

CORPORATE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – THURSDAY, 18 JUNE 2026

ITEM 6 – CABINET RESPONSE TO SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS

Scrutiny comments made on: Housing Improvement Strategy Action Plan Post Inspection report

Date considered by Cabinet: 19 May 2026

	Comments/recommendations from scrutiny	Advice provided by officers at the Scrutiny meeting	Cabinet response
C1	Language, accessibility and jargon: Members welcomed the report but noted that it contained a significant amount of jargon which could make it difficult for tenants and wider public to understand.	Officers acknowledged the concern and confirmed that a jargon-free, easy-to-read version of the document would be produced, aimed at tenants and the public.	Noted.
C2	Digital repairs reporting: Members welcomed the proposals for a new digital system, however the following concerns were raised – <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Not all tenants were digitally confident- Digital reporting must not become the only route for reporting repairs- The system should be carefully tested before full implementation.	Officers confirmed that there would be user acceptance training before the roll out and existing non-digital reporting routes would remain available.	Noted.

<p>C3</p>	<p>Stock condition survey timescales: Members raised concerns regarding inconsistencies in timescales noting that –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some actions suggested properties should meet the decent homes standard by December 2026 - The stock condition survey was shown as completing in 2028 which appeared contradictory. <p>Members also questioned whether these timescales were realistic and appropriate, particularly with the final proportion of properties.</p>	<p>Officers confirmed that the 2028 date was an error in the report and would be amended. It was noted that the final proportion of properties could take longer to access and assess, particularly where access was difficult.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>C4</p>	<p>Tenant involvement and representation: Members spoke in support of the tenant groups, however questioned if they were sufficiently representative for the wider tenant population. The challenge of achieving wider representation was acknowledged. They encouraged broader engagement including outreach beyond meetings.</p>	<p>Officers confirmed that a range of engagement methods were being developed and the approach would evolve over time. It was indicated that a clearer overview of engagement methods would be shared when reporting back on progress.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>C5</p>	<p>Member involvement with housing officers: Members welcomed opportunities for greater involvement between councillors and housing officers, such as estate walks and informal engagement.</p>	<p>The Portfolio Holder acknowledged the benefit of informal engagement and supported the approach where appropriate.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>