

Cabinet- Public Questions and Answers

Name of person submitting	Questions
Paul Elstone	<p>Question 1: It is noted that the Mid Devon District Council (MDDC) Corporate Risk Report CR 18 Housing Rent Error risk score has increased by 50% or from a score of 8 to 12 over the last month. Given that the Housing Rent Error risk is deemed either reputational or financial it would not be unreasonable to consider that it is in fact the financial risk that has increased.</p> <p>It is mentioned that Mid Devon District Council (MDDC) are waiting on a national policy decision from the Department of Work and Pensions.</p> <p>Research conducted leads me to believe that Department for Working Pension (DWP) are not constrained by the 6-year legal limitation when recovering overpayments. This including Housing Benefit and Universal Credit amounts. That the DWP have mechanisms available and which historically they have used to recover overpayments they have made, this irrespective of time limits.</p> <p>Does the increase in risk scoring now recognise this potential?</p> <p>Response from the Deputy Leader: The increase in risk score reflects the ongoing lack of decision from the DWP as referred to in the report.</p> <p>Question 2: The Council made a rent repayment provision of £1.545 million in the 2023/24 financial statement which was rolled forward and increased to £1.777 million as at the 31 March 2025.</p> <p>What is the current amount of the rent repayment provision this including when potential Department for Working Pension (DWP) uplifts are factored in?</p> <p>Response from the Deputy Leader: The current provision remains at £1.777m as per the latest set of Accounts. All provisions are reviewed on an annual basis, so this sum will be revisited when we finalise the 2025/26 Accounts.</p>

Question 3:

When the referenced outstanding Department for Working Pension (DWP) communication is received, will it be made available to all elected members?

Response from the Deputy Leader:

Yes

Question 4:

For the purposes of full openness and transparency will this document be made public?

Response from the Deputy Leader:

Yes, unless there is any legal reason to prevent us from so doing.

Question 5:

It is noted that the drawing is an old revision it shows a bike storage area that no longer exist. Additionally, the provision of the ten (10) additional parking spaces is not shown.

A parking area that was contentious and which was rejected by the Mid Devon District Council (MDDC) Planning Committee and only granted on appeal.

Was using an outdated drawing an omission, a mistake, or intentional?

Response from the Deputy Leader:

The objective of these proposals is to remedy particular concerns that do not relate to the 10 spaces mentioned. For that reason, it is not felt an older version of the plan affects any part of the proposal to address the aforementioned concerns.

Question 6:

The Appendix 1 drawing is very poorly annotated, and no explanation of the intent of the bold red line is provided. What prevents someone from parking in the location of the previous bike store and unconstrained?

Response from the Deputy Leader:

The proposals are designed to specifically address concerns raised regarding access and egress. The proposed restrictions cover from the building line to the centre of the carriageway, given that this section of land is not much wider than a car width, one could not park here and not be in contravention of the restriction.

Question 7:

With the ten (10) parking spaces not being shown as part of the Off-Street Parking Area – what is to prevent non-residents parking at this location?

Response from the Deputy Leader:

These proposals were put forward to address access and egress concerns; there have been no reports made regarding parking issues related to residents and parking within these bays. Should concerns arise this can be potentially addressed at that stage.

This page is intentionally left blank