

**NOTES  
OF THE MEETING OF THE  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GROUP  
MONDAY 26 JULY 2010**



Held at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Pavilion Road, West  
Bridgford

**PRESENT:**

Councillors Mrs J A Smith (Chairman), S J Boote, M G Hemsley, T W Holt, G R Mallender, P W Smith (substitute for Councillor T Combellack), J A Stockwood and Mrs M Stockwood (substitute for Councillor B Tansley)

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

R Crowder	Chief Executive, Rural Community Action Network
T Jarrow	Chairman, Cropwell Bishop Parish Plan Group
A Wilson	Chairman, Cropwell Bishop Parish Council

**OFFICERS PRESENT:**

P Barker	Support Services Manager
D Burch	Waste and Fleet Manager
C Jones	Senior Rural Officer
V Nightingale	Senior Member Support Officer
P Randle	Deputy Chief Executive (PR)
C Taylor	Cultural Services Manager

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:**

Councillors T Combellack, J E Cottee and B Tansley

**1. Declarations of Interest**

There were none declared.

**2. Notes of the Previous Meeting**

The notes of the meeting held on Monday 19 April 2010 were accepted as a true record.

With regard to the Action Plan Members noted that the Draft Customer Access Strategy had been approved by Cabinet and that the Deputy Chief Executive (PR) would provide Members with the information requested regarding the Choice Based Lettings Scheme and Draft Housing Allocations Policy.

**3. Community Led Planning**

Mr Crowder and Mr Jarrow gave a presentation to the Group. Mr Crowder explained how the Rural Community Action Network (RCAN) supported the rural communities on a wide range of initiatives including parish planning. He explained that the organisation was a charity and a voluntary organisation. However, it did fund rural officers who could assist groups in the rural areas to build on local knowledge and progress local projects. He explained that over £800,000 had been brought into the Rushcliffe area through obtaining external

funding. The Network had helped with the development of the Sustainable Community Strategy and several parish plans.

With regard to the parish plans he informed Members that these had been used to identify the need for play equipment in the rural areas and to justify the allocation of the Playbuilder Fund money. Also WREN had cited the parish plan as one of the reasons it had funding a project for new community facilities. Other areas where plans had been influential were:

- Identifying where local transport was required
- Community shops in small villages
- Affordable rural housing
- And environmental improvements

Mr Jarrow then explained to Members how the Plan had been developed in Cropwell Bishop. He informed Members that it had been started in 2007 and 20 people had attended the first meeting. Over the next few years public meetings had been held to identify what was needed to help build a strong and viable community. The actual Plan was launched after 2 years. Members were informed that there had been several clubs identified and the Plan had helped draw this altogether. It had been identified that there was not a youth club in the village and the young people were surveyed to identify what they wanted. Teenagers requested a skate park and this was finally achieved in November 2009. Another area of need that was addressed was the lack of allotments.

During the development stage the County Council had stated that they wished to sell off the old school which had not been used for approximately 20 years. This building had been used as a community facility and the villagers agreed to raise their parish precept to enable the community to buy, and refurbish, the building. It was now considered to be a focal point for the community and was used by many of the new clubs.

It was noted that over 200 people were now actively involved in the various clubs and that the village had an active social life, which was facilitated by a website. The IT was seen as a vital part of the growth of the Plan and also the good working relationship, and mutual support, of the parish council and the parish plan group. It was also recognised that with the number of people now involved the village was past the critical stage and that the groups were not dependent on individuals to survive. Villagers had expressed their support of the work involved in the Plan and felt that it had inspired the area.

Following questions it was acknowledged that the population of Cropwell Bishop had been very good and was workable. It was noted that larger villages could encounter problems due to their size but it was felt to be vital that the steering group should be focussed on what was required by, and for, the village. It was also felt that the larger villages could possibly feel sceptical and that they had all the necessary amenities however without asking the villagers this could not be clarified, it was also felt that the process of producing a plan helped to unite the community and truly identify the residents requirements.

Members were informed that each of the groups had their own steering committee and that they were all totally separate from each other, although it was recognised that some people did belong to more than one group. Everything was brought together in one website that could be added to by more than one individual.

With regard to urban area plans Mr Crowder explained that this was something that could be considered if required.

Mr Crowder explained to the Group that RCAN supported and revisited plans every 5 years.

It was AGREED that the work done by the rural officer and local communities in developing community led plans be commended.

The Chairman, on behalf of the Group, thanked Mr Crowder, Mr Jarrow and Mr Wilson for attending the meeting and for answering questions.

#### **4. Glass Recycling – Final Update**

The Support Services Manager explained to Members how the service had worked with parish councils and the County Council to develop new glass bring sites in the Borough. He stated that out of the 7 sites considered there had been 3 new sites introduced. The service would continue to work with developers on any new projects and would review any available areas of land in order to increase the number of sites in the Borough. It was felt that the glass recycling project had now concluded and had been incorporated into the service's work.

Councillor Mallender expressed disappointment that the Council had not implemented a kerbside collection of glass and he felt that this should be kept under review. It was noted that the Council had decided that kerbside collection was not financially viable before the recent economic crisis.

Following a question officers explained that if residents identified a suitable site the recycling officer would work with the local group to see if it was feasible and economically viable and if the site could be secured.

Members queried if there had been any complaints about the new sites and the new 'noise reduced' banks. Officers stated that there had been some complaints from Bingham and East Bridgford however the Ombudsman had found in the Council's favour.

With regard to Members' concerns over glass being put into the 'grey' bins officers stated that a waste analysis had been carried out and that very little glass was found in the residual waste, most was recycled at either the bring sites or the household waste sites.

Councillor Boote asked about the recycling of tetrapak containers. Officers explained that this had been hard to recycle, however collections were becoming more reliable and as this improved the Council would introduce more sites. It was noted that this would only increase the Council's recycling by approximately 7 tonnes per year.

With regard to the sites at Sutton Bonington it was agreed that officers would inform Members of the collection days as there were concerns expressed about glass being collected on a Sunday.

Members were informed that most of the Borough was effectively served by bring sites with just a few of the remote smaller villagers having no provision.

It was AGREED that the completion of the project be noted; and that the successful work achieved to date in delivering three new glass bring sites across the Borough be acknowledged.

## 5. Children and Young People

The Group considered the report of the Head of Community Shaping regarding the Council's Strategic Task 12 to "*work with partners to develop opportunities for children and young people to help them discover and achieve their potential over the next four years.*" The Group were informed that there were approximately 25,000 young people between the ages of 0 -19 in the Borough and that 75% were of school age, this equated to 24% of the Borough's population.

The Cultural Services Manager explained that the Nottinghamshire Children's Trust, which was a partnership between the district and County councils, the police, NHS and voluntary organisations, had produced a countywide plan for 2009-11 following extensive consultation. This Plan outlined the work that would be undertaken to achieve the 5 outcomes of the 2004 Children's Act. He explained that each priority had between 3 and 6 performance indicators.

He also there was currently no specific Council Plan for Children and Young People, however the Local Strategic Partnership's Theme Group had produced an action plan. Officers explained that the Borough Council was the lead organisation on a variety of activities that contributed towards the targets of this Plan. Officers felt that a Rushcliffe Borough Council 'Children and Young People's Action Plan' should be developed in 2011 to identify all the work undertaken by the Borough Council and to show the challenges that could impact on that work, such as

- the possible withdrawal of external funding
- the national review of the Playbuilder scheme
- the uncertainty of national priorities
- the new county wide plan by the Nottinghamshire Children's Trust.

Members were concerned about the domestic violence performances at the Bridgfest teenage music event and were assured by officers that the young people would be made aware that what had taken place was a staged performance and that this would facilitate discussions on abusive relationships and support available.

Members raised the issue of the lack of parish playschemes. The Cultural Services Manager explained that the County Council playworker had offered to help with playdays or training for volunteers but the majority of schemes were

dependent on volunteers. Members felt that the difficulties associated with CRB<sup>1</sup> checks could deter people, however, they supported playschemes in principle.

Following questions the Cultural Services Manager informed Members that equal emphasis was placed on sports and arts for young people and highlighted some of the arts projects that had been held. He stated that, to avoid duplication, the extended schools service was considered and officers then identified any gaps. He also explained that the Sports Development Officer had a good working relationship with schools and clubs.

With regard to monitoring the Rushcliffe Children and Young People action plan, and Rushcliffe's performance, Members were informed that the information was available via the Local Strategic Partnership. With regard to the district profile for Rushcliffe the only underperforming area was the number of young people voting in school elections. The performance was also compared against the country's average. Councillor J Stockwood explained that there was only the current year shown and felt that it would be beneficial to be able to compare past years to show improvements. The Cultural Services Manager agreed that this would be a valuable piece of work but was reliant on external data.

The Deputy Chief Executive (PR) explained that a new Action Plan would be developed based on the Council's Corporate Strategy and the County Council's strategies. It was felt that the Council's Action Plan was dependant on the Nottinghamshire Children's Trust's next Strategy and that the Group should reconsider this issue in early 2011.

It was AGREED that the Community Development Group

- a. endorsed the work undertaken towards the achievement of Strategic Task 12, and
- b. supported the proposal to develop a Rushcliffe Borough Council 'Children and Young People's Action Plan' during 2011 following further clarity on future national and county priorities

## 6. **Climate Change Action Plan**

The Group was presented with the revised Climate Change Action Plan. Officers informed Members that, following the Group's recommendation, the Action Plan had been prioritised by the Heads of Service and the Cabinet Portfolio Holder.

Members were concerned that there were a large number of actions delegated to the Community Energy Officer and wondered if this was realistic. The Deputy Chief Executive (PR) assured Members that this formed the basis of her work. Members queried how residents could be kept up to date on any grants/offers that might be available for insulation. The Deputy Chief Executive (PR) explained that these were mostly administered by the energy

---

<sup>1</sup> Criminal Records Bureau

companies and that residents could use the Council's website or contact the Customer Services Centre for this information.

With regard to Action 2.3 'Investigate business recycling services' Members would receive further information either as an agenda item or as part of the budget consultation.

Members were interested in the Marches Energy Agency funding for supporting community buildings to become sustainable. Officers agreed to provide further information.

Councillor P W Smith felt that meetings should start at 6.00 pm as this would not only help reduce energy use but could be an opportunity to save money. However, he was informed that this did not have overwhelming support.

Following a question regard the climate change adaptation plan officers explained that there had been no progress made as there was some uncertainty regarding National Indicator 188.

Regarding Action 3.17 'Work in partnership with the Local Strategic Partnership to ensure fuel poverty is tackled' it was felt that this should be changed to high priority as the Performance Management Board had been informed that incidents of winter deaths was high in Rushcliffe. It was also felt that people were not aware of schemes to assist people and that the Council should be more proactive. The Deputy Chief Executive (PR) stated that the Council did a lot of work to improve the standard of housing in the Borough including reports in Rushcliffe Reports, promotion at Council events and through the work of the Community Energy Officer and the Environmental Health section.

Members discussed Action Point 4.15 'Investigate option to produce and use bio-fuels produced from waste for the council fleet'. It was felt that further investigation was required as the fuel could be expensive to produce. It was noted that there was a business in the Borough that used bio-fuels. Officers explained that this had been deemed a low priority due to the Council's resources, however the County Council might wish to lead on a countywide project.

It was AGREED that

- a) Members endorsed the attached revised action plan which would be a working document and regularly updated by officers. It would be available on the council's website.
- b) The Climate Change Action Plan is monitored from now by the Performance Management Board on an annual basis using exception reporting.

## 7. **Work Programme – July 2010**

The Group considered their work programme and agreed the changes made by the Scrutiny Chairmen/Vice Chairmen's Group. It was noted that the date had changed for the October meeting.

The meeting closed at 9.10 pm.

## Action Sheet

### COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GROUP - MONDAY 26 JULY 2010

Minute Number	Actions	Officer Responsible
3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting	Choice Based Lettings Scheme and Draft Housing Allocations - officers to clarify the number of bedrooms people would be offered.	Deputy Chief Executive (PR)
6. Climate Change Action Plan	Officers to provide further information on Marches Energy Agency funding for supporting community buildings to become sustainable.	Deputy Chief Executive (PR)