

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
<b>Report:</b> Call In: Asset Disposal as part of the Interim Asset Disposal Strategy (Considered by Scrutiny & Overview Committee on 27 April 2022)							
1. It is recommended that local Members are kept informed on the progress made with finding a new venue for the New Addington Boxing Club.	The commitment from the Cabinet Member for Resources and Financial Governance and council officers to working with the New Addington Boxing Club to find a new venue was welcomed.	Councillor Jason Cummings	Accept  The Asset Team have been working with ward councillors and Cllr Stranack to find a new site.	Jane West		In process	
2. It is recommended that the Council continued to support the New Addington Boxing Club until its search for a new home has been successfully concluded.	Confirmation was also welcomed that there were two potential options under consideration as a future home for the boxing club. The Committee agreed that the Council had a moral obligation to support the club with its search for a new home and should continue to assist with this search even if it was not resolved before the end of the year	Councillor Jason Cummings	Accept  As part of the site finding exercise, the Health Authority's contractor is also considering help (either financial or practical with building modification works) to assist in the relocation during 2022 calendar year	Jane West		End Dec 2022	
3. It is recommended that the process used by the Council when delivering large scale projects is reviewed to ensure that an appropriate level of consultation and community engagement can be	The concerns raised by the Committee about the level of community engagement on this asset disposal echoed previously raised concerns about how the Council consulted on capital projects. It was agreed that the process for delivering any such	Councillor Jason Cummings	Accept  Local Engagement has always been key to such matters and ward councillors have previously been kept informed through written correspondence. As this has not proven to be	Jane West		End Dec 2022	

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
built into the process as standard practice.	projects needed to be reviewed to ensure there was sufficient time to build an appropriate level of consultation into future projects.		successful in this instance, it maybe, that more formal briefings via Teams / On Site / Face to face are piloted to ensure a better outcome.				
<b>Report:</b> 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)							
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).	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.	Councillor Lynne Hale	<p style="text-align: center;">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>	Susmita Sen	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

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. 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.  Detailed programme documentation and an officer briefing will be provided to the Streets, Environment &amp; Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee in January 2023.</p>	<p>Cabinet 16<sup>th</sup> November 2022.  Streets, Environment &amp; Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee 31<sup>st</sup> January 2023.</p>
<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</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>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>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 &amp; Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee.</p>	<p>16<sup>th</sup> November Cabinet, and 31<sup>st</sup> January 2023 Streets, Environment &amp; 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</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</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>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>Board is an independent Board, and is therefore independent from both the Council's executive and scrutiny functions.</p>				
<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</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>

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
the plan evolves over the improvement journey.							
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		Councillor Lynne Hale	<p style="text-align: center;">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 &amp; 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>	Susmita Sen	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
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		Councillor Lynne Hale	<p style="text-align: center;">ACCEPT</p>	Susmita Sen	No	Highlight report and presentation detailing the use of NEC Housing data as business intelligence presented to January Streets, Environment & Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee	31 <sup>st</sup> January 2023 Streets, Environment & Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee

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
collection on contacts made to the Housing teams – the analysis of which could be passed onto residents, members and others in a timely manner.							
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 improving tenant's experience		Councillor Lynne Hale	ACCEPT	Susmita Sen	No	Presentation from relevant officer at January Streets, Environment & Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee in relation to the use of responsive repairs data as business intelligence	31 <sup>st</sup> January 2023 Streets, Environment & Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee
10. That Cabinet also considers the comments and recommendations			REJECT  Cabinet considered the comments and recommendations made on		No	A further iteration of the Housing Improvement Plan will be brought back to the Streets, Environment & Homes	31 <sup>st</sup> January 2023 Streets, Environment



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
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	the Housing Improvement Plan by the Independent Housing Improvement Board at <u>March 2022 Cabinet</u>	Susmita Sen		Scrutiny Sub-Committee in January 2023.	t & 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 &amp; Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee in November 2022.</p>	<p>Update to be provided to the Streets, Environment &amp; Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee on 15<sup>th</sup> 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 Management Strategy, Treasury</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 undertaken in September and October 2022. A draft of the core</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 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>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 &amp; Capital Programme Cabinet Paper to February 2023 Cabinet</p>	<p>The delivery of the Housing Improvement Plan will be reflected in the HRA Business Plan &amp; Capital Programme Update Cabinet Paper to February 2023 Cabinet</p>	<p>14<sup>th</sup> March 2023 Streets, Environment &amp; 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
<b>Report:</b> Update from Executive Mayor (Considered by Scrutiny & Overview Committee on 27 June 2022)							
<p>1. That the SRAs of Cabinet Members are revisited, in consultation with London Councils' Independent Panel on the Remuneration of Members in London, in light of the reduced responsibilities of Cabinet Members and the financial position of the Council and the need to protect public finances.</p>	<p>The Committee were of the view that more detail was required to effectively scrutinise the plans resulting from the Executive Mayor's priorities. Members were encouraged that the Executive Mayor was supportive of scrutiny and the planned addition of a Housing Scrutiny Sub-Committee as well as the planned adoption of a published six-month Forward Plan.</p> <p>Members welcomed plans on co-production of services and community engagement but felt that this lacked detail.</p>	<p>Executive Mayor Jason Perry</p>	<p>While the Executive Mayor has not currently chosen to delegate decision making responsibilities, similarly to under the previous 'strong Leader' model, Cabinet Members hold a range of responsibilities as set out in the Cabinet Member role profile received by Ethics Committee in September 2021 which states:</p> <p><i>'A Cabinet Member holds strategic responsibility for, and is accountable for, a named portfolio of services, including the initiation of specific relevant policy. They provide collective and individual leadership as part of the Cabinet. The Cabinet Member represents and champions the Council on outside organisations, and contributes the Council's perspective to national, regional and sub-regional bodies, feeding back insights and learning to inform the Council's decision-making.'</i></p>	<p>Stephen Lawrence-Orumwense</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>The current Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA) for a Croydon Cabinet Member was agreed by Council on 23rd March 2022. This set the Cabinet Member SRA level at £27,503.20. This is significantly below the most recent London Councils' Independent Panel on the Remuneration of Members in London report which recommended an SRA for Cabinet Members of between £39,860 and £47,271.</p> <p>However officers have been asked to review all SRAs ahead of the Budget setting process for next year.</p>				
<p>2. To meet the Executive Mayors central priority of creating a Council that listens to residents, there needs to be an overarching Community Engagement Strategy to guide when and how the Council will engage with the local community. This</p>	<p>The Committee were of the view that more detail was required to effectively scrutinise the plans resulting from the Executive Mayor's priorities. Members were encouraged that the Executive Mayor was supportive of scrutiny and the planned addition of a Housing Scrutiny Sub-</p>	<p>Mayor Jason Perry</p>	<p>A new Corporate Plan is currently in development and will be supported by the development of a new communications and engagement strategy setting out how the Council will engage with the local community.</p>	<p>Elaine Jackson</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>should set out the Executive Mayor's vision for community engagement in the design of services and strategies and how the Council will actively look to engage with hard-to-reach groups</p>	<p>Committee as well as the planned adoption of a published six-month Forward Plan.</p> <p>Members welcomed plans on co-production of services and community engagement but felt that this lacked detail</p>						
<p>3. That consideration is given to the utilisation of citizen's assemblies to engage with residents on contentious topics such as carbon reduction and healthy neighbourhoods, alongside recommendations on resident engagement in the Independent Governance Review from 2020.</p>	<p>The Committee were of the view that more detail was required to effectively scrutinise the plans resulting from the Executive Mayor's priorities. Members were encouraged that the Executive Mayor was supportive of scrutiny and the planned addition of a Housing Scrutiny Sub-Committee as well as the planned adoption of a published six-month Forward Plan.</p> <p>Members welcomed plans on co-production of services and community engagement but felt that this lacked detail</p>	<p>Mayor Jason Perry</p>	<p>Listening to Croydon is a key part of the Mayor's agenda including introducing new forums for residents to be able to contribute to decision making and hold the political leadership to account.</p> <p>The Council can consider the use of different engagement techniques as part of the Healthy Neighbourhood programme as part of the engagement process but it is necessary to follow formal statutory processes for Traffic related schemes.</p>	<p>Nick Hibberd</p>	<p>Potentially additional cost but not known at this stage</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. Given the Mayor's acknowledgment that there was greater value for KPIs to be independently tested, the Committee would request to be involved in developing the KPIs which will monitor and evaluate the performance of implementing the Executive Mayor's priorities.</p>	<p>The Committee were of the view that more detail was required to effectively scrutinise the plans resulting from the Executive Mayor's priorities. Members were encouraged that the Executive Mayor was supportive of scrutiny and the planned addition of a Housing Scrutiny Sub-Committee as well as the planned adoption of a published six-month Forward Plan.</p> <p>Members welcomed plans on co-production of services and community engagement but felt that this lacked detail</p>	<p>Mayor Jason Perry</p>	<p>Accept</p> <p>The proposed KPIs will be developed to align with the Mayor's Strategic Plan. These will be shared with the Scrutiny and Overview Committee for comment.</p>	<p>Elaine Jackson</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>End November 2022</p>	
<p>5. The role of Youth Mayor should be reviewed to ensure that it can be an effective mechanism for youth engagement and be involved in developing the Youth Safety Strategy.</p>	<p>The Committee were of the view that more detail was required to effectively scrutinise the plans resulting from the Executive Mayor's priorities. Members were encouraged that the Executive Mayor was supportive of scrutiny and the planned addition of a Housing Scrutiny Sub-Committee as well as</p>	<p>Mayor Jason Perry</p>	<p>Accept</p> <p>The role of Youth Mayor will be reviewed in due course.</p>	<p>Debbie Jones</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>the planned adoption of a published six-month Forward Plan.</p> <p>Members welcomed plans on co-production of services and community engagement but felt that this lacked detail</p>						
<p>6. That it was essential to launch a campaign for fairer funding if the Secretary of State does not respond satisfactorily to the initial letter from the Executive Mayor.</p>	<p>The Committee were of the view that there was insufficient detail on how the Executive Mayor's priorities would be funded. As the Section 151 Officer confirmed that other areas would need to be deprioritised make way for new spending, the Committee agreed that further information was needed to understand the risk of deprioritising services. The Committee welcomed plans to introduce a 'bidding unit' to bring in more external funds for Croydon.</p> <p>Members supported a fairer funding campaign dependent on the Secretary of State's response to the Executive Mayor's letter on the matter. The</p>	<p>Mayor Jason Perry</p>	<p>Accept</p> <p>The Administration will continue to argue for fair funding and engage with Government at all levels to make the case.</p>	<p>Jane West</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Regular meetings to discuss the Council's financial position are being held by the Chief Executive and the Corporate Director of Resources with senior civil servants in the Department for Levelling UP, Housing and Communities.</p> <p>Once a new Government is in place, a letter will be sent by the Mayor to the new Secretary of State setting out the challenges faced by Croydon but also the actions being taken to return the Council to financial sustainability.</p>	<p>November 2022</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>Committee felt that there were risks in seeking additional income that addressed Capital but not Revenue funding which did not alleviate budgetary pressures which were compounded by inflationary pressures</p>					<p>No action has been taken by government in 2022 to progress any changes to the local government funding regime. There is now insufficient time to make any changes for 2023/24 and therefore a further 'roll-over' of the current arrangements is expected into 2023/24.</p> <p>The Mayor and senior officers will continue to engage with government on the issue of local government financing</p>	
<p>7. That a paper on the number of properties built by area, and application approval rates alongside appeal outcomes information should be requested to inform the meeting of the Streets, Environment &amp; Homes Sub-Committee.</p>	<p>The Committee was concerned that the risks of revoking SPD2 and the timescales of implementing replacement documentation had not been well considered and that legal advice on the revocation had not been provided in advance of the meeting. Members were</p>	<p>Councillor Jeet Bains</p>	<p>Reject - The SPD2 revocation Cabinet Report outlines the resource requirements associated with the revocation of SPD2 and the recommendation of a replacement residential extensions and alterations SPD. The implications of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill will need to be considered once the content and requirements of the final Act are known.</p>	<p>Nick Hibberd</p>	<p>The SPD2 revocation Cabinet Report sets out the final implications at paragraphs 5.1.5 &amp; 5.1.6.</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>concerned that the level of resource in the planning service had not been considered and that work would need to be duplicated once the Levelling Up Bill came into effect.</p> <p>Members were of the view that the Local Plan itself did not provide sufficient protections in the absence of a design code once SPD2 was revoked</p>		<p>Reject - Planning applications are determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. For the type of proposals formally covered under SPD2, the development plan is the Local Plan 2018 and London Plan 2021. Proposals are considered against the development plan as a whole. However, Local Plan 2018 Policy DM10 – Design and Character and London Plan 2021 H2 – Small Sites are likely to be engaged most regularly for this form of development.</p>		None		
<p>8. That a risk analysis on the revocation of SPD2 was provided to the Streets, Environment &amp; Homes Sub-Committee including timescales for the replacement guidance to be enacted.</p>	<p>The Committee was concerned that the risks of revoking SPD2 and the timescales of implementing replacement documentation had not been well considered and that legal advice on the revocation had not been provided in advance of the meeting. Members were concerned that the level of resource in the planning service had not</p>	<p>Councillor Jeet Bains</p>	<p>Reject – The SPD2 revocation Cabinet Report outlines the considerations and justification for the immediate revocation. The SPD2 revocation Cabinet Report covers the legal advice and legislation regarding revocation.</p>	<p>Nick Hibberd</p>	None		

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>been considered and that work would need to be duplicated once the Levelling Up Bill came into effect.</p> <p>Members were of the view that the Local Plan itself did not provide sufficient protections in the absence of a design code once SPD2 was revoked</p>						
<p>9. That a revised strategy for achieving carbon neutrality by 2030 is delivered as a priority, setting out a clear roadmap for how the target will be achieved and explaining the rationale for the measure that have not been included.</p>	<p>The Committee welcomed the revisitation of Croydon's Carbon Reduction Plan, as there was concern that current plan was inadequate for meeting the Council's net zero targets. It was hoped that this would lead to the Plan being strengthened, made more strategic and with a clear road map for delivery.</p> <p>Members felt that there was little detail on the reduction of private vehicle usage and road traffic and hoped that more explicit proposals on this were forthcoming</p>	<p>Councillor Scott Roche</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>The council will review the carbon neutral action plan and set out how it will lead to reduce carbon emission in the borough.</p>	<p>Nick Hibberd</p>	<p>Not known at this stage.</p>	<p>A progress report will be added to the cabinet forward plan for February 2023</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
10. For more information to be provided on how future revisions to the Local Plan will help to achieve climate change targets.	<p>The Committee welcomed the revisitation of Croydon's Carbon Reduction Plan, as there was concern that current plan was inadequate for meeting the Council's net zero targets. It was hoped that this would lead to the Plan being strengthened, made more strategic and with a clear road map for delivery.</p> <p>Members felt that there was little detail on the reduction of private vehicle usage and road traffic and hoped that more explicit proposals on this were forthcoming</p>	Councillor Jeet Bains	<p>Accepted</p> <p>The Local Plan Review will set climate change (carbon reduction) targets that accord with national and London Plan planning policy</p>	Nick Hibberd	This recommendation will be funded from the Local Plan Review budget	The timetable will be as set out for the Local Plan Review to be published in due course.	

**Report: Responsive Repairs Contract (Considered by Scrutiny & Overview Committee on 14 June 2022)**

1. That the scope for bringing all or part of the current responsive repairs service in house is evaluated as a priority to ensure that the outsourcing delivery model proposed by the Council offers the best outcomes for residents.		Councillor Lynne Hale	<p align="center">ACCEPT</p> <p>A risk based evaluation has already been undertaken which has informed our approach.</p> <p>The evaluation identified that the best outcome for residents would be achieved by continuing to contract services from</p>	Susmita Sen	Financial implications of accepting the recommendation were outlined in the June 2022 Repairs Reprocurement Cabinet report.	Not applicable	
--	--	-----------------------	---	-------------	---	----------------	--

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>the private sector, with the contact centre brought in house.</p> <p>Considering the time constraints and current capability and capacity of the organisation the risk to insourcing additional elements of the service were assessed as being too high.</p> <p>Subject to future review, provision has been built into tender documents to allow further insourcing of services at a later date.</p>				
<p>2. That there should be periodic reviews of the delivery model, including an options appraisal on the benefits of insourcing either all or part of the service, to ensure the optimal structure is in place</p>		<p>Councillor Lynne Hale</p>	<p>ACCEPT</p> <p>Regular reviews of the service should be undertaken to determine if the service provided is fit for purpose.</p> <p>We would want an annual open book approach, with a more detailed review ahead of extension points.</p>	<p>Susmita Sen</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Review of performance undertaken annually, the first review being after the first full year of operation – 2024/25.</p>	
<p>3. That the current re-procurement and delivery of the new responsive repairs contract should be informed by best practice and experience from other local authorities</p>		<p>Councillor Lynne Hale</p>	<p>ACCEPT</p> <p>Scrutiny reviewed the approach to ensuring best practice is adopted. This should be reviewed on a regular basis and should include (but not limited to)</p>	<p>Susmita Sen</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Reviews already undertaken as part of the preparation for tender.</p> <p>Review of best practice should be an ongoing exercise,</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
			review of benchmarking of performance data through benchmarking organisations such as HouseMark, benchmarking with other organisations through London Council's for example and peer reviews.			with specific focus at the annual reviews.  The first annual review will be after the first full year of operation – 2024/25	
4. That the key performance indicators created to performance manage the new contracts are reviewed by Scrutiny before they are signed off.		Councillor Lynne Hale	<p style="text-align: center;">REJECT</p> <p>Scrutiny have had the opportunity to shape the KPIs through scrutiny meetings. If there are further recommendations they can be considered as these are developed.</p> <p>However – we would want to keep Members abreast of the procurement development ahead of final contract award.</p>	Susmita Sen	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
5. That provision for a compensation scheme for residents who experience poor performance , and paid for by the contractor, is included in the contracts for the new service. The Committee would ask to be kept updated on the outcome of this work.		Councillor Lynne Hale	<p style="text-align: center;">REJECT</p> <p>We recognise that the complaints system has not always worked for residents. As part of the housing improvement plan we will be working with residents to review the complaints and compensation approach to bring in line with best practice and the ombudsman</p>	Susmita Sen	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

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
6. That the use of technology to improve the level of communication with residents needs to be set as a minimum expectation in the tender specification.		Councillor Lynne Hale	ACCEPT	Susmita Sen	Not applicable	Review of performance undertaken annually, the first review being after the first full year of operation – 2024/25. This will review the resident experience, including communication/ technology.	
7. That Housing Services commits to ensuring that the Tenant Handbook is updated and distributed to all residents to ensure they are aware of the level of service they can expect, how to access these services, how to complain when the expected service is not delivered along with confirmation of their dedicated Housing Officer.		Councillor Lynne Hale	REJECT  We recognise that we need to listen to our residents better and respond to their needs.  The Residents' Charter will pave the way for resetting the relationship with residents and reworking our services and standards.	Susmita Sen	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
8. That a political commitment is given to ensuring that the caretaker/handyman service for Council housing is fully resourced and trained		Councillor Lynne Hale	REJECT  We cannot predetermine future decisions on specific services however we will ensure that all housing staff have the necessary skills, training and support to deliver the	Susmita Sen			



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
			best outcomes for residents.				
9. The expectations of the Council on contractors to improve the culture of the staff transferred through TUPE needs to be clearly set out in the contract, with accompanying performance measures to track progress.		Councillor Lynne Hale	ACCEPT  Our requirements have been shaped by residents, and are set out in the contract. Residents are involved at the evaluation stages specifically looking at the culture and resident experience.	Susmita Sen	Not applicable	Complete.  Resident focus groups help shape the expectation which is within the tender documents. Residents are part of the evaluation panel to assess tenders	
10. That sufficient capacity is allocated to ensure the delivery of the culture change programme within the Housing Service can be progressed as far as possible by the time the new contracts are awarded.		Councillor Lynne Hale	ACCEPT	Susmita Sen	The financial implications of ensuring that there is sufficient staffing capacity to deliver the culture change programme is currently being assessed.	An update on staff capacity to deliver the culture change programme and the Housing Improvement Plan will be provided to November 2022 Cabinet.	31 <sup>st</sup> January Streets, Environment & Homes Scrutiny Sub-Committee
11. That the estimated figures provided for the cost of the contract are reviewed and replaced with a cost range, to take account of the uncertainty in both the national and world economy.		Councillor Lynne Hale	REJECT  The cabinet paper already recognises the uncertainties in the market and estimated figures are exactly that – an estimate.  The value is based upon 4 years of data from the open book reviews with inflationary uplift applied based upon the Office	Susmita Sen	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

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
			for Budget Responsibility's forecast.				
12. That the tender documents explicitly set out the Council's social value priorities it expects bidders to deliver, particularly in terms of local employment, supporting the local suppliers and climate change commitments.		Councillor Lynne Hale	<p style="text-align: center;">REJECT</p> <p>The tender documents have articulated the Council's social value priorities. Unlike previous contracts which were not properly monitored, measurable KPIs for social value will be included in the final contracts.</p> <p>We would want to keep Members abreast of the procurement development ahead of final contract award.</p>	Susmita Sen	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
13. That the measures to track the delivery of the social value aspect within the new contracts are reviewed by Scrutiny before they are signed off.		Councillor Lynne Hale	<p style="text-align: center;">REJECT</p> <p>Scrutiny have had the opportunity to shape the KPIs through the scrutiny meetings. If there are further recommendations they can be considered as these are developed.</p>	Susmita Sen	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable