

## HOMES AND SAFE COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of a Remote meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> October, 2021.

The Committee agenda is available [here](#).

The Meeting recording is available [here](#).

Present: Councillor A.M. Collins (Chair); Councillor. J. Aviet (Vice-Chair); Councillors J.C. Bird, B.E. Brooks, C.A. Cave, S.M. Hanks, R. Nugent-Finn, A.C. Parker, S.D. Perkes and L.O. Rowlands.

Also present: Councillors J.M. Norman and E. Williams (Cabinet Member for Legal, Regulatory and Planning Services) C. Ireland (Citizens Advice Cardiff and Vale Representative) and W. Hennessy, V. John and H. Smith (Representatives from Tenant Working Group / Panel).

### 459 ANNOUNCEMENT –

Prior to the commencement of the business of the Committee, the Chair read the following statement: “May I remind everyone present that the meeting will be live streamed as well as recorded via the internet and this recording archived for future viewing”.

### 460 APOLOGY FOR ABSENCE –

This was received from G. Doyle (Tenant Working Group / Panel Representative).

### 461 MINUTES –

RECOMMENDED – T H A T the minutes of the meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> September, 2021 be approved as a correct record.

### 462 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST –

No declarations were received.

### 463 REVENUE AND CAPITAL MONITORING FOR THE PERIOD 1<sup>ST</sup> APRIL TO 31<sup>ST</sup> AUGUST 2021 (DEH) –

The report was presented by the Finance Support Manager concerning the position of the revenue and capital budgets for this period, informing the Committee that:

- It was forecast that all revenue budgets under the Committee’s remit would outturn on target; with the known exception of Council Fund Housing where

the CCTV savings' target could not be achieved this year, due to funding options still being considered and discussed with the Police and Crime Commissioner for South Wales (PCC). Any shortfall would be met from reserves for this year for that service;

- Welsh Government (WG) Covid-19 funding had also assisted several of the budgets under the Committee's remit in order for them to break even this financial year;
- The efficiency targets for services under this Committee were expected to be achieved this financial year;
- Regarding the Capital Programme for this Committee, there were two new, additional, programmes to note:
  - The Target Hardening Grant: the Council had received a grant of £21,450 from WG in order to purchase the relevant equipment to enable victims of domestic abuse to remain safely in their own homes; and
  - Barry Island and Cosmeston Toilets: an additional £10,000 funding had been provided from the appropriate revenue stream in order to help fund this scheme.
- There were four schemes that had partially 'slipped' from the Housing Improvement Programme for various reasons; essentially these were delayed and their budgets (approximately £15m combined) would be slipped into the next financial year for the works to be progressed and completed then.

Following the Officers' presentation, the subsequent questions and comments were raised by the Committee:

- In response to Councillor Hanks' question whether the works at Barry Island toilets had been completed, the Finance Support Manager confirmed that yes the works indeed been completed.
- Addressing the questions raised by Councillor Hanks on what was happening regarding the Long Meadow Court scheme and Holm View Phase II, the Head of Housing and Building Services explained that:
  - At Long Meadow Court, bats had been sighted within the area and a further survey was therefore required in order to obtain the necessary license. Works at the location would still commence this financial year but some slippage was required due to the works not being completed within the current financial year. The scheme entailed mostly external works (over £1m), such as external wall insulation, roofing works, external fabrics and to the environment outside the complex, following on from the works undertaken previously as part of the Welsh Housing Quality Standard (WHQS);
  - Regarding Holm View Phase II, the Council was yet to procure the works and it was unlikely that the Council would be onsite this financial year; hence the related slippage into 2022/23.
- Responding to Councillor Aviet's query on whether the Council was getting value for money from the current contract with Bridgend around CCTV, and Councillor Parker's query on how many of the old CCTV cameras were now working, the Head of Housing and Building Services replied that:
  - It was difficult to quantify the value for money the current CCTV system offered. As part of the regional approach, CCTV for the Vale was based at, and accessed from, Bridgend which posed challenges for Vale Police

officers and others. Also, the existing system was aging, but this was not as a result of the current contract in place. The original decision to work with Bridgend delivered efficiencies of scale and value for money. The cost of maintaining this system and the partnership would still be considerably less than if the Vale had gone on its own running and maintaining the CCTV system. On a positive note, the PCC had indicated in principle to provide revenue funding and monitoring of CCTV in the South Wales area, subject to certain criteria, for example, Authorities employing a regional approach to CCTV in order to bid for this funding and support. The Council had been working with Cardiff Council recently in order to explore this opportunity and the related technological issues; this would be based on a 'hub and spoke' approach, where you would have CCTV 'hubs' regionally, but local Police, Council workers and other stakeholders could access footage within their own areas without the need to travel to a single central location in order to do this. Discussions on this were well advanced, with the hope of a positive outcome being reached in the next few months.

- The number of CCTV cameras working was constantly monitored in order to maintain the system and repair any that were not functioning. The Council had committed a capital amount (over £300k) within its Capital Programme in order to replace its aging stock of cameras; but this was on the basis that others would take on the revenue commitment for the monitoring. As part of this, the Council had been in discussions with the PCC over the last 12-16 months. The Council had also been purchasing re-deployable cameras for identified 'hotspots' not covered by traditional static cameras. Any future solution for CCTV would need to involve a mixture of both static and mobile cameras deployed.
- Concerning Ms. Smith's (Tenant Representative) query on the proposed planning and works at the Colcot Clinic, and the implications for access from the main road for the nearby community centre (and on parking nearby), the Head of Housing and Building Services stated that the plans to demolish the clinic would not impact nearby parking nor access and would cater for the local community's needs around these.

There being no further questions, Scrutiny Committee, having considered the report and all the issues and implications contained therein,

**RECOMMENDED – T H A T** the position with regard to the 2021/22 revenue and capital budgets be noted.

Reason for recommendation

Having regard to the contents of the report and discussions at the meeting.

464 YOUTH OFFENDING SERVICE: 12 MONTH PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR THE PERIOD APRIL 2020 – MARCH 2021 (DSS) –

The report, presented by the Youth Offending Services (YOS) Manager, advised of the 12 months performance report for the YOS for the period April 2020 – March 2021, the key points being:

- As part of its grant funding terms and conditions, the YOS was required by the Youth Justice Board (YJB) to undertake performance reporting in relation to a number of key performance indicators;
- It was important to note that two of the national key performance indicators, Reduction in First Time Entrants and Reduction in Re-offending were currently unable to be updated due to the lack of availability of performance data from the Ministry of Justice / Youth Justice Board. Furthermore, the performance data was extracted via the Police National Computer (PNC) so the Council could not verify the data and therefore were reliant on the YJB to validate it;
- Performance data for First Time Entrants to the Youth Justice system (WYJI 1) was for the 12 months from January – December 2019 and so there was a 'lag' in the data provided to the Committee. Performance reflected a 12.5% decrease when comparing figures to January – December 2018. This decrease equated to 3 children, with figures for 2019 showing there were 25 children in the cohort compared to 28 in 2018. Overall, performance looked positive. When comparing this performance across other areas, there had been a 4% reduction across South Wales; a 1.7% reduction across Wales and a reduction of 27.7% across the YOT (Youth Offending Teams) family, which included England and Wales. Although there had been a decrease, the rate per 100,000 within the Vale was higher than the Wales and family averages, which was due to the small size of the population of 10–17-year-olds within the Vale of Glamorgan where an increase or decrease in numbers can have a large impact on the rate per 100,000. It was also important to note that England and Wales were at different stages in providing the related prevention agenda;
- Similarly, there had been a significant reduction in the re-offending rate (from 27 reoffenders from a cohort of 59; to 21 reoffenders from a cohort of 51) and the frequency rate of re-offending (the number of re-offences committed by children / young people who re-offended; a decrease of 135 to 53) performance indicators when comparing April to March 2017/18 against April to March 2018/19. Again, the 'lag' on the provision of this data was due to the need to allow a 12-month tracking period and a six month period for any offences to go through the courts;
- Due to the above 'lag' in data, local performance indicators were used to monitor a cohort identified between January – March 2020, and then tracked over a 12 month period until 1<sup>st</sup> April 2021, with 6 of the 23 young people tracked re-offending in the 12 months committing a total of 13 offences. This equated to a re-offending percentage of 26%, (YJB rate 41.2%) with 2.16 re-offences per re-offender;
- The report also showed the range of interventions provided by the YOS and its partners to try and address the underlying causes of offending;

- Another positive result was the reduce the use of custody (WYJI 3) indicator, where during the period April 2020 to March 2021, there were no children subject to a custodial disposal;
- Regarding the engagement in education, training and employment, (WYJI 4) indicator, during period April to March 2020/21; children / young people of statutory school age were offered an average of 13.8 hours at the start of their intervention, 8.8 hours at review stage and ended on 7.5 hours. The average hours attended by children / young people was in fact less at 11.3 hours at the start and 1.3 at the end. Both the hours offered and attended were below the recommended 25 hours to children of statutory school age. Although it was worth noting that this was during the pandemic with education being provided mostly online.
- However, there was a much more positive picture with young people above statutory school age where the average hours being attended at the start were 5.3, at review 7.1 and 13.8 at the end, with the number of hours attended closer to the recommended 16 hours of provision. There was also evidence of children and young people accessing training courses and being supported by Careers Wales and Inspire to Work.
- Access to suitable accommodation (WYJI 5): over the period March 2020 – March 2021, out of the 15 children / young people who received a closed community based penalty; 14 were in suitable accommodation (with no children / young people released from custody during the period);
- Performance in respect of access to appropriate support for substance misuse difficulties (WYJI 6): the majority of young people referred continued to engage in assessment and treatment, with 15 children / young people identified as requiring assessment, of which 7 were already accessing services. 8 children / young people were referred and 4 were assessed within 5 working days. Subsequently of the 7 assessments completed, it was identified that 6 required tier 2 treatment, and 1 required tier 3, which were all started within 10 working days of the assessments (the target period);
- Access to mental health services, (WYJI 7): 5 children / young people were identified by screening as requiring a mental health assessment. All 5 were already in receipt of mental health services;
- Regarding the local performance indicator on access to Restorative Justice (victim engagement), 94 interventions were closed in 2020/21, within the reporting period. There were 74 identified victims, with an offer of restorative justice being made to 70 victims but only 3 victims received direct reparation and 8 victims received indirect reparation. There was a noticeable decline in victim engagement, which could be attributable to concerns by victims around face to face and other contact during the ongoing pandemic. The YOS would be reviewing the local Restorative Justice Indicator and the new Victim Code of Practice in relation to victim engagement to see if this was being properly measured.

Following the Officers' presentation, the subsequent questions and comments were raised by the Committee:

- Councillor Brooks raised how 'out of date' some of the data provided was and if there was anything that could be done in order to make more recent data available in order to better gauge what the current situation and trends were,

for example a report recently highlighted growing domestic violence involving young people which would not be covered by this data and also it would not cover the impact of the delays caused by the pandemic on the courts. The YOS Manager replied that data collection was challenging, as under the conditions of grant by the YJB, YOS had to provide performance information under their data recording requirements, which meant monitoring young offenders over 18 months. Due to this, local performance indicators had been developed but they could not be compared easily with others within the YOT family. The 18 month 'delay' in the provision of data was a challenge, as this limited the amount that could be done to deal with any emerging trends, etc. Regarding youth courts the delays caused by the pandemic had now been worked through. The Head of Housing and Building Services added that a report, including information of domestic abuse within the home involving children, would be coming to the next scrutiny committee meeting.

- Councillor Aviet asked what direct and indirect restorative justice / reparation entailed and any examples of these. The YOS Manager explained that:
  - Direct restorative justice entailed the victim and offender meeting face to face where the offence was discussed and how the harm caused could be repaired;
  - Indirect restorative justice entailed the victim providing their views and were not directly present.
  - Direct reparation would involve the offender undertaking something the victim had directly asked for (subject to a YOS risk assessment); and
  - Indirect reparation would include work undertaken within the community, for example, cleaning graffiti.
- Regarding Councillor Perkes' query on whether any of the YOS cohort were in mainstream school or if not, were they undertaking any training and / or the national curriculum (vocational or otherwise), in light of the figures indicating a 'tailing' off in the cohort's engagement in education, the YOS Manager explained that those children under 16 would be in some type of school provision and working under the national curriculum (with a mix of vocational training if required). Post-16, the cohort would be involved with Careers Wales and Inspire and Communities for work, who provided vocational courses such as health and safety and construction, with some of the previous YOS cohort having gone on to undertake work as part of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century school's programme. The 'tailing off' in learning could in part be explained due to the disruption caused by the pandemic, which YOS was working with Learning and Skills in order to remedy this.
- Following the Chair's query on restorative justice and what the levels were pre-pandemic the YOS Manager explained that the Vale was considered to be a 'Restorative YOS', with pre-pandemic levels of restorative engagement and justice being 40%, which were over and above the YJB average of 25%. It was hoped that as the pandemic eased, these levels could be achieved again through restoring face to face 'panel' meetings between victims and offenders.
- The YOS Manager responded to Councillor Nugent-Finn's queries as follows:
  - Regarding the uptake on vocational education / junior apprentice scheme by children and young persons previously involved with YOS, the YOS Manager did not have that information to hand and would find out;
  - On the seemingly low numbers of children from YOS accessing mental health services, it was explained that this was not the full cohort under the

- youth justice system but rather under statutory YOS cases; the YOS Manager would need to look at the size of the YOS cohort and confirm the proportion;
- On the issue of tracking performance indicators, as already stated, there were challenges and limitations around both the YJB mandated indicators and their local performance counterparts; this prompted the Councillor to suggest moving away from such indicators and focus instead on outcomes;
  - Concerning the rise in violence within the home involving young people, if this was being monitored and if the Local Authority / YOS had a strategy around combatting it, it was explained that some YOS practitioners were trained in 'respect' training and YOS could refer out to specialist training organisations to deliver such training as well, although such organisations were few in number. YOS was also working with Third Sector Organisations, although ideally greater and earlier prevention and intervention was needed.
  - On Councillor Perkes' query on whether there were still in-house staff at YOS who could support parents experiencing issues with their children, it was confirmed that YOS had a Family Support Officer who could offer support to parents whose children were referred to YOS and the Council also had a broader Parenting Service.

There being no further questions, Scrutiny Committee, having considered the report and all the issues and implications contained therein,

RECOMMENDED – T H A T the contents of the performance report for the Youth Offending Service during the period April 2020 – March 2021 be noted.

#### Reason for recommendation

Having regard to the contents of the report and discussions at the meeting.

#### 465 YOUTH OFFENDING SERVICE: YOUTH JUSTICE PLAN UPDATED JULY 2021 (DSS) –

The Youth Offending Service (YOS) Manager outlined the report, the purpose of which was to bring to the attention of Scrutiny Committee the Youth Justice Plan 2021 – 2023 which incorporated the improvements required following the Youth Justice National Standards baseline audit.

The report also highlighted:

- How the YOS, which was designated as a key public service, planned to continue to deliver services as the Council recovered from the pandemic;
- During 2020, the YOS was required by the YJB to produce a Transitions and Recovery Plan instead of a Youth Justice Plan as a result of the impact of the pandemic. This Plan was presented to Scrutiny Committee on 11<sup>th</sup> November, 2020;

- In March 2021 the YJB awarded funding to the YOS and advised that they were reverting back to an expectation to produce a Youth Justice Plan for 2021/22 in line with the Youth Justice Plans, YJB Practice Guidance March 2021. The guidance suggested the Plan should include areas such as an introduction, vision and strategy, governance, leadership and partnership arrangements, how to respond to the pandemic and enable recovery from it and to outline a service business and improvement plan;
- The Plan incorporated the following key elements:
  - the improvements required following the Youth Justice National Standards baseline audit;
  - recommendations from the Cardiff YOS Inspection Benchmarking exercise;
  - actions identified within the YOS Transitions and Recovery Plan 2020; and
  - recommendations from two HM Inspectorate of Probation reports published in November 2020.
- The Plan was set over three years in order to allow sufficient time for the necessary improvements to be achieved.
- The Plan also had to demonstrate how YOS would achieve value for money, how the YJB grant was being used to deliver Youth Justice services as well as providing performance information;
- Some progress had been made against the actions identified within the Youth Justice Plan. There had, however, been capacity issues experienced by the service throughout 2020/21 which had impacted on the service's ability to progress a range of actions from the Youth Justice Plan (such as staff absences and other vacancies arising within the team). The YOS Manager was also retiring at the end of October 2021.

Scrutiny Committee, having considered the report and all the issues and implications contained therein,

RECOMMENDED – T H A T the contents of the report be noted.

#### Reason for recommendation

Having regard to the contents of the report and discussions at the meeting.

#### 466 HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION STRATEGY 2018 – 2022 – MONITORING REPORT (DEH) –

The report was presented by the Head of Housing and Building Services who outlined the following key points from it:

- The purpose of the report was to provide the Committee with a further update on the progress made in implementing the Homelessness Prevention Strategy and Action Plan. This was as a result of the Housing (Wales) Act 2014 Act which placed a statutory requirement on Local Authorities to produce a Homelessness Strategy and Action Plan, adopted by Cabinet in June 2019, for the period 2018-2022;



- The report also highlighted the significant ongoing pressure on the Housing Solutions Service and support services resulting from the pandemic and the additional / recovery actions that had been taken;
- There were four key themes to the Action Plan which supported the Strategy and the prevention of homelessness at the earliest opportunity:
  - To provide a robust and targeted homelessness prevention service;
  - To develop and extend the availability of early housing advice and assistance;
  - To support the most vulnerable to maintain a home and to integrate into the community; and
  - To support private landlords in order to improve tenancy sustainability.
- Homelessness prevention overall remained a challenge; particularly in light of all such instances now being classed as high priority;
- Despite the challenges from the pandemic, progress had continued as shown in the Action Plan and apart from three of the actions, the rest were on course for completion. The three actions impacted by the pandemic were:
  - A003 – hospital discharge procedure: this had been impacted by resourcing issues due to the pandemic;
  - A005 – staff shadowing opportunities: opportunities have been limited due to staff required to work from home in response to Covid-19 ; and
  - A010 – the delivery of tenancy ready training within the Prison system: the Council had been working with WG in order to pilot with Cardiff Council delivery of tenancy ready training in order to help prison leavers sustain their tenancies. The Justice Service in the meantime had undertaken their own tenancy sustainability activity and so wished to avoid duplication of effort. This would be monitored however, in order to check the activity was helping and the Council would revisit if it was not.
- Since March 2020, Housing Solutions received over 5,000 homelessness enquiries, with over 1,000 people being placed into temporary accommodation. The Vale of Glamorgan currently had over 100 households in bed and breakfast hotel (B&B) units in hotels and 127 were in other forms of temporary accommodation. Over half of this cohort were single persons, under the age of 35 years. ‘Move – on’ accommodation for such groups was in extremely short supply within the Vale;
- In order to expand the supply of housing within the private rented sector, a social media survey and promotional initiative was being promoted in order to understand the needs, wishes and aspirations of private landlords in order to encourage their assistance in supplying housing. A key influencing factor on private sector landlords, Court possession proceedings, continued to take place and now prioritised serious cases of anti-social behaviour and domestic violence. Six months’ notice periods were now required to be given by all landlords in order to end tenancies with this legislative change extended to Spring of 2022;
- The previous loan scheme introduced by WG had not been widely taken up by residents and subsequently been replaced with a grants scheme allowing persons in work only to apply to Local Authorities for financial support with rent arrears. The strict and limited criteria for this grant meant there had been no eligible claims made and therefore the Housing Benefit Discretionary Payment scheme remained the main and best route for financial support for those renting and not in employment;

- An additional challenge was some private landlords insisting on six months' rent being paid in advance and increasing numbers of landlords were also insisting on guarantors even with those cases supported under the Vale Assisted Tenancy Scheme. This was believed to be linked to the increase of notice periods;
- The Committee's Task and Finish Group was well advanced in hearing on issues around housing and homelessness provision and would probably be looking at making recommendations to the Committee and Cabinet in the near future concerning the allocation and provision of housing and the prevention of homelessness;
- A new IT system would be procured for Housing in order to help to respond to residents and tenants;
- The multi-agency co-ordination cell meetings continued to operate which supported tenants in temporary accommodation;
- Most housing support grant services had now been recommissioned and a number of new projects would be coming online such as supported accommodation for people with complex needs;
- The Housing Solutions Team continued to work with Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) and their counterparts in the private sector in order to develop alternative single person accommodation with help from the Housing Support Grant.

Following the Officers' presentation, the subsequent questions and comments were raised by the Committee and addressed by the Head of Housing and Building Services:

- On Councillor Perkes' query concerning the tenancy ready training and the possibility of Housing Officers going to meet prison leavers and would-be future tenants prior to them coming to the Vale, the reply was that this had been the original aim of the service as envisaged by the Vale of Glamorgan Council in collaboration with Cardiff Council, but delays to the pilot due to the pandemic and the Justice Service having subsequently undertaken their own version of this service had now superseded this. However, the Council continued to work with the Probation and Prison Service regarding prison leavers' needs, such as risk, access to services, assessments of their needs and support (mental health and drug or alcohol dependency) and so the possibility of Housing Officers dealing with prison leavers directly around tenancy and other issues could be revisited in future.
- Regarding the Councillor's follow up question on the risk assessment and support of prison leavers moving into the local community and in particularly into housing in multiple occupation (HMO), prison leavers were risk assessed by the Prison or Probation services prior to them going out to the community in order to highlight any issues or needs, and the Council would work with partners in order to assess the appropriateness of the accommodation offered. For HMOs, the majority of prison leavers accommodated there would be considered as low risk; any issues or unacceptable behaviour raised would be dealt with the Council in conjunction with landlords and, if necessary, move or evict the tenant concerned. The Council undertook its own risk assessments in order to ensure the safety of Council and Third Sector staff supporting tenants as well.

- On Councillor Brooks' concern about the growing 'pushback' on the expansion of social housing, the Council had previously undertaken consultation with local communities around the development of social housing in their areas, such as at Court Road where Officers had spoken directly to local residents about any concerns they may have. This had proven to be successful and counteracted the often 'polarised' nature of discussion and debate on social media. The importance of expanding social housing had never been greater for the Vale, with 6,000 local residents currently looking for accommodation. The Council wanted to provide a positive message and challenge misconceptions on the social housing being built, which was generally more energy efficient, and a higher quality of build compared to the private sector, coupled with providing finance, supporting local residents to access local housing and other support and training in order to sustain tenancies, as well as taking action when necessary if these tenancies failed.
- On the Councillor's follow up query on supporting tenancies in light of the removal of the £20 Universal Credit (UC) uplift and with rising levels of fuel poverty, the Council had traditionally taken the view that no tenant would be evicted who had been subject to a change or cut to their benefits as a direct result of Welfare Reform changes. The Council had also been successful in dealing with rent arrears, with few evictions undertaken overall within the Vale. Furthermore, the Council provided help to tenants via its Money Advice Service and other teams.
- Following on from Councillor Nugent-Finn's query on specific services for military veterans around housing / tenancies, it was confirmed that legislation required the Council (in conjunction with the Forces Liaison Officer) to provide and prioritise veterans regarding various housing / allocation support services and to 'signpost' veterans to other areas of assistance and support. This was challenging however, in light of the current demands placed on housing, but the Council continued to work with partners in order to provide more bespoke services and support to veterans.
- On the Councillor's follow up questions regarding Afghan refugee resettlement and the Local Development Plan (LDP) and prioritising single person housing, the replies were as follows:
  - On the Afghan resettlement, the offer from the Council was for two Afghan families to be resettled within the area, with one accommodation unit already available and another one to be available in the next few weeks. The relevant working group, in conjunction with the Home Office, would be identifying suitable families for this accommodation, with one family already identified. The Council was looking to house the two Afghan families by Christmas 2021. In terms of resettlement of other Afghan refugees, the Council was working with the private rented sector in order to provide such accommodation.
  - Regarding the shortage of single / one bedroom housing and the LDP, the single housing provided within the Vale would be a mixture of private and social housing, but from a Council perspective the building of one bedroom accommodation remained a priority in conjunction with RSL partners, such as the development progressing at Subway Road, Barry. On mixed housing developments, the Council required a certain percentage of the houses to be one-bedroom accommodation. The building targets under the LDP could never be fully realised however, and

so it remained more aspirational and acted as a useful guide for informing where the priorities for housing lay.

There being no further questions, Scrutiny Committee, having considered the report and all the issues and implications contained therein,

**RECOMMENDED –**

(1) T H A T the progress to date in implementing the Homelessness Prevention Strategy and Action Plan be noted.

(2) T H A T the additional actions included and the significant pressures on the service, its staff and resources as a result of the COVID pandemic be noted.

Reason for recommendations

(1&2) Having regard to the contents of the report and discussions at the meeting.

**467 2<sup>ND</sup> QUARTER SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATION TRACKING 2021/22 AND UPDATED COMMITTEE FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME SCHEDULE 2021/22 (MD) –**

The report advised Members of the progress made in relation to the Scrutiny Committee's historical recommendations and the updated Forward Work Programme Schedule for 2021/22 for the Committee's consideration.

In addition, the Head of Housing and Building Services was able to provide further updates on the following uncompleted recommendations detailed within the report:

- Regarding the recommendation from April's Scrutiny Committee meeting concerning the Update on the DAARC (Domestic Abuse Assessment and Referral Co-Ordinator) Service, greater engagement with peer / support groups had been provisionally discussed with the Domestic and Sexual Abuse Co-ordinator and the Principal Community Safety Officer from the Community Safety Team and this was an area that the service would continue to support and develop;
- Concerning the ongoing recommendation (originally from the Committee meeting in December 2019) on identifying an appropriate housing solution for the Traveller community, officers within Planning and Property Services continued to try and source alternative land / sites with the related work on options, feasibility or appraisals having been delayed due to housing pressures resulting from the pandemic, but work would be progressing on this in the future. The Council was also required to undertake a new Gypsy / Traveller Assessment for the WG by February 2022, this survey to be undertaken by consultants in conjunction with the relevant internal steering group and stakeholders (such as the Police, Gypsy and Traveller Community and Education services) as well as with Elected Members (to be consulted individually and collectively).

Having considered the report, Scrutiny Committee subsequently

RECOMMENDED –

- (1) T H A T the status of the actions listed in Appendices A to C to the report be agreed.
- (2) T H A T the updated Committee Forward Work Programme Schedule attached at Appendix D be approved and uploaded to the Council's website.

Reasons for recommendations

- (1) To maintain effective tracking of the Committee's recommendations.
- (2) For consideration and information.