

Boat Dwellers and River Travellers – Cabinet response

Scrutiny lines of inquiry

Recommendation	Comments and possible lines of inquiry
<p>1 and 1.1 (High)</p>	<p>There is no mention of key information (i.e. timescales, required action) that would explain the decision and offer options for the way forward.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What does ‘significant officer time’ mean? • Have you assessed how much work would be involved, i.e. FTE? • Where could funding for the additional/seconded post come from? • When do you envisage this piece of work starting? • Has contact with other teams to be involved yet been made, i.e. scope of the work, involvement, options for lead/support staff? <p>Response:</p> <p>It is estimated that a full in-depth study/review, including the specified components, would equate to around 1FTE for 1 year. This level of funding cannot be found within existing resources, and so would need to be considered as a growth item in future financial plans. Without identified funding there is no planned start date.</p>
<p>1.2</p>	<p>No further comment</p>
<p>1.3 (Medium)</p>	<p>It could be argued that this particular piece of work would not take up ‘significant officer time’ if treated as a standalone piece of work, separate from the wider review proposed at recommendation one.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have you assessed how much work would be involved? • Could this be carried out separately from the wider review? <p>Response:</p> <p>It is hard to be precise on the resources that this piece of work would require, should it be dealt with as a separate piece of work. However, the assumption is that this work would form part of the 1 FTE mentioned above. It should be noted that individual services are tasked with ensuring that services are accessible to all residents, including boat dwellers, and that this is an area of work that the G&T Corporate Group is actively involved in.</p>
<p>1.4</p>	<p>No further comment</p>
<p>2 (Low)</p>	<p>Welcome this action, however the equalities lead officers will need to be involved to support the CRT and enable endorsement of the strategy.</p>
<p>3 (Medium)</p>	<p>The response confirms the recommendation cannot be achieved through the Strategic Housing Marketing Assessment (SHMA). However, whilst ‘a different approach’ is acknowledged, no solution appears to have been sought. It therefore seems unrealistic to make mention of ‘significant officer time’ as a barrier when the approach is unknown.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What different approaches to the SHMA are there? • What would be the feasibility of each of these approaches, i.e. impact, officer time, etc? • What is the likely delivery timescales of these other approaches? <p>Response:</p> <p>The purpose of the SHMA, and the Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation</p>

Boat Dwellers and River Travellers – Cabinet response

Scrutiny lines of inquiry

	<p>Assessment is to accurately determine future demand for different types of housing. Due to economies of scale, and to align with housing market areas, these surveys are often commissioned across a number of authorities. However, they can also be independently commissioned. As such it is possible that we could commission such a survey ourselves, however, this is likely to be costly, probably between £10,000 - £20,000, though this is clearly dependent upon the level of detail required and the period of projection. However, it may be possible to undertake something broadly similar, although with less statistical robustness, in-house as an addition to the work mentioned in 1.1 above. This would increase the appointment to an estimated 15-18 months.</p>
3.1	No further comment
3.2	No further comment
3.3 (Medium)	<p>The lack of relevant 'document or mechanism' needs further clarification to ascertain whether this is a barrier, or whether this could be resolved.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there anything actively preventing this action, i.e. legislation? • Can a policy/mechanism be put in place that will enable it? <p>Response:</p> <p>This issue will be considered within the Placemaking Plan process.</p>
3.4 (Medium)	<p>Similarly to the responses to rec 1, there is no mention of possible timescales and/or action to better enable implementation at a later date.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What exactly will require 'significant officer time'? • When do you envisage this piece of work starting, bearing in mind the Mooring Strategy is currently being developed? • What can be done to support this to inform the Mooring Strategy? • Can a partnership approach be utilised to achieve this sooner? <p>Response:</p> <p>Please refer to response 3 above.</p>
4	No further comment
4.1	No further comment
4.2	No further comment