croydon's backlog of highway repairs was not uncommon. The Chair asked if footways were prioritised lower than roadways in the context of trying to get more residents to walk; the Sub-Committee heard that footways were included in condition surveys and were prioritised on different conditions than roads which followed the prominence of roads from A road, B road, etc. Visual safety inspections took place to look for trips and necessary interventions alongside reactive maintenance on footways.

The Sub-Committee asked about the Out of Hours teams for parks and poor-quality responses which had meant police had needed to be called instead. The Director of Sustainable Communities stated that they were not aware of these issues and asked for any problems to be escalated but that any issues with smoke or fire should be reported to emergency services in the first instance.

The Chair asked about street lighting and if smarter solutions using solar and remote control were being considered. The Director of Sustainable Communities responded that solar powered bollards were in use and street signs that required lighting were using LEDs; street lighting was at a grade that could be monitored by a central management system and had provision for variable dimming with a dimming pilot for cost mitigation ongoing. An LED solution was being considered but it was thought that the current variable dimming pilot was delivering similar results and savings.

The Chair asked for more details on the Town Centre Regeneration governance model and heard that this referred to an officer board that had put in place, pooling different directorates to tackle town centre problems in a holistic way. The Sub-Committee welcomed the bid for Levelling Up funding for the town centre but asked about plans for district centres with the report stating that behaviours were changing and high streets needed to evolve and adapt to those changes. The Cabinet Member for Planning and Regeneration stated that there were aspirations to engage with and create new Business Improvement Districts. The Director of Planning & Sustainable Regeneration stated that Good Growth bid funding for regeneration had been successful for Kenley and South Norwood; recruitment into regeneration teams was ongoing but there were issues retaining staff. On 'Meanwhile' strategies, these were being developed for the Town Centre but there was not sufficient resources in the regeneration team to focus on other district centres currently. The Corporate Director, Sustainable Communities, Regeneration & Economic Recovery highlighted the need to work with private landlords and businesses

in district centres to bring vacant properties and retail units back into use. The Chair raised the possibility of taking control of vacant properties as had been suggested in previous drafts of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill; the Sub-Committee heard that the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities had not provided any update on this and it would likely be extremely difficult in practice if included in the final Bill.

The Chair asked for the key high level points of the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) review of the Planning Department and was informed that the review was detailed and included a number of recommendations; the report had not yet been received but was expected imminently and could be shared with the Sub-Committee alongside an improvement plan once written. Members heard that Croydon had a very busy department with high caseloads which led to capacity challenges, further exacerbated by the financial situation of the council. New processes were being investigated for validations as well as ways to improve productivity. It was acknowledged there had been a breakdown in trust with residents, with particular with regard to Croydon Suburban Design Guide SPD2, which made the work of the department more difficult. Cases of non-determination had gone up due to the backlog of applications and more information on this could be provided. The Cabinet Member for Planning and Regeneration highlighted the independent nature of the PAS and the quality of the report and work they had produced; there was a focus on enforcement looking at processes and resourcing, and changes were required in current practices. The Sub-Committee asked whether there were capacity issues in enforcement and heard that the team is just four staff, and the Team Leader of Enforcement post had been vacant for 10 months and was now filled by an agency member of staff due to national shortages in enforcement officers. Members heard that there did need to be clear priorities of what was and was not enforced as a priority and the enforcement plan would be updated.

Members asked about parking income targets and the impact on the departmental revenue budget in 2022/23. The Corporate Director, Sustainable Communities, Regeneration & Economic Recovery informed the Sub-Committee about changes in parking behaviours and reduced demand for parking services had created additional budget pressures since the beginning of the pandemic; transactions were returning but the value of income was not. There was significant fluctuation month on month and in period 1 the Council was predicting a £3.15 million pressure from reduced demand for parking services. The pressure in period 1 from other areas such as ANPR and increased compliance was expected at £1.75 million.

Healthy Neighbourhoods income built into the budget would likely be at risk dependent on the implementation time for each scheme. The Chair asked what was being done in regard to looking at what other parking authorities were doing and heard that data was being compared to assess trends in relation to other areas. On Freedom Passes and the Concessionary Travel Scheme, the Director of Sustainable Communities confirmed that the Council committed significant amounts of money towards these schemes and this included the majority of parking income. There had been a significant drop of

Croydon's contributions in this year which had helped somewhat, but as normal behaviours returned after COVID it was expected this would rise and this risk needed to be taken into account as part of the MTFS. There needed to be a wider conversation with London Councils about whether this scheme should be reviewed. There had also been a downturn in the number of on street PCNs issued but staff for enforcement had been increased and efforts to increase retention and recruitment in this area were ongoing.

The Chair asked for current and proposed fees covered in the recent Cabinet paper for this directorate, and it was confirmed that this would be provided. On the financial impact of landlord licensing, the Corporate Director, Sustainable Communities, Regeneration & Economic Recovery stated that the previous scheme renewal had been rejected by the Secretary of State due to the lack of a Housing Strategy; work on a Housing Strategy was being progressed and there may be work to look at a new landlord licensing scheme in the future.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Sub-Committee were of the view that it was too difficult to report missed collections in some cases and that this should be improved.

Recommendation 1: The Sub-Committee asked for better communications on the Council Website around how to report waste collection issues and for the option to 'make an enquiry' to be made more prominent.

The Sub-Committee were of the view that more work needed to be done to improve trust in waste collection services and to improve the perception that services were improving and providing value for money to residents.

Recommendation 2: The Sub-Committee recommended better data collection on areas where there were repeated missed waste collections that could be due to obstructions or narrow roads to inform a more proactive approach that was less reliant on reporting.

Request for Information: The Sub-Committee asked for the Service Improvement Notice issued to Veolia in February 2022 to be shared with Members. Members also requested that the resultant Service Improvement Plan was shared once this had been finalised.

The Sub-Committee concluded that waste collections for flats above shops were an issue and solutions on this should be fed into the review of the waste contract.

Recommendation 3: The Sub-Committee recommended that the Cabinet Member for Streets and Environment investigate pilots on waste collection trails for flats above shops.

Recommendation 4: The Sub-Committee recommended that the Council produce a Litter Strategy in line with good practice.

The Sub-Committee concluded that there should be co-ordination between waste collection and street cleansing schedules to improve perceptions of street cleanliness and that this should be fed into the review of the waste contract.

Recommendation 5: The Sub-Committee recommended Ward Councillor visits to assess street cleaning grading were resumed.

The Sub-Committee were pleased to hear that the option of bringing the waste contract in-house was one of the options being appraised as part of the forthcoming review of the contract.

Request for Information/ Work Programme: The Sub-Committee requested that Members be briefed on the Waste Commissioning Strategy before it is brought to a future meeting.

The Sub-Committee concluded that any review of Healthy Neighbourhoods scheme should be reviewed by the Sub-Committee before a decision is taken at Cabinet.

The Sub-Committee concluded that there was significant strain on parking income and that the new parking strategy needed to incorporate current trends in behaviours and the adoption of low emission vehicles.

Recommendation 7: The Sub-Committee requested clarity on timescales for the new parking strategy and for information on how this would contribute to over net zero plans.

Request for Information/ Work Programme: The Chair asked for a report to be brought to the next Committee with the position of the in-year budget for the directorate.

Request for Information: The Sub-Committee requested that information on previous and proposed fees and charges for the directorate was shared ahead of the next the next meeting.

Request for Information/ Work Programme: The Sub-Committee requested a briefing on the highway maintenance plan to ensure that prominence was being given to the maintenance of footways as well as roadways.

The Sub-Committee concluded that the directorate should look at opportunities to engage in more innovative partnership working with other authorities.

The Sub-Committee concluded that there were significant challenges in workforce retention and recruitment across the directorate, particularly in the

Planning Department, and noted that the Workforce Strategy would be reviewed by a future meeting of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee.

Request for Information: The Sub-Committee requested that the full PAS Review and Implementation Plan are shared with Members in addition to an officer briefing.

6/22 Revocation of Croydon Suburban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2 (SPD2)

The Sub-Committee considered the report set out on pages 23 to 216 of the agenda which had been approved by the Executive Mayor at Cabinet and recommended the revocation of the Croydon suburban design guide supplementary planning document (SPD2) to Council. The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Planning and Regeneration by way of a short presentation prepared by the Head of Spatial Planning and Interim Head of Growth Zone and Regeneration.

Members asked for clarification on the implementation status of the London Plan 2021 and heard that this was in place as current policy, including the relevant housing and small site targets. The Chair asked about how identifying areas of gentle intensification related to SPD2 and it was clarified by the Cabinet Member for Planning and Regeneration that these were contained within the Local Plan and not SPD2, even though the desire to move away from density driven development was identified in the report as a reason for the proposed revocation. The Sub-Committee queried why revocation was proposed before replacement supplementary planning documentation on residential extensions and alterations was ready to take its place, as was thought to be plan making best practice and carried reduced risk of poor quality residential extension and alterations. It was further asked whether this alternative approach was considered. The Cabinet Member for Planning and Regeneration stated that once the political decision had been taken to fulfil this election promise, this was the best way to achieve it in the view of the Executive.

The Sub-Committee understood that since the SPD2 had been adopted in 2019, there had been a number of planning policy changes and that alterations to the document were needed. The Director of Planning & Sustainable Regeneration informed the Sub-Committee that legal advice had been that no authority existed for the partial revocation and this was not possible. Members were advised that new guidance on residential extensions and alterations would be written as soon as possible, taking into account planning policy changes on design codes and design guidance. The Sub-Committee were informed that policy on residential extensions and alterations was in place would the position (including local planning policy and the London Plan) should SPD2 be revoked. The Head of Spatial Planning and Interim Head of Growth Zone and Regeneration restated that there was still a development plan and guidance at a national and London Plan level in place that could be used in the absence of SPD2 to determine applications.

The Chair queried whether the new residential extensions and alterations guidance would incorporate changes expected at the London Plan level and heard that this was not the case and that the guidance would be brought forward as soon as possible and that national government's focus on design and design quality, the national design code and guidance would be taken into account; these emphasised local authorities producing their own design codes and guidance. The new document would be checked against any new planning developments and the priorities of the Executive.

The Sub-Committee requested that the fall-back guidance, on the London Plan and national level, that would be used in the absence of SPD2 be shared noting that reasons for application refusals often referenced SPD2. It was stated that without this it was very difficult to ascertain what risk residents would be faced with if SPD2 was revoked without new residential extensions and alterations guidance to take its place. Members were advised that this risk had not been assessed but were reassured by the Director of Planning & Sustainable Regeneration that policy to determine applications was in place in the event that SPD2 was revoked. The Committee were informed that there had been a period of time, before the adoption of the Local Plan in 2018 and of the SPD2 in 2019, when determinations on residential extensions or alterations had been made using other planning guidance.

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Regeneration restated that there were still ways to make decisions in the absence of SPD2. The Chair restated that they wanted to know the full risks of poor development that homeowners were exposed to and requested that the guidance that would be relied upon was sent to Members.

Members highlighted inequalities in planning and the difficulty for some residents in understanding the implication of policy to their communities and asked what consideration had been given to ensure all communities were able to interpret and understand planning applications and documentation. The Sub-Committee heard that the Director of Planning & Sustainable Regeneration was passionate about communicating planning to local communities but agreed that this was a difficult and complex area to understand. Members heard that there had always been efforts by the department to talk to and meet with community groups and residents' associations which had been made more difficult due to resourcing and the pandemic; six monthly meetings with residents' associations had now been restarted to try to engage in partnership working and to disseminate information on the planning system. There were plans to restart the 'Urban Room' in the town centre, as had previously been done for the Local Plan consultation in 2018, as a way to reach hard to reach groups and young people on planning and regeneration. The Sub-Committee asked if there was data on where resident's associations and groups were located and the Director of Planning & Sustainable Regeneration stated that this could be provided.

Members highlighted significant upcoming changes in the planning sector with the new London Plan guidance and the Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill (expected early 2023). The Director of Planning & Sustainable Regeneration clarified that upcoming planning changes in the Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill looked at building on the existing planning system rather than revolutionary change and would provide for transitional arrangements. The Chair asked the Cabinet Member for Planning and Regeneration whether now was the right time for producing new planning guidance when this could result in abortive costs as the draft Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill could result in SPDs becoming redundant. An additional consequence could be the waste of officer capacity that is already under strain. The Chair also highlighted that the cost of producing the document would be met by reserves earmarked for the Local Development Framework / Local Plan review and asked how risky this approach was, as it could leave the work needed to bring the new Local Plan to adoption under-resourced. The Cabinet Member for Planning and Regeneration stated they felt there was a political mandate for the revocation of SPD2 but and that, in their opinion, there were equal risks to maintaining the SPD2 document and revoking it.

The Chair asked if issues with the SPD2 were around intensification in certain areas of the borough or character, and the Cabinet Member responded that any national or London Plan housing targets that the Council were required to meet would still be achieved; they were of the view that the SPD2 was a hated piece of guidance by members of the public and that it emphasised development over character.

The Chair acknowledged that both Mayoral candidates had promised to review the Local Plan and asked what plans were being created to ensure residents had a greater say in their area. The Cabinet Member for Planning and Regeneration responded that they were in favour of stronger community involvement and would like to look at how to keep residents better informed and educated on planning matters.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Sub-Committee regretted that there had not been an opportunity for Pre-Decision Scrutiny on the report before it was considered at Cabinet.

The Sub-Committee were concerned that revocation of SPD2 was being recommended to Council without the replacement supplementary planning documentation on residential extensions and alterations ready to take its place as was thought to be best plan making practice which was the process that had been followed for the South Norwood Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan.

Recommendation 1: The Sub-Committee requested that the policy on residential extensions and alterations in national, regional and local planning framework that would be used to determine applications in the absence of SPD2 be provided to the Sub-Committee.

The Sub-Committee were advised by the Cabinet Member for Planning and Regeneration that there was a political mandate for the revocation of SPD2 but Members were of the view that the risks to residents of poor quality residential extensions and alterations in the absence of replacement guidance had not been appropriately assessed.

Recommendation 2: The Sub-Committee requested more information on the timescales in developing and adopting the new documentation on residential extensions and alterations be provided.

The Sub-Committee were concerned about the use of earmarked reserves for the Local Development Framework / Local Plan to develop the new documentation on residential extensions and alterations and the possibility of abortive costs that could leave the work needed to bring the new Local Plan to adoption under-resourced.

The Sub-Committee were concerned about inequalities of knowledge and resource on planning matters across different communities in the borough.

Request for Information: The Sub-Committee requested a map of residents' associations and organisations that the Planning Department were already engaged with which could be shared with ward councillors to help to build the knowledge base on planning within local communities and to identify new community groups for engagement.

7/22 Housing Directorate Overview

The Sub-Committee considered a report set out on pages 217 to 224 of the agenda which provided an overview of the Housing Directorate to inform the development of the Committee's work programme for the coming year. The Cabinet Member for Homes introduced the paper with a short summary adding that close work with residents to deliver quality and value for money services would be their priority. The Sub-Committee were informed that this would be a process that took time but that a new Corporate Director was in place to bring stability and leadership to the directorate. Work was underway on re-procurement of the Responsive Repairs Contract which had been reported to the Scrutiny and Overview Committee before approval by the Mayor at Cabinet; the Residents' Charter had also been approved at Cabinet. There had been detailed discussions with the Housing Improvement Board regarding the Housing Improvement Plan which would be reshaped and reinvigorated incorporating the views of residents. A project manager had been appointed to look at Regina Road, as well as a member of staff to focus on voids and an officer to work on customer engagement.

The Sub-Committee asked about previous poor service provided to residents and asked whether there had been consideration of compensating residents; the Cabinet Member for Housing reminded Members that this had been a recommendation of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee and was awaiting a response from the Mayor.

Members highlighted the burden on residents of private sector rents and poor-quality private housing and asked about licensing in the private rented sector. The Sub-Committee heard that the previous landlord licensing scheme renewal had been rejected by the Secretary of State as it was not backed by enough data and as there was not a housing strategy in place. The Cabinet Member for Housing stated that any new scheme would take time to develop and emphasised the importance of the private sector providing quality affordable housing. Members heard that there were examples of the Council prosecuting rogue landlords under other legislation and encouraged any known issues to be reported.

The Sub-Committee asked about plans to address backlogs of complaints that had been reported by tenants. The Cabinet Member for Housing explained work to catch up on complaints was ongoing but that the department was currently overstretched, demoralised and with a large number of vacancies. Progress was being made alongside development of key performance indicators (KPIs) which would also be reported to the Tenants and Leaseholders Panel. The Head of Homelessness & Assessments informed Members that, on the homelessness side, it was known that there were common complaints, and these were being looked at to improve the strategies being used. It was explained that a different kind of service was required and there needed to be greater openness with residents about what was and was not possible.

The Chair raised concerns around the General Fund and other authorities placing people into emergency accommodation in Croydon; there had been previous pilots to address this but the results of these had not been fed back to the Sub-Committee. It was asked whether evidence-based work would be done to address this issue as it was well managed by other authorities. The Cabinet Member for Housing explained that there were many families in accommodation that did not meet their needs and noted the slow turn around and large number of voids. There were currently around 300 voids in the borough and data on this was poorly kept with records missing in some cases and an officer had been brought on to address this which would lead to lower costs on temporary and emergency accommodation as well as an increase in rental income. Current average turn arounds on voids were around twice what they should be.

Members heard that work had started on a new transformation plan on homelessness and temporary accommodation and there had been meetings with the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities who had given positive feedback. There were two aspects to reducing pressure on the General Fund; the first was managing demand of placements to emergency accommodation and the second was moving people on to a permanent home. The transformation would look at an early intervention and prevention service and creating greater churn in the system. The Chair asked for this plan to be delivered to a future meeting of the Sub-Committee.

The Chair noted the focus on culture change in the report and asked that when plans on this were ready that they come to the Sub-Committee. On performance management of staff, it was highlighted that this had been an issue that had led to failures at Regina Road and it was asked how this would be improved going forward. The Cabinet Member for Housing noted that these issues had resulted from a lack of leadership and development of staff and that the employment of the new Corporate Director would be the beginning of this improvement journey. The Interim Head of Tenancy & Resident Engagement highlighted the need to invest in staff and systems that would allow for greater efficiencies in future. The Cabinet Member for Housing noted that there were fantastic staff in the service who deserved congratulating.

The Chair highlighted the lack of follow up contact with residents who had gotten in touch with the Council for help when at risk of losing their homes and highlighted the importance of document and information management. The Head of Homelessness & Assessments responded that there were a number of problems, with five different points of contact with the service and different information systems used by the directorate; there would be a move to an early intervention and prevention model which would hopefully help with these issues and provide savings in the future by preventing homelessness in many cases.

The Chair raised work done by 'Generation Rent' to produce best practice models on engagement with the private rented sector and asked whether this was something that the Cabinet Member would be willing to look at; the Cabinet Member for Housing responded that they would investigate this. The Sub-Committee highlighted that there needed to be greater partnership working with registered social landlords in Croydon.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Sub-Committee felt that the report set out the correct priorities for the Housing Directorate for the coming year.

Request for Information/Work Programme: The Sub-Committee requested that the Temporary Accommodation Transformation Plan be shared with Members and an officer briefing be provided at a future date.

The Sub-Committee were of the view that recruitment, retention and staff capacity were still major risks within the directorate.

Request for Information: The Sub-Committee requested that the plan on Culture Change in the directorate be shared with Members when this had been finalised.

The Sub-Committee felt that the report lacked focus on the private rental sector and felt that more could be done in this area.

Recommendation 1: The Sub-Committee felt that there needed to be a greater emphasis on private sector rental accommodation and recommended that the work undertaken by Generation Rent be reviewed by the directorate and Cabinet Member for Housing to investigate best practice.

Recommendation 2: The Sub-Committee felt that there needed to be greater engagement and partnership working with registered social landlords to increase the numbers of residents moving from temporary and emergency accommodation into permanent housing.

Request for Information: The Sub-Committee asked that timescales for the Housing Strategy be provided alongside timescales for developing a new Landlord Licensing Scheme.

The Committee were concerned about documentation and information management within the directorate and the possible risks that this created for residents at risk of homelessness.

Recommendation 3: That greater detail on the proposed move to an early intervention and prevention model be provided to Members alongside additional information on information management.

8/22 Scrutiny Work Programme 2022-23

It was proposed by the Chair and seconded by Councillor Foster that the meeting continue till 9.45pm.

RESOLVED: That the guillotine be extended by 15 minutes.

The Sub-Committee noted that the following items were in the draft Work Programme for the coming year:

- Future of Healthy Neighbourhoods
- Reviewing the Mayors Pledges
- Active Travel
- Veolia Contract
- Sustainable Communities
- Purley Pool Options Appraisal
- Environment Bill Responsibilities
- Environmental Enforcement
- Biodiversity Strategy
- Implications of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill
- Temporary Accommodation
- Train Services and Operators

The meeting ended at 9.42 pm

Signed:

.....

Date:

.....

Agenda Item 5

REPORT TO:	Streets, Environment & Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee 4 th October 2022
SUBJECT:	Housing Needs Transformation Plan
LEAD OFFICER:	Hamid Khan Interim Head of Homelessness and Allocations Beatrice Cingtho-Taylor – Head of Temporary Accommodation
CABINET MEMBER:	Councillor Lynne Hale, Cabinet Member for Homes
PERSON LEADING AT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETING:	Hamid Khan Interim Head of Homelessness and Allocations Beatrice Cingtho-Taylor – Head of Temporary Accommodation
PUBLIC/EXEMPT:	Public

ORIGIN OF ITEM:	At the Sub-Committee meeting on the 20 th of July 2022, the Housing Needs Transformation Plan was identified as a topic for scrutiny at a future meeting.
BRIEF FOR THE COMMITTEE:	To receive an update on the development of the Housing Needs Transformation Plan and to examine how this is going to be delivered against the pressures of delivering in-year savings.

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. The Housing Needs Service is undergoing a transformation as part of a longer-term plan for full transformation for the whole Department. This transformation will look at Homelessness Services and Temporary Accommodation.

2. Transformation of the Housing Needs Service

2.1. Background

- 2.2. The Homelessness Reduction Act was passed as statute in 2017. Its main aim is to prevent or relieve homelessness by discharging duty into the private rented sector, if possible. The aim is to work with homeless clients in a far more holistic fashion with a real emphasis on early intervention to prevent homelessness. Being a statutory service, if homelessness cannot be prevented or relieved, then customers are placed into emergency accommodation, then eventually into temporary accommodation

2.3. **Issues**

2.4. At present the structure of the Homelessness and Assessments service does not allow for early intervention to prevent or relieve homelessness. This can be evidenced by the fact that in 2020-21 Croydon was in the bottom quartile for performance in preventing homelessness: 27.7% compared to the London average of 43.7%. The table below in **Appendix 1**, shows the better performing London Councils.

2.5. There is a culture of working in silos within the service, leading to poor customer outcomes. There is no performance management framework and working practices are outdated and inefficient, and the data within the service is extremely poor. A poorly made decision around a homelessness case, which the Council lost in High Court, will cost another £130,000 in legal fees to appeal to the Supreme Court.

2.6. The present service is not customer centric, and the customer journey is, at best, totally disjointed with several routes into the service and very few options for customers. Often customers are not moved through the system and can remain in temporary accommodation for several years. 3 recent Local Government and Social Care Ombudsmen's investigations have found against the Council for people staying too long in unsuitable temporary accommodation.

2.7. The inefficiencies within the service are further exemplified by the fact Croydon is one of two councils in England who have more than 5 families in shared Bed and Breakfast accommodation for longer than six weeks. This contravenes the statutory instrument and has brought scrutiny from DLUHC.

2.8. **Options**

2.9. The only option is to fundamentally transform the whole service. The Transformation will focus on creating a service that intervenes at the earliest possible sign of homeless to prevent that homelessness. The service will focus on cultural change, introducing a performance management framework and ensure that the service is customer centric. The services will work strategically to minimise the use of emergency accommodation.

2.10. The Transformation will ensure the Council meets its statutory obligations and focuses only on this. New methods of service delivery will bring efficiencies throughout the service.

2.11. **Proposed next steps**

2.12. The Housing Directorate has identified a series of actions to transform the Housing Needs service through an emphasis on early intervention and prevention. The approach aligns with the Government's [Ending Rough Sleeping Strategy](#) and will align with the Homelessness Prevention & Rough Sleeping Strategy.

2.13. The proposed actions are outlined below:

Transformation Action	Description
Restructure of the Housing Needs service	<p>This will improve the Council’s response to homelessness demand management through early intervention and ensuring that appropriate support is given to those who need it.</p> <p>The service must be re-structured to improve the Council's early intervention and demand management. The re-structure will ensure that the service is fit-for-purpose and that all staff are skills-matched to the roles needed to deliver an efficient and effective service</p> <p>Additional resource/Lead Officer is in place to support the service with this.</p>
Development of the Homelessness Prevention & Rough Sleeping Strategy	<p>This Strategy must be in place to ensure the Council is compliant with the Homelessness Reduction Act 2017. Without a Homelessness Strategy, the Council risks no longer being in receipt of the Homelessness Prevention Grant which totalled £7.2m in 2022/2023.</p> <p>The existing Strategy covers the period 2019-2022 and a way forward has been agreed with DLUHC based on current capacity:</p> <p>(a) To update the current action plan so that it is fit for purpose for another year</p> <p>(b) Revise the strategy which is a bigger piece of work for another 4/5 years following a review of homelessness demand/issues in the borough.</p>
Improve poor standards of temporary accommodation	<p>Some of our emergency and temporary accommodation is in poor condition and the service is increasingly receiving complaints and legal challenges</p> <p>A dynamic purchasing system (DPS) for the procurement and management of emergency accommodation is being developed to ensure the Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor compliance in accommodation standards across all placements • Effectively Contract manage the supply chain –saves times and resources • complies with procurement regulations and • achieve value-for-money for emergency accommodation.

	<p>In addition, frequent visits are taking place in response to complaints.</p> <p>Additional resource/Lead Officer is in place to develop the DPS system.</p>
<p>Reduction of Households spending long periods of time in emergency and temporary accommodation</p>	<p>The availability of affordable new supply of accommodation has reduced year on year for a combination of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 39% of private landlords have left the market in the last year. • Local Housing allowances are still stuck at 2011 rates and rents continue to rise which makes many properties unaffordable. • The cost-of-living crises means cost overall are increasing and landlords are demanding higher and higher incentives <p>As a result, households are remaining in emergency and temporary accommodation for a long period of time. In addition, there are a number of families in shared Bed & Breakfast accommodation for more than 6 weeks which is a breach of legislation.</p> <p>Council voids and pipeline of properties are being allocated in a targeting way to help create a churn within the system to move families out of emergency & temporary accommodation. A project team is in place to support the families who have spent the longest time in emergency/temporary accommodation and those who are in shared B&B by moving them into suitable accommodation. To monitor progress, monthly meetings is held with DLUHC.</p> <p>A team of officers will also be recruited to review the circumstance of all the households living in emergency and temporary accommodation so that pro-active targeted support can be given to enable them to move into settled accommodation either in the private or social sector.</p>
<p>Cleansing of Housing Needs data</p>	<p>A detailed analysis of the service data activity is required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure accurate data is submitted to the government as this has an impact on the level of Homelessness Prevention Grant that the Council is awarded. • Help the service to establish accurate baseline so that realistic targets for managing and reducing the spend across the year can be set • Support accurate budget forecast assumptions.

	Additional resource/Lead Officer is in place to support the service with this.
Occupancy check of temporary accommodation units	A team of officers will be recruited to conduct occupancy checks of temporary accommodation units to ensure our existing provision is used effectively.
Recharge of housing associations	To maximise the supply of accommodation from Housing Associations in the borough, a Liaison Officer is being recruited to develop nomination agreements or where one exists, to review it to ensure the Council receives the required nominations. This will create a supply churn for people on the waiting list including those living in emergency and temporary accommodation.

- 2.14. The delivery of these actions will be monitored and assessed by the Housing Directorate Management Meeting.

CONTACT OFFICER:

Hamid Khan, Interim Head of Homelessness

Beatrice Cingtho-Taylor, Head of Temporary Accommodation

APPENDICES TO THIS REPORT

Appendix 1

Appendix 1- % of applications accepted at prevention and relief stage (2020/2021)

Local Authority	No. of h'lessness Applications	No. of prevention duties accepted	Prevention Duties as % of total applications	No. of Relief duties accepted	Relief Duties as % of total applications
England	282,240	119,400	42.3%	149,160	52.8%
London	54,890	23,990	43.7%	27,770	50.6%
Hillingdon	1,751	1287	73.5%	440	25.1%
Merton	567	396	69.8%	155	27.3%
Lewisham	3,166	1830	57.8%	1318	41.6%
Barking and Dagenham	1,505	864	57.4%	543	36.1%
Islington	1,698	938	55.2%	685	40.3%
Barnet	2,111	1124	53.2%	906	42.9%
Havering	1,837	977	53.2%	755	41.1%
Waltham Forest	1932	996	51.6%	927	48.0%
Ealing	2,471	1234	49.9%	1205	48.8%
Lambeth	3,243	1535	47.3%	1679	51.8%
Enfield	2,029	955	47.1%	950	46.8%
Kingston	449	210	46.8%	217	48.3%

Local Authority	No. of H'lessness Applications	No. of prevention duties accepted	Prevention Duties as % of total applications	No. of Relief duties accepted	Relief Duties as % of total applications
England	282,240	119,400	42.3%	149,160	52.8%
London	54,890	23,990	43.7%	27,770	50.6%
Brent	2,951	1280	43.4%	1639	55.5%
Haringey	3,438	1486	43.2%	207	6.0%
Bromley	1,190	500	42.0%	650	54.6%
Tower Hamlets	2042	760	37.2%	1178	57.7%
Hammersmith and Fulham	1,076	400	37.2%	663	61.6%
Kensington and Chelsea	1,049	389	37.1%	637	60.7%
Sutton	962	353	36.7%	451	46.9%
Bexley	788	273	34.6%	513	65.1%
Greenwich	1,750	595	34.0%	951	54.3%
Hackney	2,224	725	32.6%	1429	64.3%
Richmond UT	295	95	32.2%	192	65.1%
Harrow	682	213	31.2%	433	63.5%
Camden	1,203	343	28.5%	755	62.8%
Croydon	2,379	658	27.7%	1629	68.5%
Southwark	3669	1005	27.4%	2390	65.1%
Westminster	1805	348	19.3%	1253	69.4%
City of London	12	2	16.7%	10	83.3%

Source: Department of Levelling Up, Housing and Communities

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS: None

REPORT TO:	Scrutiny Streets, Environment & Homes Sub-Committee Scrutiny 4th October 2022
SUBJECT:	Healthy Streets and Active Travel (including Healthy Neighbourhoods, School Streets, Vision Zero, Cycling and Walking Strategy) Update
LEAD OFFICER:	Heather Cheesbrough, Director of Planning & Sustainable Regeneration Steve Iles, Director of Sustainable Communities
CABINET MEMBER:	Cllr Roche, Cabinet Member for Streets and Environment
PERSON LEADING AT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETING:	Ian Plowright, Head of Strategic Transport
PUBLIC/EXEMPT:	Public

ORIGIN OF ITEM:	This report was requested by the Scrutiny Streets, Environment & Homes Sub-Committee Scrutiny as part of its 2022/23 Work Programme
BRIEF FOR THE COMMITTEE:	To receive an update on the Healthy Streets / Active Travel Programme including (Healthy Neighbourhoods, School Streets, Vision Zero, Cycling and Walking Strategy)

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. The report looks over the Croydon Local Implementation Plan and Cycling Strategy. It outlines the changes brought about by and during the Covid Pandemic, and the consequences for national policy and local delivery.

2. HEALTHY STREETS / ACTIVE TRAVEL PROGRAMME Mayor of London Transport Strategy

- 2.1 The Mayor of London is required (by virtue of the Greater London Authority Act) to produce a series of strategies for London including a Transport Strategy¹. As soon as reasonably practicable after the publication of the Transport Strategy, each London local authority is required to produce a plan to implement the Strategy within its area (a Local Implementation Plan (LIP)). TfL can and does publish guidance on behalf of the Mayor regarding the preparation of LIPs². The Mayor has to approve each LIP, and to do so has to be assured that the plan and resources to implement it are adequate to deliver his Strategy.

¹ <https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/about-tfl/the-mayors-transport-strategy>

² <https://content.tfl.gov.uk/lip3-guidance-for-borough-officers-preparing-lip3-2018.pdf>

2.2 The 'Healthy Streets Approach' sits at the heart of the Strategy. The first Key Theme of the Strategy is:

'1. Healthy Streets and Healthy People

Creating streets and street networks that encourage walking, cycling and public transport use will reduce car dependency and the health problems it creates'

The Strategy has a series of focused policies and proposals supporting delivery of the Healthy Streets approach:

Changing the Transport Mix

Policy 1 *The Mayor, through TfL and the boroughs, and working with stakeholders, will reduce Londoners' dependency on cars in favour of active, efficient and sustainable modes of travel, with the central aim for 80 per cent of all trips in London to be made on foot, by cycle or using public transport by 2041*

Getting all Londoners Walking and Cycling

Policy 2 *The Mayor, through TfL and the boroughs, and working with stakeholders, will seek to make London a city where people choose to walk and cycle more often by improving street environments, making it easier for everyone to get around on foot and by cycle, and promoting the benefits of active travel. The Mayor's aim is that, by 2041, all Londoners do at least the 20 minutes of active travel they need to stay healthy each day*

Proposal 3 *The Mayor, through TfL and the boroughs, will:*

- a) Deliver a London-wide strategic cycle network, with new, high quality, safe routes and improved infrastructure to tackle barriers to cycling for both shorter and longer trips. By 2041, 70 per cent of Londoners will live within 400 metres of the strategic cycle network.*
- b) Encourage additional local and neighbourhood improvements, such as using physical restrictions to prevent motorised vehicles from using certain streets, to build on and complement the strategic cycle network.*

(Figure 4 of the Transport Strategy indicates the 'Recommended London-wide Strategic Cycle Network to 2041'. Within Croydon this predominately shows 'proposed future connections' on or paralleling the Roman Way/Mitcham Road, London Road and Brighton Road corridors, with further connections from the Town Centre towards Crystal Palace and out towards the north-western edge of the Borough.)

Vision Zero for Road Danger

Policy 3 *The Mayor, through TfL and the boroughs, and working with stakeholders, will adopt Vision Zero for road danger in London. The Mayor's aim is for no one to be killed in or by a London bus by 2030, and for all deaths and serious injuries from road collisions to be eliminated from London's streets by 2041.*

Making More Efficient Use of the Street Network (Tackling Congestion)

Policy 5 *The Mayor, through TfL and the boroughs, and working with stakeholders, will prioritise space efficient modes of transport to tackle congestion and improve the efficiency of streets for the movement of people and goods, with the aim of reducing overall traffic levels by 10-15 per cent by 2041.*

Reducing Harmful Air Pollution from Road Transport

Policy 6 *The Mayor, through TfL and the boroughs, and working with stakeholders, will take action to reduce emissions – in particular diesel emissions – from vehicles on London's streets, to improve air quality and support London reaching compliance with UK and EU legal limits as soon as possible. Measures may include retrofitting vehicles with equipment to reduce emissions, promoting electrification, road charging, the imposition of parking charges/ levies, responsible procurement, the making of traffic restrictions/ regulations and local actions.*

Achieving a Zero Carbon City and Good Air Quality

Policy 7 *The Mayor, through TfL and the boroughs, and working with stakeholders, will seek to make London's transport network zero emission by 2050, contributing towards the creation of a zero carbon city, and also to deliver further improvements in air quality to help meet tighter air quality standards, including achieving a health-based target of 10µg/m³ for PM2.5 by 2030. London's streets and transport infrastructure will be transformed to enable zero emission operation, and the switch to ultra low and zero emission technologies will be supported and accelerated.*

The Croydon (3rd) Local Implementation Plan

- 2.2 The Croydon LIP³, responding to the Transport Strategy, outlines a programme to deliver amongst other things:

‘...improvements to walking and cycling routes; the rollout of electric vehicle charging infrastructure and Car Club vehicles; a Healthy Schools Neighbourhoods programme; virtual hub and electric bike share schemes; improved bus accessibility in suburban areas; Vision Zero Safer Streets schemes; traffic reduction strategies; and a Liveable Neighbourhood proposal to reconnect Old Town.....’

It takes Objectives and Targets from the Transport Strategy and translates them into local targets required to support delivery of the London wide Objectives and Outcomes (see Appendix 1).

- 2.3 TfL has traditionally provided local authorities with funding to help support delivery of proposals within their LIPs, with the funding based on a formula reflecting need. As required by TfL, the LIP set out an initial Delivery Plan covering the period 2019/20 – 2021/22. The LIP indicates the potential funding sources with which to deliver over the three years, including:

- approximately £2,362,000 LIP funding per annum through core Corridor, Neighbourhoods and Supporting Measures formula LIP Funding
- anticipating the successful £9.6 million Liveable Neighbourhood LIP Funding Bid
- S106 developer contributions provided as part of planning obligations.

explaining that *‘The largest source of funding for transport improvements in the Borough over the next several years will be from the Croydon Growth Zone’ (Funding Mechanism)*. It indicates no Parking Revenue being employed to support delivery of the LIP. Income derived from Parking and camera enforcement of moving traffic offences (including at Healthy Neighbourhoods and School Streets) could potentially be used to support implementation of the LIP Delivery Plan. Legislation sets out that parking income raised from the Penalty Charge Notices can only be used for specific purposes. Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 provides for how parking income surpluses can be used by the Local Authority, with only the following purposes permitted:

- provision or operation of, or of facilities for, public passenger transport services
- provision and maintenance of off-street parking facilities
- highway or road improvement projects

³ <https://www.croydon.gov.uk/parking-streets-and-transport/transport-policies-and-plans/third-local-implementation-plan>

- maintenance of roads
- environmental improvement
- implementation of the London transport strategy

However, in Croydon (as is the case across most of London), the surplus is fully taken up funding the Freedom Pass, London's concessionary travel scheme which allows free travel for older and disabled on London's public transport network and on local bus services across England during off-peak hours.

Cycling Strategy

2.4 Development of the Cycling Strategy preceded development of the 3rd LIP by some considerable time. It began with the Streets and Environment Scrutiny Sub-Committee undertaking Pre-Decision Scrutiny into Cycling in Croydon⁴ and the Sub-Committee publishing its report 'Cycling in Croydon'⁵. The Pre-Decision Scrutiny included / the Sub-Committee considering a potential draft Cycling Strategy which drew heavily on:

- Outcomes and Principles within Mayor of London Boris Johnson's Vision for Cycling; and
- the work undertaken to prepare the very ambitious Expression of Interest in Croydon becoming a Mini Holland, previously submitted to Boris Johnson Mayor of London.

2.5 The resulting Cycling Strategy⁶ was ambitious, reflecting the level of funding expected to be available via the Growth Zone financing mechanism for both the Cycling and Walking and the Corridors Growth Zone Programmes focussed on the Town Centre. The report⁷ recommending Cabinet adopt the Cycling Strategy, emphasised that:

'Delivery of the Strategy is dependent on the allocation of Growth Zone and LIP funding plus other funding to be bid for as opportunities arise. Growth Zone Funding for the cycle route delivery is confirmed for 2018/19 but not beyond. Similarly LIP funding is confirmed for 2018/19 but at a lower level than expected. Not having clarity / certainty as to future funding to support implementation of the Strategy is a risk to its implementation.'

⁴<https://democracy.croydon.gov.uk/CeListDocuments.aspx?Committeeld=335&MeetingId=1363&DF=02%2f12%2f2014&Ver=2>

⁵ <https://www.croydon.gov.uk/sites/default/files/articles/downloads/Cycling%20report.pdf>

⁶ <https://democracy.croydon.gov.uk/documents/s5603/Croydon%20Cycling%20Strategy%202018-2023%20-%20appendix.pdf>

⁷ [Informal Cabinet Report Template \(croydon.gov.uk\)](https://www.croydon.gov.uk/informal-cabinet-report-template)

The Covid Pandemic

- 2.6 Early in the implementation of both the LIP Delivery Plan and the Cycle Strategy, the Covid Pandemic struck. As a result of loss of fare and congestion charge income, TfL was nearing bankruptcy requiring financial bailout from central government. LIP funding ceased, replaced by very short-term funding allocations (either directly from the DfT to local authorities, or via TfL), with which to swiftly implement measures to help people walk and cycle etc. At the same time (May 2020) the Secretary of State for Transport issued Statutory Guidance calling on all local authorities to respond swiftly to the Pandemic, to create space for social distancing, walking and cycling, with measures including using planters to close streets to create Low Traffic Neighbourhoods. (The Guidance has been updated several times, becoming 'Traffic Management Act 2004: network management to support active travel' guidance).⁸ The Mayor of London and TfL published their Streetspace Plan for London and associated guidance, to guide delivery of active travel infrastructure as the first Lockdown eased. In parallel, the Council's own financial position was becoming clearer. Consequently, the Growth Zone programme (including the very ambitious Cycling and Walking and Corridors programmes) were brought to a swift halt. In place of the planned Cycle Strategy and LIP Programme delivery, a programme of rapid roll out of Temporary Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and pop-up cycle infrastructure was embarked up.
- 2.7 In July 2020, central government published 'Gear Change: A Bold Vision for Cycling and Walking' the England Walking and Cycling Strategy, which seeks to transform the role of cycling and walking in our transport system and get England moving differently. It provides detail to the Secretary of State's statutory guidance. In parallel, central government published 'Cycle infrastructure design (LTN 1/20)' guidance⁹ setting the standards for cycle infrastructure expected by central government. The following year central government published 'Gear Change: One Year One', setting out the reason why Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and other active travel infrastructure should be introduced and retained, unless there is strong evidence to suggest otherwise. It makes clear the financial consequence for local authorities that do not vigorously implement 'Gear Change' initiatives or fail to do so to the standards expected by central government.
- 2.8 In London, the stop-start transport investment drip feed has continued. At its 26 July 2021 meeting¹⁰, Cabinet considered a report which outlined and recommended expenditure for 2021/22 on a new programme to deliver Croydon Local Implementation Plan objectives; Central Government's Sustainable and Active Travel objectives; and the Mayor of London's/TfL's Streetspace Plan objectives. The report explained that the recommended spend could not be precise, as (at the time of writing the report) the results of funding requests to TfL were unknown. In anticipation of the return of LIP

⁸ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/reallocating-road-space-in-response-to-covid-19-statutory-guidance-for-local-authorities>

⁹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cycle-infrastructure-design-ltn-120>

¹⁰ [Agenda for Cabinet on Monday, 26th July, 2021, 6.30 pm | Croydon Council](#)

Funding, TfL required the London local authorities to draft new Delivery Plans and to submit requests for LIP Funding for 2022/23. In January of this year, Cabinet considered a report¹¹ recommending approval of the Spending Submission to TfL for 2022/23 LIP Funding, and as the basis of a draft Delivery Plan (2023/23 – 2024/25) component of the Croydon LIP. The report included the caveat that spend will be subject to the resulting funding allocation from TfL and Spending Control Panel Approval (a LIP funding announcement is still awaited). The report and programme reflected and built on that considered by Cabinet on 26 July 2021, setting out a programme of Healthy Neighbourhoods, School Streets, cycling infrastructure etc.

- 2.9 Croydon officers continue to pursue funding opportunities with the potential to support delivery of central government's and the Mayor of London's active travel and Healthy Streets objectives. On 6 July this year, the Croydon Executive Mayor, in Cabinet¹², considered a report summarising a Croydon Town Centre Levelling Up Fund bid. The bid seeks to physically transform the Town Centre delivering a series of public realm, walking and cycling improvements to stitch key Town Centre destinations back together.

CONTACT OFFICER: Ian Plowright, Head of Transport

APPENDICES TO THIS REPORT *(to follow)*

Appendix 1. LIP Objectives, Outcomes, Indicators and Targets
Appendix 2. School Streets

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS: None

¹¹ [Agenda for Cabinet on Monday, 24th January, 2022, 6.30 pm | Croydon Council](#)

¹² [Agenda for Cabinet on Wednesday, 6th July, 2022, 6.30 pm | Croydon Council](#)

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 7

REPORT TO:	STREETS, ENVIRONMENT & HOMES SCRUTINY SUB- COMMITTEE 4 October 2022
SUBJECT:	Scrutiny Stage 2 Responses to Recommendations arising from: Scrutiny Streets, Environment and Homes Sub-Committee on 15 March 2022.
LEAD OFFICER:	Tom Downs, Democratic Service and Governance Officer- Scrutiny

ORIGIN OF ITEM:	The Cabinet response to recommendations made by the Streets, Environment & Homes Sub-Committee is provided for the Sub-Committee's information.
BRIEF FOR THE COMMITTEE:	The Streets, Environment & Homes Sub-Committee is asked to note the response given by the Cabinet to recommendations made by the Committee and consider whether any further action is necessary.

1. RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1 The Sub-Committee is asked to note the responses given and consider whether any further action is necessary.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 2.1 The rights of scrutiny to make recommendations to the Cabinet, Council, non-Executive Committee, Partner Agency or Partnership Board is set out in Section 8 of Part 4E – Scrutiny and Overview Procedure Rules of the Council's Constitution.
- 2.2 When making a recommendation to the Cabinet, a response needs to be given within two months to confirm whether the recommendation has been accepted or not. If accepted, this response should include how the recommendation will be implemented.
- 2.3 To ensure the Sub-Committee can monitor the response given to its recommendations, this report will be included as a standing item on each agenda, setting out in Appendix A the response from the Cabinet to the recommendations of the Committee.
- 2.4 The Committee is asked to review the responses given and consider whether any further action is necessary.

3. SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 The Scrutiny recommendations are contained in the schedule in the appendix to this report.
- 3.2 The detailed responses, including reasons for rejected recommendations and action plans for the implementation of agreed recommendations are also contained in the appendix.

CONTACT OFFICER:

Tom Downs, Democratic Service and Governance Officer- Scrutiny

APPENDICES:

Appendix A: Scrutiny Stage 2 Responses

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

Report to Streets, Environment & Homes Sub-Committee on 15 March 2022.
<https://democracy.croydon.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=170&MId=2577>

SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSIONS	DEPARTMENT AND CABINET MEMBER RESPONDING	ACCEPT/ REJECT RECOMMENDATIONS (inc. reasons for rejection)	IDENTIFIED OFFICER	ANY FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS	TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS IF ACCEPTED (ie Action Plan)	DATE OF SCRUTINY MEETING TO REPORT BACK
Report: Update on the Housing Improvement Board, and the development of the Croydon Housing Improvement Plan (Considered by Streets, Environment & Homes Sub-Committee on 15 March 2022)							
<p>1. The Sub-Committee further agreed with the Housing Improvement Board's feedback that any changes to the plan should be agreed by the Board (not just delegated as per the Cabinet recommendation).</p>	<p>The Sub-Committee recognised that a lot of work had gone into delivering the improvement plan and improving housing conditions, though this had not happened as quickly as desired. This meant that a number of key milestones in the plan were scheduled for later than the Sub-Committee would have liked to have seen. The Sub-Committee recognised that this was at least in part due to the need to create capacity within the service and Members were reassured that the corporate Programme Office was now playing a full role in helping to manage delivery of the plan.</p>	<p>Councillor Lynne Hale</p>	<p>REJECT</p> <p>The role of the Housing Improvement Board is to support improvement to the Council's landlord services and provide both assurance and advice to Cabinet. The Housing Improvement Board does not have decision-making powers with regards to the Housing Improvement Plan, as outlined in the <u>terms of reference</u>. The recommendation is rejected on the basis that changes to the Plan do not need to be agreed by the Housing Improvement Board. In the <u>Housing Improvement Board's independent report on the Housing Improvement Plan</u>, the Board recommended that changes to the Plan be approved by Cabinet, not the Board itself.</p>	<p>Susmita Sen</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>
<p>2. The Sub-Committee to receive the detailed programme documentation followed by an officer briefing on it.</p>	<p>The Sub-Committee were reassured that the plan was underpinned by a professional and robust programme management approach and was of the view that they would be further reassured if the detailed programme could be shared with them for review at a future meeting</p>	<p>Councillor Lynne Hale</p>	<p>ACCEPT</p>	<p>Susmita Sen</p>	<p>No financial implications</p>	<p>A finalized version of the Housing Improvement Plan will be presented to Cabinet in November 2022.</p> <p>Detailed programme documentation and an officer briefing will be provided to the</p>	<p>Cabinet 16th November 2022.</p> <p>Streets, Environment & Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee</p>

SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSIONS	DEPARTMENT AND CABINET MEMBER RESPONDING	ACCEPT/ REJECT RECOMMENDATIONS (inc. reasons for rejection)	IDENTIFIED OFFICER	ANY FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS	TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS IF ACCEPTED (ie Action Plan)	DATE OF SCRUTINY MEETING TO REPORT BACK
						Streets, Environment & Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee in January 2023.	31 st January 2023.
<p>3. That although a streamlined version of the plan for ease of access is welcome, the plan available publicly should be amended to include greater detail on when specific actions would be delivered by; who would be responsible for delivering them; the processes that would be used for managing their delivery; and a clear sense of how improvement actions would be delivered. This should include the order in which actions are being prioritised. Any prioritised amendments should be approved by the Housing Improvement Board so there is a clear line of understanding and justification. The committee feels that would help address the Ark's report point on the importance of improving clear lines of accountability</p>	<p>Given the urgency around Housing and Tenants improvement, the Sub-Committee felt that it should continue to scrutinise progress of the delivery of the Improvement Plan on a six-monthly basis.</p>	<p>Councillor Lynne Hale</p>	<p>REJECT</p> <p>As per the response to Recommendation One, the Housing Improvement Board does not have decision-making powers in relation to the Housing Improvement Plan.</p> <p>The Housing Directorate notes that the revised Housing Improvement Plan should provide sufficient detail to enable effective scrutiny from our external stakeholders. Nonetheless, the officers responsible for delivering the actions will not be publicized. Detailed action plans will be created by the individuals leading the workstreams and will be available to the Scrutiny Sub-Committee upon request.</p>	<p>Susmita Sen</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>

SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSIONS	DEPARTMENT AND CABINET MEMBER RESPONDING	ACCEPT/ REJECT RECOMMENDATIONS (inc. reasons for rejection)	IDENTIFIED OFFICER	ANY FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS	TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS IF ACCEPTED (ie Action Plan)	DATE OF SCRUTINY MEETING TO REPORT BACK
<p>4. Considering key risks inherent to staffing capacity within the organisation, the Sub-Committee would welcome an update on staffing capacity to deliver the plan by the incoming permanent Corporate Director of Housing at a future meeting in no later than 3 months' time.</p>	<p>The Sub-Committee recognised that delivery of the Improvement Plan was entirely dependent upon staffing capacity within the organisation, and felt that it would be beneficial for the incoming permanent Corporate Director of Housing to provide an update on staffing capacity to deliver the plan to a future meeting in approximately 3 months' time.</p>	<p>Councillor Lynne Hale</p>	<p>ACCEPT</p>	<p>Susmita Sen</p>	<p>The financial implications of ensuring that there is sufficient staffing capacity to deliver the Plan have already been approved.</p>	<p>To be provided at November Cabinet, and January 2023 Streets, Environment & Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee.</p>	<p>16th November Cabinet, and 31st January 2023 Streets, Environment & Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee.</p>
<p>5. While recognising that they are separate assurance processes, it is recommended that, in order to avoid duplication of monitoring of the delivery of the improvement plan, the Sub-Committee should meet with the Independent Housing Improvement Board to discuss the roles that both forums play in monitoring and scrutinising the delivery of the plan with recommendations noted and agreed before any amendments of the plan are finalised; and how the two forums can work as value adding partners in this important role.</p>		<p>Councillor Lynne Hale</p>	<p>REJECT</p> <p>Whilst the Housing Improvement Board does not have decision-making powers in relation to the Housing Improvement Plan. The Housing Improvement Board is an independent Board, and is therefore independent from both the Council's executive and scrutiny functions.</p>	<p>Susmita Sen</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>

SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSIONS	DEPARTMENT AND CABINET MEMBER RESPONDING	ACCEPT/ REJECT RECOMMENDATIONS (inc. reasons for rejection)	IDENTIFIED OFFICER	ANY FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS	TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS IF ACCEPTED (ie Action Plan)	DATE OF SCRUTINY MEETING TO REPORT BACK
<p>6. That Cabinet assures itself that risks relating to document management (incl. version control) are being properly mitigated by having good practice documentation management and retention systems in place. This would enable the plan being treated as a live / rolling document without risks while enhancing transparency of how the plan evolves over the improvement journey.</p>		<p>Councillor Lynne Hale</p>	<p>REJECT</p> <p>A live version of the Housing Improvement Plan will not be publicly available due to the version control issues the recommendation notes and the unavailability of a technical solution to mitigate these issues. Changes and updates to the Plan will, however, be closely monitored internally to ensure a single version of the Plan.</p>	<p>Susmita Sen</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>
<p>7. On engagement, the Sub-Committee is reiterating a previous recommendation to produce an engagement and communications plan to be appended to the Improvement Plan and reviewed by the sub- committee and the Housing Improvement Board before approval. This should be done no later than the next 3 months as this was raised at the Sub-Committee July's meeting</p>		<p>Councillor Lynne Hale</p>	<p>REJECT</p> <p>The recommendation has been rejected on the basis that the draft Residents' Charter, adopted by the Executive Mayor in June 2022, supersedes a Communication & Engagement Plan. The development of the Residents' Charter will include the fundamental review of the Council's engagement with residents to ensure engagement that is meaningful and effective.</p>	<p>Susmita Sen</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>

SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSIONS	DEPARTMENT AND CABINET MEMBER RESPONDING	ACCEPT/ REJECT RECOMMENDATIONS (inc. reasons for rejection)	IDENTIFIED OFFICER	ANY FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS	TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS IF ACCEPTED (ie Action Plan)	DATE OF SCRUTINY MEETING TO REPORT BACK
<p>8. That Cabinet assures itself that risks relating to the delivery of the new Housing Service IT system, would impede many actions of the plan and should therefore be prioritised as this new system would enable a significant improvement in enabling data collection on contacts made to the Housing teams – the analysis of which could be passed onto residents, members and others in a timely manner.</p>		<p>Councillor Lynne Hale</p>	<p>ACCEPT</p>	<p>Susmita Sen</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Highlight report and presentation detailing the use of NEC Housing data as business intelligence presented to January Streets, Environment & Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee</p>	<p>31st January 2023 Streets, Environment & Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee</p>
<p>9. The Sub-Committee reiterated a previous recommendation from its July Committee that data from the responsive repairs contractor must be shared with the appropriate Management team in order to form a dedicated plan to deal with historic repetitive calls and have a more responsive and effective prioritisation of repairs calls as well as flagging any repetitive calls that would require management to intervene to speed up resolution thus</p>		<p>Councillor Lynne Hale</p>	<p>ACCEPT</p>	<p>Susmita Sen</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Presentation from relevant officer at January Streets, Environment & Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee in relation to the use of responsive repairs data as business intelligence</p>	<p>31st January 2023 Streets, Environment & Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee</p>

SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSIONS	DEPARTMENT AND CABINET MEMBER RESPONDING	ACCEPT/ REJECT RECOMMENDATIONS (inc. reasons for rejection)	IDENTIFIED OFFICER	ANY FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS	TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS IF ACCEPTED (ie Action Plan)	DATE OF SCRUTINY MEETING TO REPORT BACK
improving tenant's experience							
10. That Cabinet also considers the comments and recommendations made on the Improvement Plan by the Independent Housing Improvement Board for inclusion in future iterations of the Plan which are then brought back to the Sub Committee and Housing Improvement Board for consideration.		Councillor Lynne Hale	REJECT Cabinet considered the comments and recommendations made on the Housing Improvement Plan by the Independent Housing Improvement Board at <u>March 2022 Cabinet</u>	Susmita Sen	No	A further iteration of the Housing Improvement Plan will be brought back to the Streets, Environment & Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee in January 2023.	31 st January 2023 Streets, Environment & Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee

Report: Housing Revenue Account Business Plan (Considered by Streets, Environment & Homes Sub-Committee on 15 March 2022)

1. That, given the current healthy level of reserves available to the HRA, Cabinet gives consideration to seeking external capacity and resources in order to expedite the stock condition work and to accelerate the development of the asset management strategy.	The Sub-Committee was not confident that the service had the required staffing capacity to deliver the works detailed in the plan and was concerned that lack of capacity and necessary skills would impede its delivery. The Sub-Committee highlighted the example that while the Council had capacity challenges in ensuring that it maintained an effective stock register, it would be unlikely that there would be capacity to deliver the actions related to achieving carbon neutrality within eight years.	Councillor Lynne Hale	REJECT Stock condition survey work has already begun. The contract specification was presented to and approved by the Contracts & Commissioning Board in June 2022. The contract will be awarded in September 2022 with the first tranche of data available in January 2023.	Susmita Sen	n/a	n/a	n/a
---	--	-----------------------	---	-------------	-----	-----	-----

SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSIONS	DEPARTMENT AND CABINET MEMBER RESPONDING	ACCEPT/ REJECT RECOMMENDATIONS (inc. reasons for rejection)	IDENTIFIED OFFICER	ANY FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS	TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS IF ACCEPTED (ie Action Plan)	DATE OF SCRUTINY MEETING TO REPORT BACK
<p>2. That given the significant rise in energy costs, consideration be given to prioritising insulation works in the cyclical repair programme in advance of future Homes Improvement Grant funding becoming available through the Social Housing Decarbonisation Fund, priority for this must be met through having sufficient staff allocation and resources</p>	<p>The Sub-Committee questioned the basis on which the £27m budget for cyclical repairs had been set. Members were concerned that as greater levels of staffing capacity became available, the service would identify greater levels of need for repair and improvement works and that funds may be taken from the HRA reserves in the case of an over spend on the budgets allocated</p>	<p>Councillor Lynne Hale</p>	<p>ACCEPT</p> <p>The Housing Assets team have undertaken an analysis of stock condition information and identified homes that require fabric improvement in order to improve their thermal efficiency. Homes have been shortlisted based on type and location in order to scope out a rolling programme of improvements which will be coordinated with the overall cyclical repairs programme. A quantity survey has provided guidance costs and 'soft market testing' has been undertaken with suitable suppliers and contractors. A specialist energy efficiency consultant has been appointed to undertake energy modelling and specialist home surveys, in line with PAS 2035 legislation. An application to the Social Housing Decarbonisation Fund is being prepared and will be submitted in October 2022.</p>	<p>Susmita Sen</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Application to the Social Housing Decarbonisation Fund will be submitted in October 2022. An update will be provided to the Streets, Environment & Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee in November 2022.</p>	<p>Update to be provided to the Streets, Environment & Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee on 15th November</p>
<p>3. The Sub-Committee noted that the housing department still had work to do in meeting some good practice principles, such as having an Asset</p>	<p>The Sub-Committee noted that the Plan does not include any future projects and that this would remain the case until the Asset Management Strategy was developed.</p>	<p>Councillor Lynne Hale</p>	<p>REJECT</p> <p>Work on the Asset Management Strategy has begun. Engagement with residents regarding the Strategy is being</p>	<p>Susmita Sen</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>

SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSIONS	DEPARTMENT AND CABINET MEMBER RESPONDING	ACCEPT/ REJECT RECOMMENDATIONS (inc. reasons for rejection)	IDENTIFIED OFFICER	ANY FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS	TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS IF ACCEPTED (ie Action Plan)	DATE OF SCRUTINY MEETING TO REPORT BACK
<p>Management Strategy, Treasury Management and that some elements of governance were being established and recommends that Cabinet acknowledges these shortcomings to the plan and asks the Housing Improvement Board to help it set an appropriate timetable for delivering these outstanding actions</p>			<p>undertaken in September and October 2022. A draft of the core strategy will be available in March 2023.</p> <p>The gaps in the existing Housing Improvement Plan were acknowledged by Cabinet in both March and July 2022. The timetable for addressing the gaps in the Plan has been agreed; the revised Plan will be presented to Cabinet in November 2022.</p>				
<p>4. That Cabinet states more clearly in the HRA business plan the costs, budget and overall relationship with the delivery of the Housing Improvement Plan in cooperation with the members of the Housing Improvement Board</p>	<p>That future iterations of the business plan need to be informed by a thorough understanding of what aspects of demand the council's housing stock will lead on meeting when considered in the broader context of all Croydon's social housing providers. As such, the Sub- Committee would welcome the development of a clearer housing supply strategy that involved tenants in choosing which capital investments should be prioritised</p>	<p>Councillor Lynne Hale</p>	<p>ACCEPT</p> <p>The alignment between the Housing Improvement Plan and the HRA Business Plan is a key interest of the Housing Improvement Board. The Board will assure itself of the alignment between the two documents across the next six months.</p>	<p>Susmita Sen</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Financial implications will be outlined in the HRA Business Plan & Capital Programme Update Cabinet Paper to February 2023 Cabinet</p>	<p>The delivery of the Housing Improvement Plan will be reflected in the HRA Business Plan & Capital Programme Update Cabinet Paper to February 2023 Cabinet</p>	<p>14th March 2023 Streets, Environment & Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee</p>

Agenda Item 8

REPORT TO:	STREETS, ENVIRONMENT & HOMES SCRUTINY SUB- COMMITTEE 4 October 2022
SUBJECT:	WORK PROGRAMME 2022-23
LEAD OFFICER:	Tom Downs, Democratic Service and Governance Officer- Scrutiny
ORIGIN OF ITEM:	The Work Programme is scheduled for consideration at every ordinary meeting of the Sub - Committee.
BRIEF FOR THE COMMITTEE:	To consider any additions, amendments or changes to the agreed work programme for the Committee in 2022/23.

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 This agenda item details the Committee's work programme for the 2022/23 municipal year.
- 1.2 The Sub-Committee has the opportunity to discuss any amendments or additions that it wishes to make to the work programme.

2. WORK PROGRAMME

2.1 The work programme

The proposed work programme is attached at **Appendix 1**.

Members are asked to note that the lines of enquiry for some items have yet to be confirmed and that there are opportunities to add further items to the work programme.

2.2 Additional Scrutiny Topics

Members of the Sub-Committee are invited to suggest any other items that they consider appropriate for the Work Programme. However, due to the time limitations at Committee meetings, it is suggested that no proposed agenda contain more than two items of substantive business in order to allow effective scrutiny of items already listed.

2.3 **Participation in Scrutiny**

Members of the Sub-Committee are also requested to give consideration to any persons that it wishes to attend future meetings to assist in the consideration of agenda items. This may include Cabinet Members, Council or other public agency officers or representatives of relevant communities.

3 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 Note the most recent version of its Work Programme, as presented in the report.
- 3.2 Consider whether there are any other items that should be provisionally added to the work programme as a result of the discussions held during the meeting.

CONTACT OFFICER: Tom Downs
Democratic Services and Governance
Officer- Scrutiny
020 8726 6000 x 63779

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS: None

APPENDIX A: Work Programme 2022/23 for the
Streets, Environment & Homes
Scrutiny Sub-Committee.

Streets, Environment & Homes

The below table sets out the working version of the Streets, Environment & Homes Sub-Committee work programme.

Meeting Date	Item	Scope	Directorate & Lead Officer
04/10/22	Future of Healthy Neighbourhoods (including School Streets, Vision Zero, Cycling and Walking Strategy Update)	To cross reference relevant Climate Commission and Climate Citizen's Assembly recommendations and TfL scoring with the Council's delivery of Healthy Neighbourhoods alongside an update on School Streets, Vision Zero, and Cycling and Walking Strategies.	Sustainable Communities Regeneration & Economic Recovery Steve Iles
	Housing Needs Transformation Plan	To receive an update on the development of the Housing Needs Transformation Plan alongside the pressures of delivering in-year savings	Housing Susmita Sen
15/11/22 Consulting on a date move to earlier in the month as currently day before Cabinet.	Waste Collection and Street Cleansing Contract/	Pre-decision Scrutiny: To consider whether there are any considerations or concerns it may wish to submit to the Cabinet on 16 November 2022 during its consideration of the Strategy.	Sustainable Communities Regeneration & Economic Recovery Steve Iles
	South London Waste Plan	Pre-decision Scrutiny: To consider whether there are any considerations or concerns it may wish to submit to the Cabinet on 16 November 2022 during its consideration of the Strategy.	Sustainable Communities

			Regeneration & Economic Recovery Steve Iles
	Homelessness & Rough Sleeping Strategy 2022-2024	Pre-decision Scrutiny: To consider whether there are any considerations or concerns it may wish to submit to the Cabinet on 16 November 2022 during its consideration of the Strategy. (Would move to the Homes Sub-Committee Work Plan once it has been set up)	Housing Susmita Sen
	Regina Road, Norwood	Pre-decision Scrutiny: To consider whether there are any considerations or concerns it may wish to submit to the Cabinet on 16 November 2022 during its consideration of the Strategy. (Would move to the Homes Sub-Committee Work Plan once it has been set up)	Housing Susmita Sen
31/01/23	Budget Deep Dive – Housing and SCRER	To review in-depth budget areas identified as high risk as part of the scrutiny of the 2023-24 budget setting process. (Housing Budget would move to the Homes Sub-Committee Work Plan once it has been set up)	Sustainable Communities Regeneration & Economic Recovery; Housing Nick Hibberd & Susmita Sen
	HRA Business Plan (and update on commissioning of new responsive repairs contract)	Pre-Decision Scrutiny: To consider whether there are any considerations or concerns it may wish to submit to the Cabinet on 22 February 2023 during its consideration of the Strategy. (Would move to the Homes Sub-Committee Work Plan once it has been set up)	Housing Susmita Sen

14/03/23	Train Services and Operators	To receive an update from relevant representatives (TfL, Govia, Network Rail) and engage in discussion on key aspects of their operations.	Sustainable Communities Regeneration & Economic Recovery Ian Plowright
	Local Plan Review	To consider the work done on the Council's review of the Local Plan.	Sustainable Communities Regeneration & Economic Recovery Heather Cheesbrough

Standing Items:

Work Programme Item	Notes
Budget Dashboards for Housing and SCRER	Standing Item tracking progress with the delivery of 2022/23 Budget (To review by exception).
Update on the Housing Improvement Plan	(To review by exception)

Items of Interest

The following items haven't been scheduled into the work programme, but are highlighted as potential items of interest to be scheduled during the year ahead.

Unallocated Items	Scrutiny Officer Notes
Environment Bill Responsibilities	To review the additional responsibilities that will fall upon the Council following the adoption of the Environment Bill
Biodiversity Strategy	To review the upcoming Biodiversity Strategy once written.
Implications of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill	To review the possible implications of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill
Purley Pool Options Appraisal	To look at the options that have been appraised for the reopening of Purley Pool
Brick by Brick Wind-down	To review progress on the wind-down of Brick by Brick with Director of Commercial Investment, an Officer from Board, and the Financial Director of BXB.
Graffiti Removal Service	To review the progress on the Mayor's pledge to reinstate a dedicated Graffiti Removal Service.
Review of the Waste Contract	To review the progress on the review of the Waste Contract.
Environmental Enforcement	To review the Environmental Enforcement service.
Flood Risk and Planning	To review the Council's flood planning and risk assessments

Housing Benefit Budget deficit

To review the Housing Benefit Budget deficit

This page is intentionally left blank