

SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSIONS	DEPARTMENT AND CABINET MEMBER RESPONDING	ACCEPT/ REJECT RECOMMENDATIONS (inc. reasons for rejection)	IDENTIFIED OFFICER	ANY FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS	TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS IF ACCEPTED (ie Action Plan)	DATE OF SCRUTINY MEETING TO REPORT BACK
Report: 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.				

Report: 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</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><i>perspective to national, regional and sub-regional bodies, feeding back insights and learning to inform the Council's decision-making.'</i></p> <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>				
2. To meet the Executive Mayors central priority of creating a Council that listens to residents, there needs	The Committee were of the view that more detail was required to effectively scrutinise the plans resulting from the Executive Mayor's	Mayor Jason Perry	A new Corporate Plan is currently in development and will be supported by the development of a new	Elaine Jackson			

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>to be an overarching Community Engagement Strategy to guide when and how the Council will engage with the local community. This 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>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>communications and engagement strategy setting out how the Council will engage with the local community.</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</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
	community engagement but felt that this lacked detail						
<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</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>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>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</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>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</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>dependent on the Secretary of State's response to the Executive Mayor's letter on the matter. The 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>				No	<p>actions being taken to return the Council to financial sustainability.</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</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</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</p>	<p>Nick Hibberd</p>	<p>The SPD2 revocation Cabinet Report sets out the final implications at paragraphs 5.1.5 & 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
Streets, Environment & Homes Sub-Committee.	<p>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 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>Regeneration Bill will need to be considered once the content and requirements of the final Act are known.</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		
8. That a risk analysis on the revocation of SPD2 was provided to the Streets, Environment & Homes Sub-Committee including timescales for the replacement guidance to be enacted.	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.	Councillor Jeet Bains	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.	Nick Hibberd	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>Members were 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>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</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
	on this were forthcoming						
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		Councillor Lynne Hale	<p>ACCEPT</p> <p>A risk based evaluation has already been undertaken which has informed our approach.</p>	Susmita Sen	Financial implications of accepting the recommendation were outlined in the June 2022 Repairs	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
model proposed by the Council offers the best outcomes for residents.			<p>The evaluation identified that the best outcome for residents would be achieved by continuing to contract services from 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>		Reprocurement Cabinet report.		
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		Councillor Lynne Hale	<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>	Susmita Sen	Not applicable	Review of performance undertaken annually, the first review being after the first full year of operation – 2024/25.	

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
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		Councillor Lynne Hale	<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) 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.</p>	Susmita Sen	Not applicable	<p>Reviews already undertaken as part of the preparation for tender.</p> <p>Review of best practice should be an ongoing exercise, with specific focus at the annual reviews.</p> <p>The first annual review will be after the first full year of operation – 2024/25</p>	
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>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		Councillor Lynne Hale	<p>REJECT</p> <p>We recognise that the complaints system has not always worked for residents. As part of the</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
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.			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				
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

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
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	<p style="text-align: center;">REJECT</p> <p>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 best outcomes for residents.</p>	Susmita Sen			
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	<p style="text-align: center;">ACCEPT</p> <p>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.</p>	Susmita Sen	Not applicable	<p style="text-align: center;">Complete.</p> <p>Resident focus groups help shape the expectation which is within the tender documents. Residents are part of the evaluation panel to assess tenders</p>	
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	<p style="text-align: center;">ACCEPT</p>	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 st 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		Councillor Lynne Hale	<p style="text-align: center;">REJECT</p> <p>The cabinet paper already recognises the uncertainties in the</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
the uncertainty in both the national and world economy.			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 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	REJECT 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. We would want to keep Members abreast of the procurement development ahead of final contract award.	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	REJECT Scrutiny have had the opportunity to shape the KPIs through the scrutiny meetings. If there are further	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
			recommendations they can be considered as these are developed.				