

## Finance and Resources OSC Action Points

<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Action point</b>	<b>Responsible officer</b>	<b>Date action completed</b>	<b>Response</b>
06/09/22	<p>Councillor Tindall also referred to item 8.4. He asked if anyone had evaluated the turnover in Right to Buy properties in recent years to get an idea of how far the policy could be taken. He commented that £1m was on the low side, particularly when we are desperate for housing, and that he felt it was an easy way to mitigate some of the actions taken in the 1980s.</p> <p>F Jump replied she did not have the statistics to hand but was happy to circulate the information.</p>	Fiona Jump		<p>The Council received 59 offers to purchase properties sold under Right to Buy legislation in 2021. The same number were received in 2020. For 2022 year to date, we have received 38 offers so far.</p> <p>A proposed budget of £1m for the purchase of such properties has been put forward for approval and will be kept under review.</p>
06/09/22	<p>Councillor Tindall referred to page 61, the percentage of community alarm calls answered within 1 minute, noting that there was no number stating how many alarm calls were made and how far outside a minute they were answered.</p> <p>M Brookes stated that this was not his service and therefore did not come under his area. It was noted that this could be taken to the Housing team to respond to.</p>	Mark Brookes	26/09/22 & 31/10/22	<p>The question has been referred to the housing team and the response is currently awaited.</p> <p>Update 31/10/22:</p> <p>There were 10,332 calls in total made in the quarter. Of those calls 310 were not answered within 1 minute. Of the 310 not answered within 1 minute, 51 were not answered within 3 minutes.</p> <p>A further piece of work is required to identify the duration of those calls that fell outside of 3 minutes and the nature of the call. It's important to recognise that all</p>

				calls, including low priority such as door entry panels, are included within this figure.
06/09/22	<p>Councillor Tindall referred to page 64, noting the number of red across housing benefit claims and that he hoped there was a plan intended to ensure claims are made in a more-timely manner.</p> <p>M Brookes stated that there was a presentation error in terms of statistics as this is not under his remit.</p> <p>F Jump added that the service is looking to ensure they are responding as needed and would seek a response on the point.</p>	Fiona Jump	01/11/22	<p>Unfortunately there was an error in the production of the Q1 report, and this data about the previous quarter and year's performance was incorrectly included. As part of the government's ongoing welfare reform programme, and the rollout of Universal Credit, there are now many fewer new claims for housing benefit, and so measure RBF01 has been updated to make it a better reflection of the work that the service carries out for residents.</p> <p>The information about performance against this updated measure was correctly shown on page 35 of the report.</p> <p>The issue has been corrected prior to the issue of the Q2 report.</p>
06/09/22	<p>Councillor Symington thanked B Hosier for the report and appreciated the response to the recommendation from the Audit Committee. Councillor Symington then referred to page 68 of the report, commenting that non-compliant aspects were listed but no costs were attached.</p> <p>B Hosier agreed that no figures are listed, and any figures included would be contractual, which are published on the</p>	Ben Hosier	22/9/22	<p>Update sent to Member Support as a separate document.</p> <p>Information circulated to the committee via email by T Angel.</p>

	<p>website. He confirmed he would come back to members with the value of the contracts, adding that they are only non-compliant from when the contract has expired and that the table lists mitigations for each item.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--