

Leicester City Council

Scrutiny Review

A short review of progress and performance relating to
void times in city council housing stock

November 2015

Background to scrutiny reviews

To be completed by the Member proposing the review		
1.	Title of the proposed scrutiny review	Progress and performance relating to void times in city council housing stock
2.	Proposed by	Cllr Paul Newcombe
3.	Rationale Why do you want to undertake this review?	<p>State what prompted the review e.g. media interest /public feedback / new legislation / performance information.</p> <p>Voids and void times are a matter of on-going interest for ward members, members of the scrutiny commission and tenants. There were known difficulties due to the failure of a contractor which required the diversion of departmental resources and caused voids times to increase.</p> <p>A short review would assess the current position, how this relates to previous performance and prospects of further improvements.</p>
4.	Purpose and aims of the review What question(s) do you want to answer and what do you want to achieve? (Outcomes?)	<p>To determine performance levels based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area housing offices • Contractor client (relevant depots) • Relevant KPIs for the service and compared with other authorities • Housing type and locations across the city, including inner and outer estates
5.	Links with corporate aims / priorities How does the review link to corporate aims and priorities? http://citymayor.leicester.gov.uk/delivery-plan-2013-14/	<p>The built and natural environment Neighbourhoods and communities Providing care and support</p>
6.	Scope Set out what is included in the scope of the review and what is not. For example which services it does and does not cover.	<p>A task group would look at a small number of cases from a range of housing offices across the city For example the task group would look at two examples within each area of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the quickest turn-round of voids • homes empty the longest • repairs completed around the average for the service

Develop a draft Project Plan to incorporate sections seven to twelve of this form		
7.	Methodology Describe the methods you will use to undertake the review. How will you undertake the review, what evidence will need to be gathered from members, officers and key stakeholders, including partners and external organisations and experts?	The inquiry will be conducted by a task group and involve at least two meetings. Evidence will be assembled into conclusions and recommendations made to the Housing Scrutiny Commission. Tenant representatives will be invited to take part in the Review Project Plan should be attached.
	Witnesses Set out who you want to gather evidence from and how you will plan to do this	Evidence would be taken from officers, local members where appropriate, tenant representatives and other interested individuals or groups. Evidence will be in the form of written reports and oral evidence to the Task Group Site visits would also be organised to look at a range of voids
8.	Timescales How long is the review expected to take to complete?	Four months
	Proposed start date	December 2015
	Proposed completion date	March 2016
9.	Resources / staffing requirements Scrutiny reviews are facilitated by Scrutiny Policy Officers and it is important to estimate the amount of their time, in weeks, that will be required in order to manage the review Project Plan effectively.	Approximately two weeks of Scrutiny Policy Officer time
	Do you anticipate any further resources will be required e.g. site visits or independent technical advice? If so, please provide details.	Site visits within the city may be organised as part of the task group review
10.	Review recommendations and findings To whom will the recommendations be addressed? E.g. Executive / External Partner?	Recommendations will be made to the executive
11.	Likely publicity arising	

	from the review - Is this topic likely to be of high interest to the media? Please explain.	This is unlikely to be a high-profile issue attracting significant media attention. However the media office will be notified routinely when reports are made to the Scrutiny Commission
12.	Publicising the review and its findings and recommendations How will these be published / advertised?	Recommendations and conclusions will be communicated to tenant representative groups and forums; A media report may be produced on the main findings and recommendations
13.	How will this review add value to policy development or service improvement?	By concentrating on an area of performance which has been of interest to members and making constructive recommendations it is hoped to achieve an improvement in the service. It is recognised that external factors (such as the 1% year on year rent reductions demanded by the government) may have a negative impact on the performance of this (and other) housing services.
To be completed by the Divisional Lead Director		
14.	Divisional Comments Scrutiny's role is to influence others to take action and it is important that Scrutiny Commissions seek and understand the views of the Divisional Director.	To come
15.	Are there any potential risks to undertaking this scrutiny review? E.g. are there any similar reviews being undertaken, on-going work or changes in policy which would supersede the need for this review?	
16.	Are you able to assist with the proposed review? If not please explain why. In terms of agreement / supporting documentation / resource availability?	
	Name	
	Role	
	Date	
To be completed by the Scrutiny Support Manager		
17.	Will the proposed scrutiny review / timescales negatively impact on other work within the Scrutiny Team? (Conflicts with other work commitments)	It is expected that this review can be supported fully by the SPO and that it is anticipated to be a fairly quick review. It is also the first review for this commission and is not likely to have any negative impact on any other work of the commission.

	Do you have available staffing resources to facilitate this scrutiny review? If not, please provide details.	Yes, the SPO should be able to adequately support this review.
	Name	Kalvaran Sandhu
	Date	3 rd December 2015

DRAFT