

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee: Holding the Executive to Account

Scrutiny Monitoring – 16 December 2021

Date	Portfolio	Title	Action proposed	Action Taken	Progress Status
11/11/21	Communities, Culture & Heritage	Townhill Park Regeneration - Update	<p>1) That the Committee are provided with information relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The number of people on Southampton's housing waiting list who have indicated that they are interested in Shared Ownership. b. Whether the increase in Shared Ownership tenure properties at Townhill Park will decrease the overall number of Affordable Rent properties in Southampton. c. How the number and percentage of family homes (3 bedrooms +) for plots 2,9 and 10 has changed from the original proposals. 	<p>a). The Council stopped asking this question in 2016. (Possibly because shared ownership was administered by the Help to Buy agent, and SCC didn't offer shared ownership at this time)</p> <p>In 2016 395 applicants indicated they would be interested in Shared Ownership. (Some of these applications are very old and some applicants themselves may not be eligible for a mortgage.)</p> <p>Since 2016, there are were a further 242 applicants who stated their income comes from employment only and who have savings of more than £1000. Income status/savings bracket is the only guide to indicate potential suitability for Shared Ownership for recent applicants to the register now that an interest in Shared Ownership is no longer identified.</p> <p>b) It seems likely that an increase in Shared Ownership properties on sites which were previously council social or affordable rental properties will decrease Affordable rent properties in the city. However, Shared Ownership (Intermediate Housing), social and affordable all fall under the category of Affordable housing according to the Homes England definition.</p>	

Date	Portfolio	Title	Action proposed	Action Taken	Progress Status																								
				<p>c) Total numbers of all homes proposed for plots 2, 9 and 10</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1339 331 1872 568"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1339 331 1514 416">Plot</th> <th data-bbox="1514 331 1688 416">Previous Proposals</th> <th data-bbox="1688 331 1872 416">Current Proposals</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1339 416 1514 467">Plot 2</td> <td data-bbox="1514 416 1688 467">213</td> <td data-bbox="1688 416 1872 467">202</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1339 467 1514 518">Plot 9</td> <td data-bbox="1514 467 1688 518">48</td> <td data-bbox="1688 467 1872 518">53</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1339 518 1514 568">Plot 10</td> <td data-bbox="1514 518 1688 568">20</td> <td data-bbox="1688 518 1872 568">20</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1339 568 1872 687">All homes are now National Design Space Standards which are larger than previously designed.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1339 738 1872 975"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1339 738 1431 823">Plot</th> <th data-bbox="1431 738 1641 823">Previous number & %</th> <th data-bbox="1641 738 1872 823">Current numbers & %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1339 823 1431 874">P2</td> <td data-bbox="1431 823 1641 874">37 No = 17%</td> <td data-bbox="1641 823 1872 874">27 = 13%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1339 874 1431 925">P9</td> <td data-bbox="1431 874 1641 925">39 No = 81%</td> <td data-bbox="1641 874 1872 925">21 No = 40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1339 925 1431 975">P10</td> <td data-bbox="1431 925 1641 975">20 No = 100%</td> <td data-bbox="1641 925 1872 975">20 No = 100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1339 975 1872 1099">The total % of 3 bed + has changed previous 96 No = 34% current 68 No = 25%</p>	Plot	Previous Proposals	Current Proposals	Plot 2	213	202	Plot 9	48	53	Plot 10	20	20	Plot	Previous number & %	Current numbers & %	P2	37 No = 17%	27 = 13%	P9	39 No = 81%	21 No = 40%	P10	20 No = 100%	20 No = 100%	
Plot	Previous Proposals	Current Proposals																											
Plot 2	213	202																											
Plot 9	48	53																											
Plot 10	20	20																											
Plot	Previous number & %	Current numbers & %																											
P2	37 No = 17%	27 = 13%																											
P9	39 No = 81%	21 No = 40%																											
P10	20 No = 100%	20 No = 100%																											
			<p>2) That the Administration re-invigorates engagement with schools in the locality of Townhill Park and ensures that it gives due consideration to proposals to support the maintenance and growth of the schools moving forward.</p>	<p>Contact with the schools will continue. Currently, we have been waiting to receive the new draft design proposals confirming the numbers of homes and the programme for Plots 2, 9 & 10 before the next meeting with the schools. This will be scheduled in the near future.</p>																									

Date	Portfolio	Title	Action proposed	Action Taken	Progress Status
			3) That the Cabinet Member looks at Hinkler Parade estate regeneration, and the tenure mix within the development, to help inform the approach at Townhill Park.	Information is being gathered on Hinkler Parade to be sent to the Cabinet Member.	
			4) That, for the benefit of the local community, the Administration: a. Publishes an indicative timetable for the future development of Townhill Park as soon as possible. b. Improves engagement with the local community.	a) A review of options for the future sites in Townhill Park is underway and further information will be made available when this has been more fully developed. b) There has been a significant improvement in the engagement with the local community in Townhill Park over the last two years with the involvement of a dedicated Property Communications officer. This has resulted in a wide range of communication routes including bulletins, consultation surveys, Facebook groups and press releases. This is kept under review and the council is always looking to find ways of improvement.	
11/11/21	Communities, Culture & Heritage	1,000 Additional Parking Spaces	1) That the Administration does not release information within the public domain on the siting of additional parking spaces until the list of sites is confirmed and shared with all Members.	A provisional list will be shared with all members before it is shared with the public.	
			2) That the Administration engages with local communities on greening and place making measures for the confirmed sites.	This will happen as sites are progressed.	
			3) That the Committee are provided with an indicative timetable for the installation of electric vehicle charging infrastructure for the confirmed sites for additional car parking spaces.	To be reviewed with Place colleagues as the sites are agreed	

Date	Portfolio	Title	Action proposed	Action Taken	Progress Status
			<p>4) That the Committee are provided with details on the schemes that have been slipped in the HRA Capital Programme to fund the additional parking spaces programme.</p>	<p>For the 2021/22 year there were a number of lines in the capital programme that were showing an underspend, largely because of difficulties completing this work due to COVID19, therefore funds from those lines have been used to fund the parking spaces that will be delivered in this year.</p> <p>The funding for the remaining parking spaces for programme to be delivered in 2022/23 have been built into the capital programme.</p>	
			<p>5) That the financial assumptions upon which the overall budget for the programme is based are circulated to the Committee (para 16).</p>	<p>The assumptions that have been used are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. HRA vs GF - The split of cost between the HRA and the GF was based on an initial list of possible sites across the city. From the outset it was known that this was an 'assumption' that would need to be reviewed as the project progressed and sites were assessed for deliverability. 2. The timing of the project was assumed for delivery across 2021/22 and 2022/23. Initially an estimated split of cost across the 2 years was made, and has been revised as sites have been assessed and a likely delivery schedule is developed. 3. The average cost was assumed to be £5k per space, based on previous costs of delivering parking spaces by the housing team. Again, this was an assumption made at a time when individual sites had not been visited or worked up, procurement had not been 	

Date	Portfolio	Title	Action proposed	Action Taken	Progress Status
				<p>undertaken, nor had any environmental impact assessments or mitigation measures been agreed.</p> <p>The budgets will be kept under constant review as part of the project.</p>	
11/11/21	Health & Adult Social Care	Carer Friendly Southampton	<p>1) That the Cabinet Member informs the Committee when the plans for unplanned breaks for carers will be finalised.</p>	Agreed, this is complex project. The current timescales is for an update on this in 6 months' time alongside the wider Carer Friendly Southampton actions.	
			<p>2) That the issue returns to the OSMC agenda in 6 months' time to enable the Committee to scrutinise progress.</p>	Agreed	
11/11/21	Customer Service & Transformation	Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy	<p>1) That the Administration explores opportunities to pilot a food waste collection service in advance of the expected 2024 statutory duty.</p>	The potential implementation of a food-waste trial will be considered in 2022 following the implementation of the Waste Improvement and Transformation Plan (WITP).	
			<p>2) That, when it is available, the Committee are provided with an overview of the communications plan that will support the proposed waste collection changes and the aspiration to transform recycling rates in the city.</p>	<p>Strategic work on communications is being progressed by the WITP. In particular, work has begun to improve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the reliability of data; • the analysis of data to identify barriers to effective waste management by households; and, • the use of data analysis in targeting communications. 	
			<p>3) That the Joint Municipal Waste Strategy returns to the OSMC agenda in 6 months' time to enable the Committee to review progress.</p>	The decision to adopt the JMWMS was approved by Cabinet on 15 November 2021. Approval was obtained from the Change Authority Board on 24 November 2021 to add £2.92M capital expenditure for the proposed Eastleigh MRF to the capital programme.	

Date	Portfolio	Title	Action proposed	Action Taken	Progress Status
11/11/21	Growth	Toys R Us – Commercial Terms	1) That the Cabinet Member presents to the Committee the Administration’s vision for the Mayflower Quarter when it is developed.	AR Urbanism will be carrying out changes to the plan following a further review. There will be an opportunity to share a revised approach once this is finalised in the spring of 2022.	