

Public Document Pack



	MID SUFFOLK OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
DATE	Thursday, 17 August 2017 at 9.30 am
PLACE	Council Chamber, Council Offices, High Street, Needham Market

PLEASE NOTE START TIME OF MEETING

Members

Chairman: Rachel Eburne
Vice Chairman: Derek Osborne

James Caston
John Field
Elizabeth Gibson-Harries

Lavinia Hadingham
Lesley Mayes
Kevin Welsby

A G E N D A

	<u>Page(s)</u>
1 Apologies for absence/substitutions	
2 To receive any declarations of pecuniary or non-pecuniary interest by Members	
3 MOS/17/8 To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2017	1 - 6
4 To receive notification of petitions in accordance with the Council's Petition Scheme	
5 MOS/17/9 Review of Western Suffolk Community Safety Partnership (WSCSP)	7 - 14
6 MOS/17/10 Scoping a review of Voids	15 - 18
7 Update from Development Control on Planning Appeals	
An update to be provided at the meeting.	
8 Information Bulletin	
9 MOS/17/11 MSDC Overview and Scrutiny Forward Plan	19 - 22

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

MOS/17/8

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the **MID SUFFOLK OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** held at the Council Chamber, Council Offices, High Street, Needham Market on Thursday, 20 July 2017

PRESENT:

Chairman: Councillor Rachel Eburne
Vice Chairman: Councillor Derek Osborne

Councillors: James Caston
Suzie Morley
Kevin Welsby

In attendance:

Assistant Director – Governance and Law
Corporate Manager – Tenant Services
Corporate manager – Homeless Prevention and Older Persons
Corporate Manager – Business Improvement (Corporate)
Corporate Manager – Internal Audit
Homelessness Officer Leader
Project Officer (BS)
Governance Support Officer (VL/RC)

19 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/SUBSTITUTIONS**

Councillor Suzie Morley was substituting for Councillor Lavinia Hadingham. An apology for absence was received from Councillors John Field, Elizabeth Gibson-Harries and Lesley Mayes.

20 **TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY OR NON-PECUNIARY INTEREST BY MEMBERS**

There were no declarations of interests.

21 **MOS/17/5 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 15 JUNE 2017**

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 June 2017 be confirmed as a correct record.

22 **TO RECEIVE NOTIFICATION OF PETITIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COUNCIL'S PETITION SCHEME**

None received.

23 **MOS/17/6 OUTSTANDING ITEMS FROM JOINT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETINGS 2016/17**

The Project and Research Officer updated the Committee on the current status of items reviewed previously but not marked complete so that a decision could be made on whether they should be added to the Forward Plan for further consideration.

Fuel Poverty – he advised that Suffolk County Council (SCC) had accessed two funds, one targeting those who would benefit from central heating and the Green Deals Communities Fund. Information regarding who would benefit from central heating installation was provided by partner organisations, eg GP practices and hospitals, and the criteria for eligibility assessed. He understood that a number of households in Mid Suffolk had received a grant from this source but SCC, who was administering the scheme in Suffolk, had not provided details. The Green Deals Fund focused less on fuel poverty but had been accessed by some for better, cheaper heating and could be used as a gateway to various sources of funding. It was noted that the issue should be a consideration in all Council policies and steps should be taken to ensure that those in fuel poverty were considered in all new policies and steps taken regarding mitigation. Although the Scrutiny Committee recommendations had been delegated to the Programme Steering Boards (PSB) by the Executive Committee it had not been possible to find out any outcomes. It was agreed that an update should be provided by the appropriate PSB Lead Member or Officer.

Supporting Business Growth – It was noted that this issue was not currently moving forward or being dealt with elsewhere in the Council. The Corporate Manager – Open for Business had given an insight into the Open for Business Plan but it was felt that more time was needed to assess how this was working. It was agreed that an item should be added to the Forward Plan for the Committee to look at how Business Rate retention could be maximised and how growth of micro-businesses could be supported.

Community Grants – the Corporate Manager – Strong Communities was unable to attend the meeting to give an update. Members felt that grants had been considered on several occasions and that there was no need for a further review.

Planning Appeals – The Corporate Manager – Planning and Sustainable Growth was unable to attend the meeting and Members requested an update at the next meeting.

24

SCOPING FOR HOMELESS/ BED AND BREAKFAST ACCOMMODATION REVIEW

The Corporate Manager – Homeless Prevention and Older Persons gave a detailed presentation on the work undertaken by the Team dealing with the homeless issue. She clarified the legal statutes that the Council had to work within and the timescale for dealing with an application for homelessness.

She advised the Committee that the major concern was the proposed introduction of the Homelessness Reduction Act in April 2018 which was likely to increase the workload significantly. Although the Council would not have to provide

accommodation for all those claiming homelessness it would have to draw up a meaningful action plan to mitigate the situation. Following a set period of time if the situation was not resolved then the person(s) would be deemed homeless and the Council would be expected to find them accommodation. The benefit cap and introduction of Universal Credit, which was to be rolled out to single person claimants in Mid Suffolk next year, was expected to result in a major increase in those unable to pay their rent and it was expected that other services, eg police, probation, GPs, would refer people who were expecting to become homeless. There would be further adverse impact from the local housing allowance rates being frozen and the effect on people accessing the private rented sector.

The team was actively working to minimise the effects of the introduction of the Act in various ways including looking at ways to increase the private sector rental offer; trying to increase the temporary accommodation offer; and introduction of a scheme where a single person could rent a room in a house, with the tenant matched to the landlord, and with the rent assessed to ensure it was tax free.

A joint bid with SCC had resulted in funding that was being used to employ an Officer who worked with rough sleepers to try and help and also to prevent the situation occurring. The Council had an obligation to provide shelter to those sleeping rough in bad weather.

A joint funding bid for monies to help those suffering from domestic abuse had allowed three dwellings to be purchased which would provide a safe place and also intensive support.

She tabled homeless statistics for the years 2014/15, 2015/16 and 2016/17 together with details of the numbers of families placed in bed and breakfast accommodation and the costs, and cases where homelessness was prevented by appropriate intervention. In respect of the use of bed and breakfast accommodation it was noted that overall the figures for the last three years had gone down and that the Mid Suffolk figures were much lower than the national average. It was noted that bed and breakfast accommodation was only used as a last resort.

Concern was expressed regarding the team's ability to cope with the introduction of the Homelessness Reduction Act. The Officer advised that a business case was being prepared to increase the team by 4.5 full time equivalent posts. The team was also currently undertaking additional work which could actually be done elsewhere in the organisation which would free up more time to work on homelessness prevention.

Members discussed the information provided and questioned Officers on various aspects including:

- How more short term accommodation could be procured eg hostel – A number of temporary accommodations were available. A balance had to be achieved between providing sufficient accommodation and costs eg hostel accommodation might not be filled permanently against bed and breakfast which was only paid for when necessary
- Location of bed and breakfast accommodation – None was available in Mid

- Suffolk. Ipswich accommodation was used when necessary.
- Number of beds available in temporary accommodation – Sufficient to accommodate thirteen households
 - Duration of stay in temporary accommodation – Time varied but there was an impact on VOID performance if empty council properties were used
 - Expected increase in homeless cases following introduction of the Bill – Currently all those contacting the Council for assistance were not recorded, the only data was for those found homeless. From April when a case would have to be opened for all contacts it was expected to be approximately 300 per year.

The Committee discussed the information provided and agreed that it was confident that the work being undertaken to reduce the use of bed and breakfast accommodation was good and no review was necessary and this would be reported to the Cabinet.

It was felt that a more worthwhile piece of work would be to pre-scrutinise the steps being taken to prepare for the introduction of the Homelessness Reduction Act. It was proposed a review be undertaken in November and that other organisations who worked with Mid Suffolk residents, eg Citizens' Advice Bureau, should also be brought in to gain their views.

RESOLUTION

That a review of the work being undertaken in preparation for the implementation of the Homelessness Reduction Act be brought to the 16 November meeting

25

DISCUSSION ON RISK AND PERFORMANCE AND WHERE THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE CAN ADD VALUE

Members were asked to consider whether there were any areas of performance and risk that they felt should be reviewed by the Scrutiny Committee.

The Corporate Manager – Business Improvement said that Programme Officers were working with the Assistant Directors and Portfolio Holders to refine the tracking and influencing performance measures and develop robust targets.

She advised that there were two areas that Scrutiny might like to consider: the process regarding the development of the performance framework and the content within the performance reports. It was necessary to ensure the process was robust; that chosen indicators measured delivery of the Strategic Plan, that there were no gaps of significant information and appropriate targets were set. In addition the quarterly performance information on Connect, the published Facts and Stats and the half yearly reports to Cabinet could be used to identify any areas the Committee had concerns about. The highest areas on the Risk Register could be used as a focus to identify actions to mitigate risks. The relationship between performance and risk would be enhanced with this approach.

The Corporate Manager – Internal Audit said there was a clear correlation between risk and performance. As the Risk Register was refined the Audit Team would work

with the Corporate Manager – Business Improvement to enhance the correlation between the two.

It was noted that Babergh District Council had allocated areas of interest to each Overview and Scrutiny Committee Member, who would then look at the Risk Register and advise the appropriate Cabinet Member if they felt an area should be scrutinised. It was suggested that the Red, Amber, Green ratings could be used with only red rated areas being looked at with a pre-scrutiny of the measures being used to address the problem.

Further suggestions of issues the Committee might look at included:

- How performance measures were determined
- Areas of poor performance and the connected risk
- Refining the tracking and performance indicators
- Comparison of the Risk Register and performance figures.

It was felt that as the Terms of reference for the Joint Audit and Standards Committee included ensuring robust risk management was in place the Overview and Scrutiny Committee could concentrate on performance.

Following discussion it was agreed that the Committee should monitor Cabinet decisions and put forward any issues it was felt required scrutiny. Also where an area was designated 'red' the Committee could decide if it required examination taking into account the risk level.

It was agreed that the Officers should report to the Committee again when the performance measures had been refined to ensure the correct measures were being monitored.

RESOLUTION

That a further report be brought to Committee when the performance measures had been refined

26 **TRAINING UPDATE**

The Assistant Director – Governance and Law advised that the draft training programme previously circulated to Members had now been given more detail by the Centre for Public Scrutiny and a full programme was now being drawn up. A 'toolkit' was also being developed. It was noted that the estimated cost was less than expected and so well within the planned budget.

RESOLUTION

That the training programme be agreed

27 **MOS/17/7 MSDC OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY FORWARD PLAN**

The Chairman advised that she had met with the Babergh Overview and Scrutiny

Committee Chairman and the following items had been raised for potential inclusion on the Forward Plan:

- Crime Prevention Strategy
- Investment Strategy
- Shared Legal Service
- Business Rates Retention.

The following items to be added to the Forward Plan:

Homelessness Reduction Act and associated issues – November
Process for Performance Management - October

Agenda Item 5

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

From: ASSISTANT DIRECTOR COMMUNITIES AND PUBLIC ACCESS	Report Number: MOS/17/9
To: OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	Date of meeting: 17 AUGUST 2017

REVIEW OF WESTERN SUFFOLK COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP (WSCSP)

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 For the committee to fulfil its function under Sections 19 and 20 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, the Police and Justice Act 2006 and the Crime and Disorder Overview and Scrutiny Regulations 2009 to scrutinise the work of Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs).

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 To review and scrutinise the community safety activity of the Western Suffolk Community Safety Partnership (WSCSP) from April 2016 to July 2017

It is recommended that the Committee note the contents.

3. Financial Implications

- 3.1 Funding for Domestic Homicide Reviews (DHRs). A decision was agreed through the Strong and Safe Communities Group (SSCG), that DHRs will be funded equally by the statutory partners of the CSP in the area where the review is being conducted.
- 3.2 Funding for target hardening for high risk victims of domestic abuse. A decision was agreed through the Safe and Strong Communities Group (SSCG), that a pooled funding pot of £19,000 would be made available to partner organisations to co-ordinate this activity across the county. From September 2017, each of the seven District and Borough Councils will contribute £2,000, Suffolk County Council (SCC) will contribute £3,000 and £2,000 from the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC). This will be funded from existing budgets. The pilot will run for 18 months.
- 3.3 In 2013-2014 the Police and Crime Commissioner passed the Home Office Crime and Disorder Grant on to the Suffolk Community Safety Partnerships to commission services and award grants that contributed to their Strategic Priorities and the Police and Crime Strategic Priorities in the Police and Crime Plan. Since April 2014, Suffolk CSPs no longer receive this funding as the PCC has devolved the Home Office Crime and Disorder Grant to Suffolk Community Foundation as the Safer Suffolk Fund (SSF). Bids to this fund can be made by community and voluntary organisations but not by statutory bodies including CSPs. Community Safety Partnerships can support these organisations with applications to access funding from the SSF to deliver community safety projects that address the CSPs strategic priorities.

4. Legal Implications

- 4.1 Community Safety Partnerships were created in accordance with Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 which gave local authorities and the police new responsibilities to work in partnership with other organisations and the community to draw up strategies to reduce crime and disorder.

5. Risk Management

- 5.1 This report does not link to any of the Council's Corporate / Significant Business Risks. However, the risks are set out below:

Risk Description	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation Measures
If there are changes and reorganisations of key statutory partners, then the strength of partnership working may be lost.	4 - Highly Probable	3 - Bad	Review role of partnership working and ensure all key partners have a key responsibility
If staff are working in isolation rather than collaboratively this could see a return to silo working within partners and withdraw from engagement	3 - Probable	3 - Bad	WSCSP Portfolio Holders, Members and Senior Leadership Team to encourage and embed partnership working in all areas of business for the Council(s)

6. Consultations

- 6.1 The annual monitoring report draws on information from partner agencies relating to community safety issues. Due to the sensitivity, some information remains restricted.

7. Equality Analysis

- 7.1 The content of this report is such that there are no equality issues arising from this report although the review itself may consider any equality impacts.

8. Shared Service / Partnership Implications

- 8.1 The Western Suffolk Community Safety Partnership consists of a wide range of statutory representatives from:

- Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils
- Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury District Councils
- Suffolk County Council

- Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service
- Suffolk Constabulary
- Youth Offending Service
- National Probation Service
- Norfolk and Suffolk Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC)
- West Suffolk and Ipswich and East Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)
- Registered Social Landlords (RSLs)

These partners form the Responsible Authorities Group (RAG)

9. Links to Joint Strategic Plan

9.1 Continued support for health and wellbeing outcomes that prevent interventions.

10. Key Information

10.1 On 30 November 2015, the Combination Agreement was finalised between the Suffolk Police and Crime Commissioner and each of the responsible authorities which saw the Western CSP merging with the Babergh CSP.

10.2 Over the past 15 months, the Western Suffolk Community Safety Partnership (WSCSP) continued to meet and to discharge its statutory functions by:

- I. carrying out an annual assessment of crime
- II. producing an annual plan
- III. undertaking Domestic Homicide Reviews (DHRs) as required.

In June 2017, the WSCSP completed and published its partnership plan and project plan for identified community priorities for 2017/2018. The project plan is attached as Appendix 1.

10.3 The WSCSP has completed a Domestic Homicide Review (DHR) for the Babergh area. The report, compiled by an Independent Chair commissioned by the Partnership, was published in October 2016, following approval by the Home Office. An Action Plan relating to the recommendations in the report is being monitored by the WSCSP and will continue until all actions are completed to the satisfaction of the partnership. The total cost of the review was just under £7,000. The WSCSP is currently undertaking a Domestic Homicide Review in the Mid Suffolk District. The Partnership has commissioned an Independent Chair to complete the report. The total cost of the review once known will be shared equally among the statutory partners.

10.4 Following a recommendation from the Health and Wellbeing Board (HWB) in February 2015, a need was recognised to have a countywide strategic coordination of community safety issues. As a result, the SSCG was formed from a number of partners across Suffolk. The Group's purpose is to:

- I. Provide a strategic steer and coordination in the key areas for community safety across the county
- II. Reduce duplication and
- III. Ensure that partners share one set of data and intelligence

10.5 Membership of the SSCG includes: District and Borough Councils, Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), Public Health, Police, Youth Offending Service (YOS), Adults Safeguarding, Children's Safeguarding, Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) and chairs of Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs).

11. Appendices

Title	Location
(a) Western Suffolk Community Safety Partnership Plan 2016 - 2019	Appendix 1
(b) Multi-Agency Working Groups	Appendix 2
(c)	
(d)	

12. Background Documents

12.1 The Police and Crime Commissioners Police and Crime Plan (2017-2021)
www.suffolk-pcc.gov.uk

Authorship:
Melanie Yolland
Communities Officer (Safe)

Tel: 01449 724928
Email:
melanie.yolland@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk



Western Suffolk Community Safety Partnership Plan 2016-19

The Western Suffolk Community Safety Partnership (WSCSP) is a statutory body with a responsibility to:

- Make an assessment of community safety issues
- Produce a plan which responds to those issues
- Review and report on progress against that plan
- Carry out Domestic Homicide Reviews

The partnership is made up of statutory representatives from local councils in St Edmundsbury, Forest Heath, Mid Suffolk and Babergh, Suffolk Police, Registered Social Landlords, Suffolk County Council, Probation, Rehabilitation company and the Clinical Commissioning Group. The Youth Offending Service and Havebury Housing Partnership are long-serving co-opted members.

The WSCSP works to support community/voluntary groups to secure funding to deliver projects/initiatives which meet an identified community safety issue, which are a threat or risk or will cause the greatest harm to the community.

How does this work?

WSCSP has a duty to consider the more strategic overarching issues which are affecting community safety in Western Suffolk. These are issues which may not affect our communities on a day to day basis, but are a threat to overall safety in Suffolk and undermine families and communities. These will be identified by making an assessment of crime and community safety in partnership with Suffolk County Council and Suffolk Police.

Who we will work with?

In addition to the statutory agencies of the partnership working together, we also have strong links with the following groups;

Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC): The PCC is fully supportive of CSPs and their work and in turn, CSPs have a duty to take due regard of the Police and Crime Commissioner's Police and Crime Plan. The WSCSP plan reflects those issues in the PCP which result in producing the greatest threat, risk and harm to our communities.

Strong and Safe Communities Group (SSCG): This group was commissioned by the Health and Wellbeing Board and works with the Community Safety Partnerships; it does not replicate or duplicate what is already happening. Community safety is a key determinant for health and wellbeing and this tactical county wide group has been developed with an aim to give a light touch coordinated response, with a view of getting a better understanding of the whole picture in community safety, drawing agendas together, identifying gaps and responding.

Priorities for WSCSP

A strategic assessment has been undertaken. This is an assessment of all crime and disorder and substance misuse problems that Western Suffolk faces. This assessment assists with the most effective use of available resources in a way which will have the greatest impact on the most relevant problems. It is not intended that the issues identified are the ONLY issues which are addressed throughout the year, but that the issues highlighted are prioritised when resources are available for allocation.

The following data sources have been used to determine this assessment:

- Crime and Disorder data and reports from Suffolk Police
- Ambulance call out data
- Substance misuse data from Public Health England
- Iquanta performance data

Open source research has also been undertaken where relevant to identify emerging national policy developments.

The following priority areas of work have been identified as the focus for the WSCSP:

- 1) Supporting vulnerable people from becoming targeted by criminals from out of the county. This will include victims of substance misuse, Drug dealing and supply, vulnerable adults at risk of 'cuckooing', young people being used to 'run' drugs and sexual exploitation.
- 2) Violence against women and girls. This will include domestic abuse, sexual violence, modern day slavery, sexual exploitation.
- 3) Emerging issues. This could include rural crime, homelessness and street begging, E safety, Hate Crime and Prevent.
- 4) Domestic Homicide reviews. This will include ensuring that the WSCSP continues to carry out reviews, refines processes and shares learning.

The intention is not to duplicate any work that individual agencies may be doing but to understand the relevance to Community Safety for residents in Western Suffolk and maximise the opportunities for coordinating a response and intelligence between agencies in the West.

For further information please contact:

Cllr Robert Everitt, Chair, Western Suffolk Community Safety Partnership

Western Suffolk Community Safety Partnership (WSCSP)

Multi-Agency Working Groups

Safe and Strong Communities Group (SSCG)

Chaired by Ian Gallin, (Chief Executive for West Suffolk Councils), the multi-agency group identified four key workstreams on which to focus as they are considered to be the greatest threat, risk and harm to our communities. The four workstreams are:

- I. Domestic abuse
- II. Youth violence and gangs
- III. Sexual exploitation and
- IV. Cyber crime

Work on each of these four workstreams has been progressing, commencing with a deep-dive exercise to establish the current position for each workstream.

- I. Domestic abuse – an action plan has been produced and four areas of work were identified;
 1. Commissioning
 2. Training
 3. Awareness raising and
 4. One front door to access services for victims and professionals

Work is progressing in each of these areas.

- II. Youth violence and gangs – the University of Suffolk has been commissioned to produce a threat assessment for youth gang and violence in Ipswich, followed by the West and then the East with final assessment being completed by September 2017.
- III. Sexual exploitation – the deep dive identifies that work is fully embedded for safeguarding children, however, gaps were identified for adults. This will be the focus of future work, led by the Safeguarding Adults Board.
- IV. Cybercrime – the deep dive identified work which is now fully embedded and led by the Police cybercrime unit and the Safeguarding Boards.

Mid Suffolk Information Sharing Group

The Mid Suffolk Information Sharing Group is a multi-agency operational group which has been in existence for a number of years and meets bi-monthly in the Mid Suffolk District area.

Membership of the group includes: BMSDC Communities, BMSDC Housing and BMSDC Environmental Protection Officers, Police Safer Neighbourhood Teams and Suffolk Family Focus, SCC Adults Social Care, SCC Children and Young People's Services, SCC Early Help, Catch 22 mediation service, Suffolk Youth Offending Service and a number of housing associations.

Appendix 2

The group addresses referrals of anti-social behaviour (individuals/families/locations), we also discuss referrals relating to vulnerable people, homelessness, mental health and substance misuse including drugs. These meetings focus on 'task and finish' solutions to issues within the Mid Suffolk District that need a joined-up approach. For cases involving vulnerable people, a multi-agency approach is taken with regards to supporting them and identifying and tackling those that are responsible.

Mid Suffolk information successes include a MSDC family causing anti-social behaviour receiving additional support from the Early Help team and an injunction preventing an individual with mental health issues who was causing anti-social behaviour in the community and a potential fire risk to his neighbours from returning to his flat.

Mid Suffolk Domestic Abuse Forum

Mid Suffolk Domestic Abuse Forum is a multi-agency working group which raises awareness of domestic abuse and domestic violence and provides funding support for the delivery of domestic abuse programmes across Mid Suffolk.

The group meets quarterly and membership includes: BMSDC Communities Officer (Chair), Suffolk Police, Suffolk County Council Partnerships and Localities, SCC CYP Early Help, Victim Support, Bury Women's Aid, Home Start Suffolk, Children's Centres, Citizens Advice, Schools, Colchester Army Welfare Officer, Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service and MSDC District Councillors.

The Forum raises awareness of domestic abuse and domestic violence through campaigns including the annual national White Ribbon Campaign which is part of a global movement to stop male violence against women and girls.

The Forum has provided funding for the delivery of programmes to address domestic abuse. This includes funding for 2 Family Support Practitioners to deliver the Helping Hands programme which is a preventative education programme, created by the Women's Aid Federation Northern Ireland in 2000, for children and young people. The programme aims to increase children's understanding of feeling safe and to explore and promote behaviours which will contribute to a safe environment and help those with low confidence and self-esteem as a result of their experience of domestic violence.

Agenda Item 6

MOS/17/10



Mid Suffolk Overview and Scrutiny Committees –Review Scoping Document

Review Topic (name of review)	Voids	
Lead members		
Officer Support	Sue Lister, Justin Wright-Newton Ben Staines	
Rationale Key issues and reason for the review. Include how it relates to the Joint Strategic Plan.	<p>HRA Business Plan gave figures for voids performance that show performance at a lower level than expected.</p> <p>Recent performance reporting (June 2017) shows voids at 35 days, 7 days above target.</p> <p>Poor voids performance is costly to the Council and means housing is not available for residents in need.</p> <p>‘Makes best use of existing housing assets’.</p>	
Purpose of the review/Objective (quantify the outcomes the review will seek to achieve)	<p>The review is to give confidence that measures are being put in place to deliver an improvement in voids performance through measures such as:</p> <p>Identifying blockages;</p> <p>Identifying causes of delays;</p> <p>Recently established BMBS team shows new management of repairs to improve voids;</p> <p>Benchmarking and examining other bodies best practices; and</p> <p>Monitoring of performance and early action to address issues.</p>	
Success measures	What are the expected outcomes?	<p>Scrutiny will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have confidence that best practice is being operated in the voids process • Be confident the processes being used deliver the lowest costs available and

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the long term, see improvements in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the transparency of the voids reporting and ○ the turnaround times for each type of property when it becomes void leading to ○ Increased income through reduced void times
	What are the likely benefits to the council and its community?	Improved voids process means homes become available quicker and rental income is increased.
	What value is O&S adding to the process?	Providing reassurance that the processes bring operated are best able to deliver the outcomes set by Cabinet or Portfolio Holders. Should we be asking for more involvement from the Committee such as providing their own researched examples of voids management?
	Are there any barriers/dangers/risks?	Inactivity leading to no fundamental change being made for the long term. Setting expectations too low and in too long a time frame. Cross connection with other issues.
	How are you going to know that you have reached the end of the O&S activity?	Measurable improvements in 1st year to 18 months with evidence of improved procedures.
Background information	For Mid Suffolk, the average time to turn around an empty council property in 2016/17 was, for each of quarters 1 to 4 respectively, 35, 36, 35 and 35 days. This is against a target of 28 days.	

<p>Methodology/ Approach (what types of enquiry will be used to gather evidence and why)</p>	<p>The points below are what the committee would like to examine:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historical position last year (From 17 Feb 2016) and review of the situation since that time. • Reasons for the deterioration and improvements in the void figures. • Partitioning the void figures into housing categories. • Review of the management process, structure and responsibilities. • Financial breakdown and comparison between different void periods (typically 28 days and 21 days). • Financial implications to the revenue budget. • Social implications of long void periods. • Comparison of void periods with other councils. 7 days has been quoted for other Councils! • Gain evidence from the LGA and Network of District Councils to provide national picture. • Action plan to improve the void periods and performance, including proactive management requirements. Why it is intended to take 3 years to show a small improvement and how this can be improved. • Adequacy of repair and maintenance resources to improve the void periods.
<p>Resource requirements</p>	
<p>Project parameters</p>	
<p>Specify Witnesses/ Experts/ Stakeholders (who to see and when)- subject to review as evidence becomes available.</p>	<p>A representative from another council who can talk about best practice in their council.</p>

Specify Evidence Sources for documents			
Specify Site Visits (where and when)			
Barriers/dangers/risks Identify any weaknesses and potential pitfalls	Constant change within the organisation means reasons are given for not achieving targets that could prevent potential new improvements being identified and/or made.		
Projected start date	24 July 2017	Draft report deadline	
Meeting frequency		Projected completion date	

Note:

Please can we ensure we are clear on what we are measuring. There has previously been discussion about excluding from the figures hard to let properties or those being reserved for other purposes (such as demolition).

Voids performance was last looked at by Joint Scrutiny in February 2016. Nothing has changed! The target then was 28 days. Voids performance was 34 days for standard repairs in MSDC – last performance review in June 2017 says 35 days.

The key point missing from the Feb 2016 report was benchmarking and best practice from other councils.

I think Members should be sent the papers from the Feb 2016 meeting as an aide memoir for the scoping discussion – it will also prevent officers from having to repeat what the process is etc.

Agenda Item 9

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

From: Ben Staines, Project and Research Officer	Report Number: MOS/17/11
To: Mid Suffolk Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Date of meeting: 17 August 2017

FORWARD PLAN FOR 2017/2018

The table below is a draft of the forward plan for the Mid Suffolk Overview and Scrutiny Committee. This table will be reviewed at each meeting and could be amended in the light of new items arising or as a result of items on the Forthcoming Decisions List being selected for scrutiny.

Date of Committee – 17 August 2017

Topic	Purpose	Lead Officer	Joint Strategic plan reference
Review of Western Suffolk Community Safety Partnership (WSCSP)	For the members to consider the actions of the Western CSP and in doing so fulfil the requirement for the Committee to meet at least once every 12 months in their role as the Crime and Disorder Committee.	Melanie Yolland - Communities Officer (Safe) and Safeguarding Lead and Prevent Lead. (The chair if WSCSP, Cllr Robert Everitt, will also attend).	Continued support for health and wellbeing outcomes that prevent interventions.
Scoping a review of voids	To scope the area and identify how Overview and Scrutiny (O&S) could add value to the process.	Sue Lister – Corporate Manager Housing Options Justin Wright-Newton – Corporate Manager Babergh and Mid Suffolk Building Services.	Make best use of our existing Housing assets
Update from Development Control on Planning Appeals	To inform members of the Committee of the position on planning appeals and report on the actions taken to address the matters highlighted when the matter was before Joint scrutiny in December 2016.	Tom Barker – Assistant Director – Planning for Growth; Philip Isbell – Corporate Manager – Growth and Sustainable Planning	Agree where growth goes; unlock barriers to growth;

Date of Committee – 14 September 2017

Topic	Purpose	Lead Officer	Joint Strategic plan reference
Voids review	Members to receive a report as scoped at the August meeting.	Sue Lister – Corporate Manager Housing Options Justin Wright-Newton – Corporate Manager Babergh and Mid Suffolk Building Services.	Make best use of our existing Housing assets
Supporting Business Growth	To look at how business rates retention could be maximised and how the growth of micro-businesses could be supported.	Lee Carvell – Corporate Manager - Open for Business	Engage with and support business to thrive; Increased understanding of local businesses and their needs.

Date of Committee – 19 October 2017

Topic	Purpose	Lead Officer	Joint Strategic plan reference
Neighbourhood plans	The Corporate Manager – Community Planning and Heritage was asked to report back on progress on the recommendations made by the Joint Scrutiny Committee in April 2017.	William Newman - Corporate Manager – Strategic Planning	Communities engaged as early as possible - community led planning
Community Engagement	Senior Leadership Team were asked to report back regarding the recommendations from the Joint Scrutiny Committee in April 2017.	Mike Evans – Strategic Director	Provide insight of growth benefits to Communities and Communities embrace new homes growth.
Community grants	The Corporate Manager – Strong and Safe Communities was asked to report back following a 'health check' of the groups receiving grants.	Sue Clements - Corporate Manager – Strong and Safe Communities	Targeted grants and funding to support Community capacity building; Community led solutions to deliver services and manage assets.

Performance management	To consider the performance measures that have been developed since the matter was considered at the July meeting of the Committee.	Karen Coll - Corporate Manager – Business Improvement (Communities)	Intelligence-based community insight and outcome-focused performance management.
------------------------	---	---	--

Date of Committee – 16 November 2017

Topic	Purpose	Lead Officer	Joint Strategic plan reference
CIL	Review of the impact and delivery of the CIL regime for Infrastructure	William Newman - Corporate Manager – Strategic Planning	Agree where growth goes
Review of the effectiveness of preparations for the introduction of the Homelessness Reduction Act	To review the actions that are being taken to prepare for the anticipated impacts of the Homelessness Reduction Act being implemented in April 2018	Heather Sparrow – Corporate Manager - Homeless Prevention and Older Persons	Make best use of our existing Housing assets
Scoping a review of the Legal Services Partnership.	To identify what the Committee would want to look at in this review and also what the aims, objectives and desired outcomes, of the review would be.	Emily Yule - Assistant Director – Law and Governance.	Financially sustainable Councils; Strengthened and clear governance to enable delivery.

Date of Committee – 14 December 2017

Topic	Purpose	Lead Officer	Joint Strategic plan reference
Review of the Legal Services Partnership.	To carry out the review in accordance with the aims, objectives and desired outcomes identified in the scoping carried out at the November 2017 meeting.	Assistant Director – Law and Governance.	Financially sustainable Councils; Strengthened and clear governance to enable delivery.

Topics identified for review by O&S but not currently timetabled:

Babergh and Mid Suffolk Building Services.

Plan for this to be reviewed 12 months after the implementation of the services, in April 2018.

Home Ownership Review.

This was on the forthcoming decisions List for July 2017 but has been deferred for Cabinet consideration in August 2017.

Performance and Risk

It was decided at the July 2017 meeting that officers would report to the committee again when the performance measures had been refined to ensure the correct measures were being monitored.

Investment Strategy

It was agreed at the July 2017 meeting that this would be included in the forward plan at an as yet to be determined date.

Authorship:

Ben Staines
Project and Research Officer

Tel: 01449 724572
E-mail: ben.staines@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk