

Appendix B

Extract from the draft Minutes of the Housing Management Consultative Sub Committee held on 4 September 2012 relating to the issue of Tenant Scrutiny

15 REPORT OF THE INNOVATION GROUP ON RESIDENT INVOLVEMENT

- 15.1 The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director Place on the work and final proposals of the Innovation Group on resident involvement. The report followed a report to the Housing Committee in April 2012 which had made the Committee aware of the draft Innovation Group report and the plans for further resident consultation on the proposals. The report updated the draft version following consultations which took place at the May 2012 City Assembly, meetings with individual residents and through Homing In magazine. The Chair thanked all those, residents and officers, who had been involved in preparing the report.
- 15.2 Appendix one to the report (pages 20-22 in the agenda) included a summary of the 36 main suggestions, and it was agreed that the Committee would comment on each of those suggestions.
- 15.12 Suggestion 18 related to Tenant Scrutiny Panel and would be covered in more detail in Item 16 on the agenda.
- 15.14 Councillor Peltzer Dunn noted an inconsistency with information relating to a meeting of the Tenant Scrutiny Panel on pages 72 and 105 of the report. On page 72 it says a meeting would be qourate with 6 people and on page 105 it would be 7 people. Councillor Peltzer Dunn also noted that page 72 stated that 'inqourate meetings should be noted and decisions ratified at the next qourate meeting'. It was agreed that it should read '*any discussion at an inqourate meeting should be noted and considered at the next qourate meeting*'.
- 15.18 **RESOLVED** – That the report of the Innovation Group on Resident Involvement, together with an action plan following comments made at this meeting, be considered at the meeting of the Housing Management Consultative Sub Committee on 23 October 2012.

16 TENANT SCRUTINY

- 16.1 The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director Place, on the creation of a Tenant Scrutiny Panel (TSP). The report set out the model for the introduction of a TSP in Brighton and Hove.
- 16.2 Councillor Mears noted that recommendations of the TSP would be presented to the Housing Committee, and asked if it could also be

presented to Housing Management Consultative Sub Committee (HMCSC) for information. Councillor Mears was concerned that the creation of a TSP would devalue the role of the HMCSC, and asked if the long term plan was to get rid of the Committee altogether. The Chair assured the Committee that there was no intention to remove the HMCSC. Officers referred Councillor Mears to paragraph 5.6 of the report which stated that all recommendations of the TSP would be presented to the Housing Committee and then the responses of that Committee would then be reported to the HMCSC. Officers explained that TSP would make recommendations directly to the Council's Housing Committee rather than formally via HMCSC. This was because HMCSC and Housing Committee had an overlapping membership, and it was a fundamental principle of scrutiny that the body responding to scrutiny recommendations should be discrete from the body making those recommendations (i.e. that members should not sit on both bodies). However, this formal reporting pathway aside, it was intended that the TSP and HMCSC should be close and mutually supportive partners.

- 16.3 Mr Crowhurst asked if the TSP would be able to make any decisions themselves. Officers confirmed that the TSP could only make recommendations.
- 16.4 Mr Kent was concerned over the role of the HMCSC, previously it had been a full Committee and now it was a 'sub' Committee with no powers and asked why it had been changed. Mr Kent was advised that the council had agreed to move from a Cabinet system to a Committee system, and so this Committee was now part of the Housing Committee. The change had been agreed by Full Council.
- 16.5 Mr Melson was concerned that if tenants were conducting the scrutiny there was a possibility that it could become adversarial. Officers reassured Mr Melson that a panel would need to be very clear about why it was being held, and confirmed that scrutiny officers would offer support to the TSP.
- 16.6 Councillor Robins thanked officers for the report and thought the introduction of a TSP was a positive thing, and encouraged everyone to support it. Councillor Robins asked if the Chair of the Panel would be independent. Officers said that the plan was to have an independent mentor who would be able to support the panel.
- 16.7 Councillor Peltzer Dunn agreed with the comments of Councillor Robins. Councillor Peltzer Dunn referred to the report and suggested the wording of paragraphs 5.3 and 5.6 be looked at, as they appeared to contradict each other. Councillor Peltzer Dunn noted that paragraph 1.2 stated that the report had 'been' presented to HMCSC on 4 September. The report on the Innovation Group, which recommended the creation of the TSP, had not yet been endorsed by the HMCSC and so the wording of that paragraph was misleading.

16.8 Mr Crowhurst asked if a TSP requested information, officers would be compelled to provide it. It was confirmed they would, subject to the usual scrutiny 'access to information' regulations.

16.9 RESOLVED

(1) That the Housing Management Consultative Sub Committee noted the report.

(2) That the comments of the Housing Management Consultative Sub Committee be taken into consideration.

