### **Communities, Housing and Public Protection Committee**

ABERDEEN, 27 May 2025. Minute of Meeting of the COMMUNITIES, HOUSING AND PUBLIC PROTECTION COMMITTEE. <u>Present</u>:- Councillor Radley, <u>Convener</u>; Councillor Henrickson, <u>Vice-Convener</u>; and Councillors Bouse, Cross, Davidson, Graham, Malik (as substitute for Councillor Mrs Stewart), McLellan and Watson.

The agenda and reports associated with this minute can be located here here.

Please note that if any changes are made to this minute at the point of approval, these will be outlined in the subsequent minute and this document will not be retrospectively altered.

# THERE ARE FOUR DEPUTATION REQUESTS IN RELATION TO ITEM 11.3 ON THE AGENDA - VIABILITY ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSALS FROM OWNERS OF PROPERTIES WITH RAAC

1. The Committee received four deputation requests in relation to item 11.3 on the agenda (Viability Assessment of Proposals from Owners of Properties with RAAC).

The first deputation request was from Lindsay Bruce, Press and Journal and Evening Express reporter, who was heading up a Trapped by RAAC campaign.

Ms Bruce advised that she aimed to highlight how this situation was impacting the lives of fellow Aberdonians, neighbours, their children, the electorate, and expressed how home owners affected by RAAC needed Members to act on their behalf as though their lives depended on it. Ms Bruce indicated that others here today offering deputations would also point Members to ways in which the administration could help homeowners, whilst still offering best value.

Ms Bruce stated that for the wider Aberdeen public, she would like to implore Members from the outset to come with an openness to hear the words of those at the core of the situation. Ms Bruce highlighted there had never been another situation like this in Aberdeen, and it was an extraordinary crisis that required extraordinary solutions, and there were no previous paths to follow.

Ms Bruce explained that this was Members' opportunity to act with creativity and compassion to find ways to best serve the people of Aberdeen and in doing so, pave the way for other local authorities. Ms Bruce intimated that she stood with those impacted by RAAC and noted that the people of Torry had become very important to her and their stories had become ingrained deeply.

Ms Bruce explained how she had been impacted from hearing stories from multiple families and homeowners. Stories of good hard working people about to lose their homes and the lives they strived and saved for, stories of a tight knit community about to be ripped apart. These stories were of people not precedent, people not policies, people not politics, and it was with this that they launched their campaign.

Ms Bruce intimated that good local journalism had always sought to dig deeper to robustly cover issues of public interest and to call power to account on the ground. She noted that they heard stories first hand and they saw the impact of what was happening in the city, and when an extraordinary event such as the RAAC crisis happened, they had the incredible privilege and platform to give voice to those experiencing injustice.

Ms Bruce indicated that she had met and covered stories of families in Balnagask and had interviewed at least 65 individuals. She had spoken with individuals who could no longer dream of starting a family, due to the financial and mental load, pensioners who were worrying that they could no longer enjoy their retirement, and also individuals who could no longer retire at all.

Ms Bruce asked Members to be mindful not only of the health and safety impact of this crisis but of the greater impact the financial effect this would have on homeowners without exception, through no fault of their own. Ms Bruce intimated that the more pressing issue was how a solution was administered that was fair and just, not just one that eradicated by flattening buildings to the ground.

Ms Bruce advised that homeowners believed that all costs should be met by the Council and she felt that this was right as it was the local authority who built the houses and the local authority who sold the houses. Ms Bruce advised that the report stated that the Council could not accept open ended financial liability for circumstances arising from private ownership, which she felt suggested that there should be a cost paid by homeowners, so that it was fair to the rest of the Aberdeen public. However Ms Bruce stated that the homeowners were Council taxpayers and they were part of the population of Aberdeen, noting that you could not divorce the situation unfolding and the people at the heart, from the rest of their city.

Ms Bruce also spoke about the suggestion that for those who wished to remain in Balnagask, that they could perhaps pay for their own roof to be fixed, with a low cost or no interest loan. Ms Bruce felt that this option was estranged from the reality of life for the general population and stated that homeowners would not be able to pay back the £40,000.

Ms Bruce also spoke about legislation and how houses were purchased through the Right to Buy scheme formally under the House in Scotland Act 1987, which meant homeowners bought the houses and would take on full repairs and insurance. It was a duty for the local authority to disclose any known issues and she questioned why the risks were not disclosed retrospectively.

The final point Ms Bruce raised was when the report stated that in relation to the option to replace roofs and if this was taken forward and the homeowners could no't afford to do so, that there should be ways to help them cover the cost without paying right at the outset, and the Council should consider making these funds available as a grant and not a loan.

In conclusion Ms Bruce highlighted that even if the Council did accept full financial liability, it would still offer the best value to Aberdeen people. Best value was not just about financial management but it was about ensuring that there was good governance and effective management of resources with a focus on improvement to deliver the best possible outcomes for the public. Ms Bruce noted that this was not an unfixable situation, and asked Members to put people before precedent and the people before politics and asked Members to do the right thing.

Members then asked a number of questions of Ms Bruce.

The second deputation request was from Paula Fraser who advised that she represented the residents of Balnagask affected by RAAC. Ms Fraser noted that it had now been 19 months since they were made aware of the situation, which felt like a lifetime, stating that their community had been literally torn apart. Tenants were forced to leave their loved homes on the understanding that they would have ongoing support but for the majority, this had not been the case. Children had been separated from their friendship groups, their social activities, young families uprooted, elderly and disabled people were ripped from their support network as well as local GP's being put under pressure to deal with a catalogue of health issues that this situation had caused.

Ms Fraser advised that when she presented her first deputation at a previous Committee, she urged Members to make people's mental health a priority, however it was not until April 2025 that they heard about assistance available from Scottish Action for Mental Health (SAMH), by which time most people struggling had established their own support from other areas. Ms Fraser questioned why it took over a year to set this up.

Ms Fraser intimated that when they met with the Housing Minister for Scotland, they were informed that the Council had not put any detailed funding proposals to the Scottish Government. Councillor Allard confirmed to one of the members of the group that he had received correspondence from both the Scottish and UK Government refusing assistance. Ms Fraser asked if there had been any subsequent requests lodged to both governments, specifically detailed funding proposals.

Ms Fraser advised that she felt that the Council had not been successful in the engagement of homeowners and even for the homeowners who did engage, the timescale was unacceptable from agreeing to engage to the valuation being done, to accepting the offer. She noted that one resident had accepted the offer at the end of January yet were still waiting to hear and questioned what the delay was.

Ms Fraser indicated that the citizens of Aberdeen voted Members in and gave Members the privilege of their trust to do what was best for them and said that she felt the citizens were feeling miserable at the level of support. Ms Fraser stated that they had no trust in Aberdeen City Council, noting that people's hopes and dreams had been ruined. Friendships and relationships were under pressure, people's dreams of getting married, starting families, upsizing, downsizing, all were in limbo. Ms Fraser felt that people were

being stripped of their homes and their dignity, leaving them with unsustainable amounts of debt in which many had to declare bankruptcy.

Ms Fraser then provided examples of people's situations and highlighted the suffering they had gone through due to the RAAC situation.

Members then asked a number of questions of Ms Fraser.

The Committee then heard the third deputation from Mr Wilson Chowdhry. Mr Chowdhry advised that he felt it was clear that a lot of effort had gone into preparing the report and also into preparing a framework that offered homeowners a genuine range of choices, which mattered deeply to the community. He noted that the most acceptable outcome for most homeowners would be the ability to retain their existing homes, as these properties were not just bricks and mortar, they represented a lifetime of memories. There were also deep community roots and for many, the only source of financial security and the prospect of being uprooted and moved to an alternative was far more distressing than remaining in and investing in the homes they already cherished. Mr Chowdhry therefore believed the option to retain and make these homes safe would be the most welcome and widely supported path forward.

Mr Chowdhry noted that he was pleased to hear that grants may be available for environmental retrofits to bring these properties up to modern standards. He felt it was not only desirable but it was necessary. He asked the Council to consider going further by supporting those who may not meet the standard grant eligibility criteria.

Mr Chowdhry asked Members to continue to seek support from the UK Government, via the UK Shared Prosperity Fund or similar routes, to ensure wider funding was available. He also stated that he felt, like most homeowners, that the Council should step up and fully fund the necessary works, which would include both repair costs and associated disturbance and home loss payments. Mr Chowdhry intimated that homeowners did not cause this crisis and many bought their homes in good faith, noting there was no disclosure, no warning and no opportunity for informed consent.

Mr Chowdhry indicated that he felt unfortunately there was a situation where the Council were not budging and he urged the Council to seriously consider offering low or no interest loans through a sundry debt scheme.

Mr Chowdhry advised that one thing beyond doubt was that homeowners had waited far too long and this prolonged and drawn out process had only deepened uncertainty and distress for countless families. He stated that a decision must now be taken, one that was urgent and rooted in compassion.

Mr Chowdhry highlighted the importance of option 3 within the report, which he believed was a pragmatic way forward, as it would allow homeowners and their families to temporarily relocate and re enter their properties once works were completed.

Mr Chowdhry indicated that many homeowners may consider an option for house swap, but many did not fully grasp just how limited their choices would likely be, as the significant deduction the Council proposed, would make the existing value of their homes less, and could result in far less purchasing power than residents currently expected. Furthermore, he stated that those who felt confident about taking improvement works, may not fully appreciate the condition of the properties they were likely to be offered in exchange. Mr Chowdhry urged the Council to provide clear, concrete examples of what these swaps might look like in practise.

In conclusion, Mr Chowdhry urged the Council to approve an approach that recognised the hardships already endured, that put fairness first and that truly honoured the commitment to the community, whether through grants, fair compensation or practical relocation schemes, he stated that the Council must act now to give homeowners clarity, dignity and justice.

The Committee had no questions for Mr Chowdhry.

The Committee then heard from Mr Raymond Davidson, who was speaking on behalf of the Torry Community RAAC Campaign Group. Mr Davidson advised that the future of 138 families was at stake and Members had the chance to show real compassion, not in theory but in a way that could transform lives. He indicated that for the past 18 months, the homeowners had lived in fear, stress and uncertainty through no fault of their own and their homes, once their greatest asset, became a liability overnight. The discovery of RAAC had left them financially trapped, unable to sell, unable to repair and unless something changed, unable to move forward. Mr Davidson questioned if it was right that these families should be punished for circumstances beyond their control. These residents had done nothing wrong, yet they had been paying the price every single day since this crisis began. Mr Davidson intimated that homeowners were not looking for charity, but for leadership and for fairness.

Mr Davidson noted that Members may feel torn between compassion for residents and the duty to deliver value for money across the city. He questioned if Members could do both. He stated that their proposal would offer both, provide support and also protect the public purse.

Mr Davidson advised that the Council had already approved a funding solution of around £13 million for the voluntary acquisition of the properties and the plan was then to demolish the homes and be left with a cleared site. He queried what the £13 million would actually buy. He stated that after demolition, at an estimated cost of around £10,000 per property and factoring in the modest value of the land, the Council would be left with an empty site. There would then be 138 displaced households, families, pensioners and working people and many would fall into negative equity, some would face bankruptcy and others risked homelessness. People would be unable to buy again, unable to get a mortgage, many would become homeless and there would be 138 fewer homes in the city, which had already declared a housing emergency. Mr Davidson did not think that was value for money.

Mr Davidson asked Members to compare what they were proposing as an alternative, which was pragmatic, cost saving and compassionate. It would cost around £2 million to £3 million less than the demolition plan and it preserved the housing stock. It would also reduce pressure on Council housing lists and supported a more strategic approach to site planning but above all, it would give residents hope and it would give them a future.

Mr Davidson indicated that their plan identified a cluster of RAAC affected homes on the edge of Balnagask which could be made safe for £2-£3 million less on demolition costs. These homes would be offered to affected residents in exchange for their current properties, allowing the Council to plan its future site redevelopment and a more manageable contiguous area whilst avoiding the personal and financial destruction that mass displacement would bring. This option would allow the Council to maintain community cohesion, reduce the number of demolitions and protect people's financial dignity, whilst also avoiding placing additional pressure on an already over stretched housing list and make a significant public saving.

Mr Davidson advised that officers had confirmed their proposal was a viable option, and the only barrier was that officers recommended that homeowners pay for the roof replacement costs, but homeowners simply could not afford to do that. Mr Davidson stated that if residents could not afford the roof repairs and Members supported the officers current recommendation, the opportunity for remediation would disappear and that sent it back to mass demolition at a greater cost with greater human impact.

Mr Davidson asked Members to look beyond the numbers, as this situation was not just about buildings but it was about people. People who trusted the system to protect them in a time of great need. People who now needed Members to stand up for them. Mr Davidson intimated that there was a choice to be made today. Either to demolish homes and displace a number of families at a cost of £13million, leaving the Council with a site of no value, or the Council could spend less, save homes, protect financial futures, maintain a community and still deliver value for money.

Mr Davidson highlighted that this situation was not about party politics or scoring points or ideological debates. This was about people and it was about families facing financial ruin and despair through no fault of their own and to turn this into a political contest would be a failure of leadership. There was no political capital to be gained from forcing families out of their homes and Mr Davidson felt this was a moment in public service to rise above political divisions, to set differences aside and act in the shared interests of the constituents.

Mr Davidson concluded by asking Members to set aside the politics, to choose unity, compassion, value and hope and above all, choose a solution that respected the dignity of the people who were trusting the Council to protect their future over demolition, displacement and despair.

The Committee then asked a number of questions of Mr Davidson.

The Convener thanked all of the individuals who had presented their deputations.

### VIABILITY ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSALS FROM OWNERS OF PROPERTIES WITH RAAC - F&C/25/124

2. With reference to article 3 of the minute of Council of 17 February 2025, the Committee had before it a report by the Chief Officers - Corporate Landlord, Finance and Housing, which advised that the Council had noted the alternative options proposed by the Torry RAAC Campaign Group Management Committee and instructed officers to explore the feasibility, benefits and risks associated with each option, alongside any other identified opportunities to support owners and report the findings to this Committee. The report shared the outcomes of a Viability Assessment undertaken and made recommendations for consideration.

The report also took account of the instruction to consider the landscaping options outlined in a previous report, more fully when reporting back to Committee on the viability of the alternative options presented by the Torry RAAC Campaign Group Management Committee (TRCG).

#### The report recommended:-

that the Committee -

- (a) thank the Torry RAAC Campaign Group Management Committee (TRCG) and UK RAAC Campaign Group for their positive engagement in the process of identifying alternative options for owners and for granting permission to share the note of engagement via Appendix A with the Committee;
- (b) note the contents of the Viability Assessment contained in Appendix B and that the purpose of the review was to determine if there are additional options which would meet the Council's overall objectives:
- (c) note that Options 2, 3 and 4 in the Report are all identified by officers as being viable and worth investigating further with all owners;
- (d) note that TRCG have expressed a view that any option which involves owners contributing to costs or sharing equity in their property will not be acceptable to them;
- (e) note that if Option 3 is pursued there will require to be a commitment from all owners within any identified terraces of properties and that there will be a requirement to vacate properties timeously as part of the overall agreement in order to mitigate the health and safety risks;
- (f) note the previous decisions that Voluntary Acquisition will be at Market Value (with additional supporting payments as previously agreed) and agree that all options should be equitable in so far as no single option will be more financially beneficial than any other to owners;
- (g) instruct the Chief Officer Corporate Landlord to write to all homeowners to advise them of the alternative options presented, in keeping with the officer modelling within Appendix B, and ask homeowners, having considered the information, to

formally identify by the end of June 2025 which option they would be willing to consider; and:

#### In relation to the roof on roof off proposal (Option 3):

- instruct the Chief Officer Corporate Landlord, in consultation with the Chief Officers of Finance, Housing and Capital, to thereafter review terraces on the site which would best lend themselves to meeting demand for the roof on roof off option as indicated by owners;
- instruct the Chief Officer Corporate Landlord to progress negotiations with owners to deliver the option as identified in the Viability Assessment and enter into legal agreements as required if there is sufficient interest to undertake this option in relation to at least one full terrace where all owners are in agreement;
- approve the necessary spend, using the funding solution identified for voluntary acquisition, to undertake works as identified in the Viability Assessment including procuring works, supplies and services as required in accordance with the Council's Procurement Regulations;
- 4. instruct the Chief Officer Finance to explore the options in relation to loan, standard securities and shared equity mechanisms to support owners to meet a share of costs as outlined in the Viability Assessment in connection with their properties;
- 5. instruct the Chief Officer Corporate Landlord to instruct the disposal of properties to owners as identified in the Viability Assessment, where this is considered appropriate;

#### In relation to the excambion (house swap) option (Option 4):

- instruct the Chief Officer Corporate Landlord and Chief Officer Housing to identify Council houses that may be appropriate for excambion, prepare property information on these and circulate details to interested owners;
- 7. instruct the Chief Officer Corporate Landlord and Chief Officer Governance to arrange any necessary works to properties under existing delegated powers and conclude transactions in relation to this Option in accordance with the terms contained within the Viability Assessment;
- 8. approve the use of the existing funding solution for voluntary acquisition to fund these works, including making payment to the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) for the loss of housing stock (all at Market Value);
- 9. instruct the Chief Officer Housing to keep the Scottish Housing Regulator advised of progress with this work;
- (h) instruct the Chief Officer Corporate Landlord to progress negotiations with owners, in consultation with the Chief Officer Finance, and report back on

27 May 2025

- progress to the Communities, Housing and Public Protection Committee in August 2025 within the already scheduled report;
- (i) note that the first proposal within the UK RAAC Campaign Group Option is assessed as unviable, but that the remaining proposals have been built into the roof off/roof on proposal from the TRCG;
- (j) note that works to masterplan the site have been 'stepped down' until July 2025 to ensure clarity over the options being taken forward in this report, as have works to progress site landscaping and demolition to avoid abortive costs;
- instruct the Chief Officers of Finance, Housing and Corporate Landlord to continue to pursue all available funding options to meet the needs of the Council and owners; and
- (I) instruct the Chief Officers of Finance, Housing and Corporate Landlord to discuss the content of this report formally with External Audit to confirm that they have no objections to the Value for Money of the recommendations within this report.

The Convener moved, seconded by the Vice Convener:-

That the Committee approve the recommendations contained in the report.

Councillor Watson, seconded by Councillor Graham, moved as an amendment:-

That the Committee:-

- 1. note the contents of the report and approve recommendations 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.7 (subject to the changes below), 2.8 and 2.10;
- 2. agree that in respect of 2.5 of the recommendations, this matter was first brought to the attention of Elected Members back in February 2024;
- agree that the current proposals are likely to be unacceptable to the RAAC home owners, that this stalemate is likely to incur costs to the Council and instruct the Chief Officer - Capital and Chief Officer - Corporate Landlord to bring a paper to the next Communities, Housing and Public Protection Committee meeting on the additional costs to the Council if the process of demolition is delayed by one year;
- 4. approve recommendation 2.7 with the addition of instructing the Chief Officer Corporate Landlord to engage with owners on the following proposed amended options:-
  - (a) in relation to the house swap option, to include an additional discretionary financial contribution within the notional Voluntary acquisition package to reflect the impact of RAAC on property values (as per indicative figures in this report), where necessary to facilitate a viable exchange;
  - (b) in relation to the roof-off roof-on option, to agree that this option should be fully funded by the Council as a discretionary intervention with no expectation of any contribution from owners to any costs; and
  - (c) in relation to supporting owners to undertake RAAC remedial work, to agree that this should, where reasonable, be fully funded by ACC,

Reporting the outcome of this engagement, along with the financial benefit if properties do not have to be demolished to the next appropriate committee, to include consideration of financial and legal implications.

- 5. agree the Council had in the past moved forward with the legislation and carried out works by taking charges against owners' properties;
- 6. approve recommendation 2.11 with the addition of noting that there had been no formal proposal to the Scottish Government to use the spare £20 million in the City Region Deal to resolve the RAAC crisis; and instruct the Chief Officer Corporate Landlord to bring a report to the next Finance and Resources Committee on the potential for preparing a bid to the Scottish Government for the use of any parts of the Housing Infrastructure Fund under the City Region Deal, fiscal flexibility, potential capital funds or other pots of money, to cover the potential costs of resolving the RAAC issue based on a maximum of offering homeowners the Market Value of their property with an additional payment to reflect the impact of RAAC on the value of their property, subject to agreement of a lawful funding mechanism;
- 7. instruct the Interim Chief Officer Governance to provide or obtain a legal opinion on whether the Council had any legal duty to disclose the presence of RAAC or problems associated with RAAC when the council houses were sold by the Council under Right to Buy; and
- 8. instruct the Chief Executive to write to the First Minister calling for a full statutory public inquiry, under the Inquiries Act 2005.

On a division, there voted - <u>for the motion</u> (5) - the Convener, the Vice Convener and Councillors Bouse, Davidson and McLellan - <u>for the amendment</u> (4) - Councillors Cross, Graham, Malik and Watson.

#### The Committee resolved:-

- (i) to note that the Chief Officer Corporate Landlord, would issue a Service Update to members with details on offers accepted from homeowners; and
- (ii) to adopt the motion.

At this juncture, Councillor Watson intimated that he wished to refer the matter to Council, under Standing Order 34.1. The Convener advised that she was exercising her right under Standing Order 34.1 to determine that the matter would not be referred.

#### **HOUSING BI ANNUAL REPORT - F&C/25/119**

3. With reference to article 13 of the minute of the meeting of 21 November 2024, the Committee had before it a report by the Executive Director – Families and Communities, which presented Committee with the bi-annual report, to enable Members to have oversight of all housing improvement activity being coordinated by the Housing Board.

The report also aimed to satisfy a previous instruction to report the implications of resource planning assumptions made by the Scottish Government, when known.

The Committee heard from Lewis McGill and Geraldine Matthew, who represented the Aberdeen Housing Service Review Group and provided an overview of the review that had been undertaken. The review was an appendix to the report.

Ms Matthew began by advising that from the beginning, the group had agreed that there would be no barrier to joining the group, and wanted to ensure that the group truly represented all of its tenants and to be fully inclusive.

Ms Matthew indicated that they worked closely with the communities team, Community Councils and also had a member of the Aberdeen Youth Group attend their meetings. They were also engaged with the Aberdeen Learning Disability Group. Ms Matthew highlighted that the group had received several national awards over the years and had recently been shortlisted for tenant group of the year 2025, as well as individual recognitions and awards, which highlighted the dedication that the volunteers put into their communities.

Ms Matthew spoke about what had been working well and also what could be done to improve things from a tenant's perspective. Ms Matthew indicated that they were pleased to say that they now felt empowered, more now than ever.

Mr McGill then spoke and advised that the group aimed to represent all Council tenants and noted that communication and engagement were very important, with social media playing a key role and they used it frequently to connect with tenants. They also made sure they met people face to face too. The Facebook group now had over 4000 members and it was an active space where tenants could stay informed, ask questions and share their views.

Mr McGill noted that to date, the Housing Service Review Group had completed six full reviews and one read review. Every set of recommendations they made were included in an action plan, as part of their final report. These actions were implemented unless a specific reason was provided, such as limitations due to the technology.

Mr McGill provided a summary of the work that had been undertaken so far, and noted that the group took pride in making sure the reports were clear, well represented and accessible. He thanked the communications and design team for their ongoing support. In order to reach as many tenants as possible Mr McGill asked that the Council email the reports to everyone with an email address, which was around 13,500 tenants.

Mr McGill thanked Members for inviting them along to the meeting and noted that he hoped it marked the beginning of a stronger tenant involvement. He also hoped that Members found the latest report and its recommendations informative and constructive, in order to work together for better services.

27 May 2025

Members then asked a number of questions of Ms Matthew and Mr McGill.

#### The report recommended:-

that the Committee -

- (a) note the progress made by the Housing Board from December 2024 to May 2025;
- (b) endorse the amended Plan available in Appendix A;
- (c) instruct the Housing Board to present an amended and measurable Improvement Plan for approval as part of the Housing Board Bi-Annual Report in November 2025:
- (d) note the key data summary available in Appendix B;
- (e) note the Terms of Reference for the Cross Party Working Group available in Appendix C;
- (f) welcome the findings of the Aberdeen Tenant Service Review Group available in Appendix D;
- (g) instruct the Chief Officer Housing to work with the Aberdeen Tenant Service Review Group to positively respond to the findings of their review and report progress against tenant recommendations through a subsequent Housing Board Bi-Annual Report;
- (h) approve the arranged access procedure available in Appendix E in relation to Electrical Installation Condition Report inspections to ensure that all Council owned properties comply with necessary health and safety checks;
- (i) instruct the Chief Officer Housing to implement the Quality Improvement Framework available in Appendix F;
- (j) instruct the Chief Officer Housing to evaluate the impact of the Quality Improvement Framework on an annual basis and present an updated Framework to Committee for approval within one calendar year as part of the May Housing Board Bi-Annual Report:
- (k) note the homeless benchmarking summary report available in Appendix G; and
- (I) note the resource planning assumptions issued by Scottish Government on 18 March 2025 for the affordable housing supply programme in 2025/26:

The Convener moved, seconded by the Vice Convener:-

That the Committee approve the recommendations contained in the report.

Councillor Graham, seconded by Councillor Watson, moved as an amendment:-

That the Committee -

- 1. note that there was an ongoing housing emergency, and that there were still significant levels of homelessness in Aberdeen and the Council house voids figures were still woefully high;
- 2. note that the Convener of the Communities, Housing and Public Protection Committee did not attend the last Voids Working Group;
- note that the Housing Emergency Action Plan was not working quickly enough;
- 4. instruct the Executive Director Families and Communities to submit an updated Housing Emergency Action Plan to the next Communities, Housing

and Public Protection Committee which reflects the true scale of the housing emergency in Aberdeen.

On a division, there voted – <u>for the motion</u> (5) – the Convener, the Vice Convener and Councillors Bouse, Davidson and McLellan – <u>for the amendment</u> (4) – Councillors Cross, Graham, Malik and Watson.

#### The Committee resolved:-

- (i) to request that the Chief Officer Housing, provide information to members by way of email, in regards to the various tenants groups and provide details on frequency of their meetings, as well as how members were recruited; and
- (ii) to adopt the motion.

#### MINUTE OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF 11 MARCH 2025

**4.** The Committee had before it the minute of the previous meeting of 11 March 2025, for approval.

#### The Committee resolved:-

to approve the minute as a correct record.

#### COMMITTEE BUSINESS PLANNER

**5.** The Committee had before it the committee business planner, as prepared by the Interim Chief Officer – Governance.

#### The Committee resolved:-

- (i) to agree to remove item 40 (Aberdeen City's Strategic Housing Investment Plan 2025/26 2029/30), as this was incorporated into the Housing Bi-Annual report; and
- (ii) to otherwise note the committee business planner.

#### **BUILDING STANDARDS ACTIVITY REPORT - CR&E/25/114**

**6.** The Committee had before it a report by the Chief Officer – Strategic Place Planning, which provided assurance and an overview of the Council's responsibilities in relation to securing dangerous buildings and protecting public safety, as well as activity on unauthorised building work and unauthorised occupation of buildings.

#### The report recommended:-

that the Committee -

(a) note the contents of the report and appendix; and

(b) agree to receive a further Building Standards Activity Report at the meeting of the Communities, Housing and Public Protection Committee on 11th November 2025.

#### The Committee resolved:-

to approve the recommendations.

### PROTECTIVE SERVICES FOOD REGULATORY SERVICE PLAN 2025-26 - CORS/25/026

7. The Committee had before it a report by the Interim Chief Officer – Governance, which advised that the Food Law Code of Practice (Scotland) 2019 required Local Authorities to prepare an annual Service Plan which detailed the intended activity of the Service based on the resources allocated.

The report noted that food enforcement services provided by Aberdeen City Council were located in Protective Services, a city-wide service within Governance and the majority of food enforcement work took place within the Commercial section of the service and officers were also involved in the provision of Elementary Food Hygiene Training, enforcement of health and safety, port health, licensing and animal health & welfare.

#### The report recommended:-

that the Committee -

- (a) approve the Protective Services Food Regulatory Service Plan 2025/2026 as detailed in Appendix A: and
- (b) note the review of performance against the Protective Services Food Regulatory Service Plan 2024/2025 contained within Appendix 2 of the Service Plan 2025/2026.

#### The Committee resolved:-

to approve the recommendations.

### PROTECTIVE SERVICES OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY REGULATORY SERVICE PLAN 2025/26 - CORS/25/058

**8.** The Committee had before it a report by the Interim Chief Officer – Governance, which outlined the Protective Services proposals for delivering the Occupational Health and Safety Regulatory Service for year 2025/26.

The report noted that as an enforcing authority, the Council had responsibility for the provision of health and safety enforcement services which covered a range of businesses, mainly within the service sector and covered approximately 4500 establishments.

#### The report recommended:-

that the Committee approve the Occupational Health and Safety Regulatory Service Plan for 2025/26 at appendix 1.

#### The Committee resolved:-

to approve the recommendation.

#### PERFORMANCE REPORT - CORS/25/095

**9.** The Committee had before it a report by the Chief Officer – Data Insights, which presented Committee with the status of appropriate key performance measures relating to services falling within its remit.

#### The report recommended:-

that the Committee note the report and provide comments and observations on the performance information contained in the report Appendix.

#### The Committee resolved:-

- (i) to request that the Chief Officer Corporate Landlord, provide details to members via email in relation to the average time to complete repairs;
- (ii) to request that the Chief Officer Corporate Landlord include information in the next performance report in relation to the increase of complaints being upheld;
- (iii) to request that the Chief Officer Digital and Technology provide information to members via email, in regards to the percentage of priority one and two incidents closed in the time scale on page 147 of the report; and
- (iv) to note the performance report.

#### SCOTTISH FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE PERFORMANCE REPORT- SFR/25/115

**10.** The Committee had before it a report by Scottish Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS), which presented the end of year performance figures, from 1 April 2024 to 31 March 2025 of the SFRS against the current objectives contained within the Aberdeen City Local Fire and Rescue Plan.

#### The report recommended:-

that the Committee note the performance data provided within the Scottish Fire & Rescue Service end of year performance report 1 April 2024 to 31 March 2025, at appendix A.

The Committee heard from Andrew Wright, Local Commander, Scottish Fire and Rescue Service, who spoke in furtherance of the report and answered various questions from Members.

#### The Committee resolved:-

to note the performance report.

#### POLICE SCOTLAND THEMATIC REPORT - WILFUL FIRERAISING - POL/25/117

**11.** The Committee had before it a report by Police Scotland, which provided the Committee with an overview of Wilful Fire-Raising in Aberdeen City and the collaborative approaches with stakeholders in response.

The report noted that wilful fire-raising offences across North East Division had followed a consistent downward trend over the last five years (2020 to 2025), aligned with broader force-wide reductions.

The report also indicated that division wide data analysis highlighted both seasonal and geographic spikes in offending, particularly during March, June and November, with statistical peaks occurring in late evenings and on Saturdays. The trend appeared linked to seasonal behaviours and social activity patterns, which offered opportunities for targeted preventative work.

The Committee heard from Divisional Commander Kate Stephen who provided an overview of the report and answered various questions from Members.

#### The report recommended:-

that the Committee discuss, comment on, and endorse the report.

#### The Committee resolved:-

to note the information contained in the report.

#### POLICE SCOTLAND CRIME PREVENTION THEMATIC REPORT - POL/25/116

**12.** The Committee had before it a report by Police Scotland, which provided the Committee with a strategic overview of ongoing crime prevention activity across the North East Division.

The report noted that the North East Division, in collaboration with stakeholders, delivered crime prevention through the implementation of strategies, policies, and measures designed to reduce crime, deter criminality, and enhance public safety through early intervention. Whilst crime prevention was a shared responsibility, the Division's dedicated workstreams were primarily led by the Partnerships, Preventions and Interventions Unit (PPI) and the Criminal Investigation Department (CID), under the oversight of departmental Chief Inspectors.

The Committee heard from Divisional Commander Kate Stephen who provided an overview of the report and answered various questions from Members.

#### The report recommended:-

that the Committee discuss, comment on and endorse the report.

#### The Committee resolved:-

- (i) to note that Police Scotland would provide any feedback to members via the clerk, in regards to the meet your police officer events which had been held recently in the city; and
- (ii) to otherwise note the information contained in the report.

### POLICE SCOTLAND THEMATIC REPORT - COMMUNITY SAFETY DOG RELATED INCIDENTS - POL/25/118

**13.** The Committee had before it a report by Police Scotland, which provided the Committee with an overview of legislation, current processes and procedures and data in respect of incidents and offences relating to Dangerous Dogs and Banned Breeds.

The report noted that given public interest, increased reporting, the necessity to collate information to assess/mitigate risk and provide community reassurance, Community Safety Partnership Officers within Aberdeen City identified all dog related incidents/crime reports daily and shared information with partners in order that the information could be enhanced, risk could be assessed and incidents allocated to the most appropriate agency.

In addition to partners within the Community Safety Partnership, Aberdeen City Police Officers also had direct contact with the Local Area Dog Warden (or Animal Welfare Officer).

The Committee heard from Divisional Commander Kate Stephen who provided an overview of the report and answered various questions from Members.

#### The report recommended:-

that the Committee discuss, comment on, and endorse the report.

#### The Committee resolved:-

- (i) to request that the Executive Director Families & Communities, liaise with the dog wardens in regards to any trends with dangerous dogs and for this information to be circulated to members by way of email; and
- (ii) to note the information contained in the report.

#### **AFFORDABLE HOUSING - F&C/25/120**

**14.** With reference to article 13 of the minute of the meeting of 5 September 2024, the Committee had before it a report by the Chief Officer – Housing, which provided an update on Aberdeen City's Affordable Housing Delivery Programme.

The report noted that £12.508m was allocated to Aberdeen City Council in 2024/25 through the Scottish Government's affordable housing supply programme which was fully utilised, and in 2024/25 there were 459 affordable housing completions through the affordable housing supply programme. 334 of these homes were fully wheelchair accessible and 8 were specialist provision homes. It was projected that a further 472 homes would be completed in 2025/26.

#### The report recommended:-

that the Committee note the progress on delivery of Aberdeen City's Affordable Housing Delivery Programme.

The Convener moved, seconded by the Vice Convener:-

That the Committee approve the recommendations contained in the report.

Councillor Graham, seconded by Councillor Watson, moved as an amendment:-

That the Committee:-

- 1. approve recommendation 2.1;
- 2. congratulate officers on the delivery of 200 new council houses for social rent in 2024/25, which were commissioned under the previous Labour led administration; and
- 3. instruct the Chief Officer Corporate Landlord, following consultation with the Chief Officer - Finance and the Chief Officer - Housing, to prepare a strategic outline business case to consider the options to deliver 1,000 new council houses in the city, to include a realistic timeframe, financial implications on the Housing Revenue Account and potential delivery mechanisms, and to be reported as part of the 25/26 budget process.

On a division, there voted - <u>for the motion</u> (5) - the Convener, the Vice Convener and Councillors Bouse, Davidson and McLellan - <u>for the amendment</u> (4) - Councillors Cross, Graham, Malik and Watson.

#### The Committee resolved:-

to adopt the motion.

- COUNCILLOR MIRANDA RADLEY, Convener