



Leicester  
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
HOUSING SCRUTINY COMMISSION

Held: TUESDAY, 26 AUGUST 2025 at 5:30 pm

P R E S E N T :

Councillor O'Neill (Chair)  
Councillor Bajaj (Vice Chair)

Councillor Aqbany

Councillor Gregg

Councillor Gopal

\* \* \* \* \*

**32. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Cllrs Mahesh and Zaman.

**33. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

The Chair asked members to declare any interests in the proceedings. Cllr Aqbany declared a potential conflict regarding the agenda items because he lived in a council house.

**34. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

The Chair highlighted that the minutes of the special meeting held on 12 June 2025, and the HSC meeting held on 10 July 2025 were included in the agenda pack. She asked members to confirm whether the minutes were an accurate record.

AGREED:

It was agreed that the referenced minutes were an accurate record.

**35. CHAIRS ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chair informed that an email had been sent to non-commission members inviting questions regarding the Housing Regulatory Inspection, but no questions had been submitted, nor were any non-members in attendance. She also noted that this matter would be addressed at the special council meeting scheduled for 1 September 2025.

### **36. QUESTIONS, REPRESENTATIONS AND STATEMENTS OF CASE**

It was noted that none had been received.

### **37. PETITIONS**

It was noted that none had been received.

### **38. HOUSING REGULATORY INSPECTION UPDATE**

The Director of Housing presented a report to update the commission on the outcome of the Regulator of Social Housing's initial inspection of the Council's landlord function, along with the action plan to address identified assurance gaps.

It was noted that:

- The RSH regulations came into effect in April 2024 for Local Authorities with housing stock. Following an inspection of the Council's landlord function, Leicester had received a C3 judgment, as anticipated, equivalent to the judgment received by comparable authorities, including Bristol, Nottingham, and Sheffield.
- In the judgment, which was announced on 30 July 2025, the Regulator recognised the significant work underway toward compliance and praised the council for its open and transparent approach. The regulator was also complimentary about the council's work in meeting the standards for the delivery of services.
- The Regulator was assured that the consumer standards were being met in safety and quality, with legal compliance in gas safety, smoke and carbon monoxide safety, fire safety, water safety and lift safety.
- The Housing division demonstrated an understanding of the diverse needs of tenants, taking into account their views in the decision-making process. The Regulator was also assured that the Council deals effectively with Anti-Social Behaviour, further to which the Council was deemed fully compliant with the Neighbourhood and Community standards.
- For the Tenancy standard, the Regulator saw evidence that Leicester was offering tenancies that were compatible with the purpose of its accommodation, the needs of individual households, sustainability of the community, and efficient use of the housing stock. Leicester's mutual exchange processes also met the required outcome of the tenancy standards. Leicester was similarly deemed fully compliant with this standard.

- Only two of the four standards had gaps and issues identified, i.e., Safety and Quality; and Transparency, Influence, and Accountability.
- Under the Safety and Quality Standards, the following areas of improvement were identified:
  - Improved evidence needed on stock condition using the Housing Health and Safety Rating System (HHSRS), to demonstrate that homes were free from Category 1 hazards and give assurance in the level of decent homes.
  - For Electrical Installation Condition Report (EICR) to be completed on a 5-year cycle for all domestic homes.
  - Requirement of additional oversight of Health and Safety performance.
  - Need to strengthen repairs and maintenance services.
- Under the Transparency, Influence and Accountability standards, the following gaps were identified;
  - Additional performance information to tenants
  - Increased opportunities for tenants to scrutinise and influence services.
  - Enhanced complaints handling and reporting.
  - Formalised reporting on learning from complaints.
- The highlighted gaps had already been identified by the Council through a self-assessment before the inspection, and the Housing Division had already commenced work towards compliance since the introduction of the Regulator in 2024. The Regulator was advised of these self-assessed gaps, along with an action plan for addressing them and the required timescales to become compliant in relation to the entire standard.
- Despite detailed evidence of stock knowledge, the Regulator did not accept this due to the absence of HHSRS inspections. Although 500 HHSRS inspections showed no Category 1 hazards, the Regulator still did not consider this sufficient evidence. To date, 1,000 inspections had been completed with no Category 1 hazards found, supporting the Council's belief in 99.5% Decent Home compliance.
- The Regulator also declined to accept the fact that the Council was already 27% compliant for EICR checks and had a full programme that meets the new standards requirement, notwithstanding that this requirement was not mandatory before 2024.
- As of 31 March 2025, given increased demand and lack of craft staff and contractor resources, the Council had about 5000 outstanding out of category repairs (none of which were category 1 or emergency) and 1254 damp and mould out-of-category repairs. As of 31 July, these numbers had significantly reduced to 589 damp and mould repairs and 4,191 out-of-category repairs, respectively.

- The Housing Division had engaged contractors to reduce these numbers further, and it was anticipated that by the end of 2025, all damp and mould out-of-category repairs, and by early 2026, all repairs and maintenance that are out of category, would have been addressed
- From a Transparency, Influence, and Accountability perspective, in the last 12 months, a new tenant scrutiny panel had been introduced and was now up and running. There were also pop-up Housing Officers and two new engagement officers to enhance tenant engagement. Two new communication officers had also been recently recruited to boost tenants' communication.
- On complaints, the whole corporate complaints team had now moved under the Housing Division and was in the process of putting in place correct staffing levels, additional training, a new IT system, and reporting to enable the Council to meet the requirements of reviewing and assessing the type of complaints, as well as lessons learned from that. These will be fully in place over the next 12 months to ensure compliance.
- The Council would be subject to regular engagement and oversight with the regulator, who would monitor compliance with meeting the standards.
- Internally, a Regulator of Social Housing Oversight Board, headed by the Strategic Director, had been set up, reporting to the Deputy City Mayor, Housing, Economy and Neighbourhoods, as well as the Executive. This Oversight Board was proposing to provide progress reports to the Housing Scrutiny Commission alongside detailed reports relevant to the different areas.

In response to questions and comments, the following points were made:

- In reaching its judgment, the Regulator attended two Housing Scrutiny meetings to hear about detailed reports, met with the tenant Scrutiny Panel, and held behind-closed-door sessions with tenants to allow tenants' feedback in relation to services. The Regulator also met with officers across the Housing Division over the course of two days. Finally, they met partners who provide services, including police and community safety.
- It was emphasised by members that tenants' participation was important in shaping services. The Director of Housing assured that officers were proactively ensuring this, and tenants had different channels for reaching officers, including pop-up housing offices, where queries were dealt with on site. The Council had consistently engaged tenants more broadly across the whole of the estate and was identifying champions that could be worked with.
- The distinction between tenants and leaseholders was clarified: the Council, as the landlord, was responsible for repairs,

maintenance, and management of the building where its tenants were, whereas the leaseholder, as homeowner, would be responsible for paying for repairs and maintaining the property, particularly internally. In blocks that the Council was responsible for, leaseholders would need to share the cost of any work undertaken. A leaseholder could potentially be responsible for peripherals, i.e., they could be charged for maintenance of externals beyond their core block.

- In response to the cost of repairs being high, it was noted that the increased cost of engaging craft operatives and current inflation were contributory factors to this. The Council always looked to get the best value and multiple quotes where work is externalised and consulting leaseholders on costs and processes.
- The pop-up housing programme was widely marketed; however, more could be done, including some information going out with the rent statements. A review would also be conducted to determine whether the units were in the right places and if there was a need for additional units or expansion.
- One key area that had been identified was the requirement to undertake 5-yearly EICR inspections. Currently, the council was 27% compliant, and it would have been impossible to achieve 100% across the council stock at the time of the inspection, since the requirement was only introduced in April 2024.
- Other unitary authorities with large stockholding and the same capacity and financial situation as the Leicester City Council were unable to complete, and the Council's expectation was that the Regulator would recognise this in its judgement however this did not happen.
- The Council had always adopted a risk-based approach in checking electrical safety and was therefore confident that its housing stock was safe, e.g., no property has electrical wiring that was older than 30 years old, EICRs were conducted when a property was being let or during mutual exchanges, minor works certificates and electrical installation certificates were issued, and tenants could report electrical faults directly. Tenants also had the opportunity to report concerns to members.
- Leicester housing stock had had £169m investment over the last 10 years, and the Council had detailed information on the different property elements, including roofs, windows, boilers, electric, and their respective lifecycles. Within the decent homes lifecycle, the following replacements had been carried out: 98.2% doors and windows, 92% replacement of central heating, 91.2% electricals (though over 3500 households refused because of its disruptive nature) and 88% kitchens and 77% bathrooms. Additionally, 74% roofs did not exceed 50 years. The following substantiated the Council's position that it did have decent homes.
- The HHSRS and 5 yearly inspections was not a mandatory requirement under the Housing Act 2004 and was introduced as a tool to identify category 1 hazards. The Council had previously

done this a different way but would now undertake the HHRS inspection across its stock. About 1000 had been carried out, with the expectation of fully completing over the next 3 years. The data obtained from this process would be fed into a new IT system to replace the existing data knowledge.

- Operational Tenant satisfaction with repairs remained high at 94%, with only 0.24% of repairs leading to complaints.
- The new legislation has increased the workload and broadened the responsibilities of the Council as a social landlord through the requirement of more preventative work, a 5-year cycle for EICR, and the upcoming Awaab's law. All of these needed to be responded to with the limited resources available.
- Most of the out-of-category repairs had been visited to identify actual risk to tenants.
- The council utilised other councils' inspection outcomes to feed into its self-assessment and identify areas linked to the actual standards. This was beneficial in the drawing up of a robust action plan and identifying solutions.
- There were plans to improve on tenant engagement. In addition to the previously mentioned strategies, including pop-up offices and recruitment of communication officers, it was imperative to ensure that the right performance information was communicated, there was a clear strategy of how people can engage, as well as the incorporation of tenants' input/feedback.
- The complaints process had now been brought under the Housing Division, as opposed to being managed by different departments within the Council. There was an annual report that goes to the Governance and Audit committee, which set out most complaints and timelines for response. The Council was currently about 75% compliant in meeting the timescales.
- Other unitary authorities with a similar-sized stock, and who owned and managed their own stockholding, had received a C3 rating, and this put into context the circumstances surrounding the stock, including age, HRA, the ability to raise funds, etc. Hence, statistically, more councils got C3 than any other grade.
- Officers were encouraged to take into consideration the needs of disabled tenants when carrying out inspections like EICR.
- The council acknowledged ongoing issues in relation to domestic refuse, recycling, and the work to manage the same.
- It was noted that the tenant scrutiny panel's preference for participation in the Council's scrutiny process was either to attend an HSC meeting to provide some feedback on different issues or to send the notes from the entire scrutiny panel for the commission to view.
- The Council was expected to formally report to the Regulator the outcomes and feedback from the Tenants' Scrutiny Panel. The intention was for the Tenants' Scrutiny Panel to be representative of the different estates, and part of the role of the new team being set up would involve visiting the estate to investigate how people

wanted to be engaged locally, to accommodate their different needs. In terms of areas of interest, the Panel wanted to scrutinize and input into performance, environmental budget, allocation policy, inspection outcomes, etc. Ultimately, the agenda was set by them.

- Tenants' satisfaction surveys were undertaken on 100% of repairs. The plan was to extend these surveys to other service areas. The annual satisfaction survey, which was a requirement of the regulator, has just been concluded, and the questions covered the different service areas.

AGREED:

- 1) That the report be noted
- 2) That comments made by members of the Commission be taken into account by lead officers
- 3) Provide regular dashboard reports on the HHRS inspection to the Commission
- 4) Present tenancy scrutiny engagement outcomes to the Commission in 6 months, including proposals to integrate the tenant scrutiny engagement with the Council's scrutiny function
- 5) Provide a future report on lessons learned from the complaints process and from other councils in similar situations.

### **39. WHO GETS SOCIAL HOUSING**

The Director of Housing submitted a report that provided an update on the 'headline' Housing Register and Lettings data, relating to Leicester City Council's Housing Register, for the 2024/2025 financial year.

Key Points included:

- There had been a national 3% increase across the households on registers.
- This was the highest number nationally since 2014.
- The average waiting time (nationally) for a suitable let was 2.9 years.
- In 2024/2025, Leicester's average wait in Band 1 was 18 months for a 2-bed property, 22 months for a 3-bed property and 25 months for a 4-bed property. These averages were shorter than the national average.
- The Housing Register was a register of need rather than a waiting list. The number on the waiting list was just over 6,000. This was a reduction of 5% at the same time in the previous year.
- There had been a reduction in households on the register, but there had been a 7% increase in homeless households.
- The numbers in Band 1 were 5% higher than the previous year,

the numbers in Band 2 were down 1% on the previous year, and the numbers in Band 3 had remained consistent.

- Overcrowding was the biggest reason for people being on the register; however, there had been a 4% reduction in this since last year. Work had been done on overcrowding, such as the EasyMove scheme, which involved people exchanging properties for ones that were more mutually suitable.
- 'Housing need' was driven by population growth and socio-economic factors, whereas 'Housing demand' was based on where people wanted to live.
- People could choose which properties they wished to bid on. People were advised to bid as often and as widely as possible to maximise the chance of being rehoused.
- The highest housing need was for three-bed properties.
- Family-sized housing was the most in-demand.
- The demand for wheelchair accommodation outstripped supply. It was aimed to source more of this.
- Those requiring partially adapted accommodation were achieving lets at a higher rate than their representation on the register.
- The number of lettings in the last 12 months had increased by 13%, largely due to an increase in build schemes.
- Band 1 had the highest proportion of people achieving lets. 65% of these were homeless or at risk of homelessness. This was an increase of 12% on the same time in the previous year.
- New Parks had the most lettings, followed by Belgrave and Rushey Mead.
- The average waiting times were only a guide and there were many variables on individual cases.
- The amount of time on the register was dependent on the activity and choices of the applicants.
- Waiting times had slightly decreased for wheelchair accommodation, and there had been an additional seven lettings to households for this kind of accommodation compared to 2023.24.
- Leicester Home Choice (our choice-based lettings scheme) was provided with 50% of all available Housing Association properties and this was monitored.

The Commission were invited to ask questions and make comments. Key points included:

- The Allocations Policy served as the rulebook on how to allocate housing fairly and transparently. Bands were based on priority and did not factor in characteristics such as age or gender. This policy was published online and accessible by the public. The approach taken was based on personal circumstances, and if



people did not agree with it, they could challenge it.

- If circumstances changed, people could submit these changes and be reassessed. Additionally, if people went over the income threshold, they could be updated.
- The policy was consulted on and reviewed to ensure it was current.
- Much work had been done on reducing long waiting times. A housing crisis had been declared, and there were not enough homes to meet needs. Therefore, schemes of acquisitions had been undertaken. Additionally, the mutual exchange scheme had been undertaken to help with the suitability of accommodation, and people in private rented accommodation were worked with to ensure that they did not lose priority on the list. Further work was done on temporary accommodation and homelessness.
- Preparation work was being done with landlords on the Renters Rights Bill to offer reassurance and to work with them to bring people into the system.
- Once the bidding cycle opened, there was no preference for those bidding early. Once bids closed, they were then processed into a list based on band and time at which point those who had been on the highest banding that had bid waiting longest were given priority.
- The more properties that were bid on, the more opportunities they were to be chosen.
- In terms of the number of people in need of adapted homes, these people were served better than some other categories. Adapted properties are only available for those with this specific need to bid on.
- Families were worked with to adapt the properties they lived in. Additionally, adapted and adaptable properties were acquired as part of the new-build scheme.
- When it came to Council land, the council would build a high quota of adaptable/adapted homes in them.
- Adult Social Care and Children's Social Care were worked with to look at the issue holistically.
- The number of properties from new-build schemes had increased the supply of properties.
- A report would be brought to the Commission on the Mutual Exchange Swap Scheme.
- Priority was based on individual circumstances, which was the reason for the banding system. However, it was recognised that many people were in the same situation, which was why it was based on chronology within the band. If circumstances changed, it could impact banding, so people needed to update the Council.
- Case work was all dealt with fairly and transparently, so enquiries would be looked at to see if they required change in banding. Councillors were encouraged to explain the process to residents

and to reinforce the message that it was open and transparent alongside the pressures, waits and limited supply of Council Housing.

- It was suggested that for someone in band 3, it might be better for them to seek accommodation in the private rented sector.
- In relation to Band 2 those successful was largely age-restricted and sheltered accommodation, because that there was less demand.
- Care leavers and Looked After Children were worked with closely in order to locate properties, and the Leaving Care Team was worked with to look at sustainable options in the private rented sector.
- With regard to the EasyMove scheme, people could not be forced to take part, so incentives were needed, such as helping with moving costs, cash incentives, or the possibility of moving to a more preferable area. It was aimed to look at these on an individual basis and help to overcome barriers.
- EasyMove was only a small percentage of the exchanges that occurred. The Council also facilitated a free online national service on home-swapping that could also go across other local authorities.

AGREED:

- 1) That the report be noted.
- 2) That the comments made by members of this commission to be taken into account.

*Councillor Aqbany left the meeting during the consideration of this item.*

#### **40. REPAIRS & MAINTENANCE UPDATE**

The Heads of Service presented an update on the current position of the Repairs and Maintenance performance, including responsive repairs, voids, and damp and mould, the team's performance throughout 2024-24 and projections for 2025-26. It was noted that:

- There was new legislation around Electrical and HHSRS inspections. The team, therefore, anticipated having requests through that route.
- One of the challenges had been around vacancies (with 32 currently, which represents 10% of the Council's craft workforce). This impacted the team's capacity to undertake as many repairs

as it would like.

- A positive development was that outstanding repairs had gone down by 3,000 for total outstanding, and by over 1000 in the repairs that were out-of-category. Hence, the overall repair trend was on a positive trajectory.
- The overall repair trends had been stable, which was beneficial in predicting demands. Work was still ongoing to improve the overall position of the Repairs team.
- The four tenant satisfaction measures showed good progress in comparison to other local authorities. The transactional surveys were over 95% positive as well.
- The team was continuing work with contractors to explore additional capacity to get through the repairs. One of the major goals of the team this year was the investment in staff and an increase in the apprenticeship programme. This is due to a significant skills gap in the craft sector, and this was a way for the Council to proactively address this.
- The team was working hard to achieve its projections and targets for the year.
- On voids, it was noted that:
  - The previous reports had highlighted some improvements. Part of this improvement was the merger of the damp and mould teams within the voids team. The impact on voids had been relatively minimal, while there had been incredibly positive improvements with damp and mould.
  - It was expected that there would be a slight increase in the voids outstanding although still very low numbers, as the teams got involved in supporting voids and damp and mould works, but these projections were based on a stable resource position.
- On Damp and mould, it was noted that:
  - Awareness had heightened on damp and mould, particularly since the unfortunate passing of Awaab Ishak.
  - The Council promptly responded to remedial works, and the Service had been focused on reducing outstanding works to meet the requirements of phase 1 of Awaab's law, which would become effective from October 2025.
  - There were currently no out-of-category inspections outstanding, and there has been a significant improvement in the outstanding remedials, which at the time of the report sat at 689 outstanding, and 546 out of category.
  - 47% of all live remedials outstanding had been visited, in addition to initial inspections to survey for materials, undertake damp and mould cleaning or commence remedial repairs.

- The projection was to clear all out-of-category remedials by December 2025, based on the assumption that resource was stable, contractors would continue to meet expectations, and the team would be able to gain access to properties.
- The number of reports was likely to continue to grow now that we were approaching the colder months.
- Damp and mould were linked to multiple projects because of their multifaceted nature and requiring different actions. Where vulnerabilities were identified, multi-agency meetings were held with technical services and the repairs team to brainstorm the best outcome. There was also a partnership with social work and health professionals to ensure relevant information was obtained in making informed decisions.
- One of the challenges the team continued to face was in respect to job cancellations, however, there has been an improvement in the last six months.
- Some of the changes that would be introduced by Awaab's law from 27 October 2025 was around timelines for investigation and the steps that must be taken by the Council as a social landlord in relation to damp and mould (detailed in the report). Further extensions would be introduced by Awaab's law in 2026 and 2027.

The Commission were invited to ask questions and make comments. Key points included:

- In reference to complaints around hot water, particularly in the shower, and heating, it was explained that showers were normally set to a regulated temperature to prevent scalding. Delays to radiators may impact areas served by district heating due to their special design. Members were encouraged to report any individual cases.
- Tenants could opt out of Light House by discussing it with the relevant housing officer.
- Performance was measured through KPIs shared in the senior management meeting. The team also periodically attended members' briefings and Executive meetings to provide updates, as well as brought reports to the Housing Scrutiny Commission.
- There had been improvements with satisfaction levels; however, the team wanted to increase the types of transactional surveys and response rates so that the service could have a live dialogue of feedback from customers, feed that into the dashboard, and extract quantitative information; as a future way to shape service. Additionally, there were plans to liaise more with the tenant scrutiny panel to get feedback.

- The team was aware of the demand coming in and was building the repairs team to meet these demands through the apprenticeship programme, building its contractor base etc.
- Regarding what could be done to reduce the tide of tenant cancellations, the plan was to reverse engineer the process and work backwards to better understand the tenants' needs and requirements, utilising information from the different types of surveys and feedback. This would also involve adopting effective and suitable communication techniques.
- Tenants were normally informed at the beginning of tenancies about the potential need for contractor access for repairs. One of the reasons for cancellations was due to the chaotic lifestyle of some tenants with complex needs, which subsequently impacted their ability to maintain appointments. The council supported such cases through the STAR service. The Council also had an access procedure that could be invoked where a tenant continually refused access.

**AGREED:**

- 1) That the report be noted.
- 2) That comments made by members of this commission to be taken into account.
- 3) The Council's approach to implementing Awaab's Law to be added to the work programme.

#### **41. MAINTENANCE CHARGES**

The Head of Service presented a report summarising the findings from the review of cleaning and associated charges for communal areas in council-owned accommodation, and the improvements to the service. It was noted that:

- Not every communal area was normally cleaned, because following the initial consultation with tenants when the service was first set up, some opted out to avoid additional charges.
- The need for this review arose after the New Parks enquiry on the level of cleaning. The service identified that the level of cleaning needed to be enhanced to meet the changing service needs.
- A review of the service had not been carried out since its introduction and the level of service had not been formally assessed.
- The tenancy satisfaction measure for satisfaction with communal areas was 49% and had increased to 70% this year as a result of the enhanced cleaning that took place.
- The council cleaned over 50 sites, and 550 properties were charged for communal cleaning.

- The review had led to enhanced cleaning at the Burns Flat, and this standard was now being rolled out across the city.
- It was discovered that in sheltered housing the service was not charging tenants the full cost of cleaning.
- The Service used the opportunity of review to see if flats that had previously opted out were interested in opting back in, because the Council was still having to carry out intensive cleaning in those communal areas, funded through the HRA.
- Formal monitoring arrangements were now in place with the Housing and Cleaning staff who meet regularly on the estate to ensure standards were being maintained.
- The Service was engaging with tenants to get their feedback so that issues could be picked up on quickly and brought to monitoring meetings.
- An annual review would take place to ensure services aligned with charges.
- A special project was planned for an in-depth review of all sheltered housing charges and the service provided.

In response to questions and comments, it was noted that:

- Sheltered housing units were cleaned every weekday, while other blocks were cleaned once or twice a week.
- Maintenance charges were calculated based on time and frequency, and areas that needed to be cleaned.
- The council ensured transparency through listing the charges payable on the rent invoices that went out to tenants.
- In relation to how the charges could be minimised in view of the cost-of-living situation, it was noted that this was normally considered within the HRA budget report on an annual basis, and tenants were engaged with for ways to support. However, it was emphasised that the rising inflation and increase in wages had to be considered.
- It was recommended that formal tenant engagement in big blocks around the city should be carried out to ensure the residents were getting value for money. This should also be considered through the Tenant Scrutiny panel, since the issues can be specific to the areas they live in.

AGREED:

1. That the report be noted.
2. That comments made by members of this commission to be taken into account.
3. Feedback to be provided to the Commission on how the Council benchmarks maintenance charges against other Local Authorities or Housing Providers

4. Other maintenance charges to be brought to future meetings.

## **42. WATER HYGIENE REPORT**

The Director of Housing submitted a report to provide an update on how the Housing Division managed water hygiene safety in its communal areas and tenants' homes.

The Commission were invited to ask questions and make comments. Key points included:

- Legionella was a key risk, and as such, the report had focused on it.
- Of the 1500 communal areas, only 36 had a water supply, so the legionella risk assessment was done on those blocks.
- All assessments were complete and reviewed on an ongoing cyclical programme on a three-yearly basis. There was confidence that all requirements were met.
- It was not mandatory to run checks on individual homes, but a 10%-sample was taken of individual homes, usually when they were void. 81% of the housing stock did not have stored water (i.e. no tank in the loft). Overall, the remaining stock with stored water was at higher risk, and the strategy was to remove stored water as much as possible. There was confidence that of the stock with stored water, 96% was low risk from a water hygiene perspective.
- It was being looked at to remove stored water from sheltered housing and replace it with a different system.
- A Legionella Risk Assessment was carried out in voids. With proper management in place, all risks could be effectively mitigated. However, the long-term goal was to fully and fundamentally design out these risks—a process that would take time. In the meantime, mitigations were carried out to control risks to an acceptable level.
- Communications were carried out with tenants to advise them on water hygiene advice that could be followed, such as flushing out showers when a person had been away for a number of weeks.

AGREED:

- 1) That the report be noted.
- 2) That comments made by members of this commission to be taken into account.

## **43. WORK PROGRAMME**

The chair invited members to make suggestions on items that they wished to be included in the work programme. The work programme was noted.

#### **44. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 19.50.