



**NOTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT BOARD
TUESDAY 29 JUNE 2010**

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

PRESENT:

Councillors S Bennett (Chairman), Mrs S P Bailey, B Buschman, R M Jones (substitute for Councillor), A MacInnes, Mrs J M Marshall, J A Stockwood, Mrs M Stockwood (substitute for Councillor) and D G Wheeler

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Councillors S J Boote and J A Cranswick

OFFICERS PRESENT:

C Caven-Atack	Performance and Reputation Manager
S Goodrich	Head of Revenues & ICT Services
S Griffiths	Deputy Chief Executive (SG)
V Nightingale	Senior Member Support Officer

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

Councillors M M Champion and K A Khan

1. Declarations of Interest

There were none declared.

2. Cabinet Member Questions

There were none received.

3. Notes of the Previous Meeting

The notes of the meeting held on Tuesday 27 April 2010 were accepted as a true record.

4. Cabinet Call In – Improvements to Public Conveniences – Bridgford Park – Approval of Scheme

Councillor Jones requested that anyone who had previously had discussions with the Executive on this issue should not vote on the Call In. He was advised that this was not a relevant objection.

Councillor Boote, as lead signatory, explained the reasons why the issue had been called in. He stated that all the signatories strongly supported the refurbishment of the toilets, that it was an important facility and would have many users. However, he felt that the issue needed to be scrutinised and felt that this should have been considered by the Community Development Group before Cabinet had made the decision. He informed Members that following a

conversation with the British Toilet Association regarding the issue he had several concerns. These were:

1. Unisex cubicles – it was apparent from a community survey that some people did not like sharing toilets with the opposite gender. He felt that one if not all the cubicles should have urinals. Also if considering the best method for throughput a single queue was better.
2. A lack of natural light – people would feel uneasy and enclosed if there was a power cut. He asked if small skylights should have been part of the design.
3. Charging – he queried how many people voted for the 20p charge. He was concerned about charging as public toilets used to be free, and still were in many areas of the Borough – thereby giving an inconsistent approach by the Council. He requested further information on how this would impact on children using the park's facilities, would there be access via the radar key for the disabled. He asked if officers felt that charging would incur or avoid incidents of vandalism.
4. Supervision – he felt that Members needed further information on the amount of supervision the toilets would have from the people in the kiosk. He also wanted information on the cleaning schedule.
5. Costs – when speaking to the British Toilet Association Councillor Boote stated that in the Association's opinion the scheme would cost in excess of £100,000 and operating costs would be approximately £15-17,000 per annum, which would not be recouped at a charge of 20p.
6. Strategy – Councillor Boote felt that the Council needed an overall toilet strategy. He recognised that this was not a statutory duty, however the public did expect this service and the Council did provide free toilets in other areas of the Borough. He had proposed a community toilet scheme at a previous meeting of the Community Development Group and this had not been pursued as it was felt to be too expensive.

Overall he supported the proposals but felt that more scrutiny was required. He was concerned that this project would put a £2 increase on the Council Tax of all residents and wondered if it should be funded through the West Bridgford Special Expense. He urged Members to refer this issue back to Cabinet for it to be referred to a meeting of the Community Development Group.

Members of the Board expressed concerns that some of Councillor Boote's concerns were not part of the Call In process. The Chairman stated that only those issues contained within the Call In document would be considered by the Board.

Councillor Cranswick, Cabinet portfolio holder for Finance and Asset Management, replied to Councillor Boote's relevant concerns.

1. Radar Key Access – he assured Members that one cubicle would be accessible via the Radar Key and that there would be no charge for use with that scheme.

2. Cleaning Schedule – he did not feel that this was an issue for Cabinet to discuss as officers would ensure that the toilets were kept clean. At present the toilets were cleaned twice a day and this was increased when it was felt necessary to use extra resources. If the toilets were not kept to a reasonable clean standard then Members would be able to contact officers and ask why.
3. Vandalism – Councillor Cranswick stated that realistically you could not make these toilets completely vandal proof. However, through the use of new materials the furnishings were not as easy to damage. Officers had spoken to the British Toilet Association and had received advice that a minimal charge of 20p would mitigate vandalism, opportune vandals would be deterred. To help stop vandalism the toilet doors would be facing the kiosk. As stated in the Cabinet report officers were in discussion with retailers on the use of the kiosk, however, if this was not viable then the kiosk would be the park rangers' office.

The Head of Revenues & ICT Services explained that from the Council's survey 42% of the responses said that they were happy to pay 20p and 51% agreed to a charge of up to 20p.

Some Members were still concerned about the cleaning of the facilities as this was one of the issues raised by residents. Councillor Cranswick stated that experience would inform officers the best method for keeping the toilets reasonably clean and that any schedule would be extremely varied due to other factors ie cricket/football matches, events at the park. He assured Members that the Council would keep the facilities clean and if a complaint was received officers would act upon it. The Head of Revenues & ICT Services explained that the proposed fixtures and fittings would look cleaner than those presently used.

Following a question officers informed Members that the issue of cash collection and the possible anti-social behaviour associated with having cash on the premises had been considered and was included in the feasibility study that Cabinet had requested.

Councillor Boote stated that this discussion had increased his knowledge of the issue and he welcomed the fact that Radar Keys could be used. He was still concerned about vandalism and about the costs of the project. However, he was surprised that Cabinet had not requested further information on the cleaning schedule and felt that this was part of scrutinising a decision.

In conclusion Councillor Cranswick stated that no-one could say how much vandalism would occur and that mitigating factors were part of the project, eg the kiosk and supervision. He was uncertain how the Association could cost the project without fully knowing all the facts, had they been made aware of the fact that the structure of the building existed and that the contractor had costed the project. He pointed out that if there were any problems following the introduction of the new facilities this would be part of the scrutiny process to ensure that services were run effectively.

Councillor MacInnes, Ward Member, said that the Ward Councillors had also undertaken a survey and the results were fairly similar to the Council's especially regarding charging. He was still concerned that all 4 cubicles would be unisex and that no provision had been provided to address female concerns. He was still concerned about access for 11 – 14 year olds.

The Chairman asked that these concerns be included in the feasibility study. Councillor Cranswick agreed to consider this.

The Board considered the options available to them, whether to refer it back to Cabinet or to uphold the Cabinet's decision.

It was AGREED that the Cabinet's decision be upheld.

5. Nottinghamshire Local Area Agreement 2008 - 2011

The Performance and Reputation Manager presented a report outlining the progress made on the eleven areas which Rushcliffe Borough Council was contributing to as part of the Local Area Agreement. She explained that in six indicators Rushcliffe was performing at a higher level than the County overall, in three performance was lower and that no data was available for the remaining two indicators. Members were also informed of recent changes to the amount of the Local Area Agreement grant and that there was an uncertainty on future funding.

Following a question the Deputy Chief Executive (SG) explained that the reward grant was held by the Borough Council on behalf of the Local Strategic Partnership and any reductions would not affect the Council's budgets. The reward had been received for 2009/10 but the amount, if any, for 2010/11 was uncertain. She stated that how the Partnership would be able to deliver the Local Area Agreement targets and the Sustainable Community Strategy was, at present, unclear.

The data relating to crime statistics was queried as these were shown in different formats. The Performance and Reputation Manager agreed to clarify this but she believed that these were displayed per 1,000 population and not as a percentage.

It was acknowledged that NI154 would now be affected by recent Government changes to the Regional Spatial Strategy.

With regard to NI186 Members asked if the information would be available for August when the Board would be considering Climate Change. Officers stated that these would be included in the Board's report.

The Board felt that more local indicators were displayed on the LAA's website and asked for further information on these indicators. Officers agreed to investigate.

AGREED that

the Board recognised the excellent contribution Rushcliffe was making to the county-wide Local Area Agreement.

6. Performance Monitoring – Outturn – 2009/10

The Performance and Reputation Manager presented the end of year performance report. She informed the Board that 45 of the 59 national and local indicators had achieved or exceeded the targets set. Of the Strategic Tasks 5 had been completed, 7 were on target and only 1 needed some corrective action. Unfortunately, as previously reported, corporate sickness was above the profiled target and previous years' performance. With regard to Equality Impact Assessments 65 assessments had been completed and 17 had been moved forward into 2010/11.

Following a question regarding the impact of the abolition of the Regional Spatial Strategy and Strategic Task 02, the Performance and Reputation Manager explained that this was the position on 31 March 2010 and any impact would be shown when the Board considered the 2010/11 quarter one monitoring statement.

Concerns were raised that the indicators for the Planning and Place Shaping section focussed on applications and did not inform Members of any enforcements carried out. Officers assured Members that this information was collected and monitored by the Head of Planning and Place Shaping. It was agreed to produce a briefing note containing this information.

Following a question officers explained that it was no longer a statutory duty to produce a Best Value, or equivalent, plan. The Deputy Chief Executive (SG) explained that the Senior Management Team felt that it was important to measure performance regularly, she also stated that there could be a change to performance monitoring nationally. She agreed to keep Members updated.

Councillor J Stockwood requested further information on fuel poverty and how the number of people experiencing this problem was rising. He was also concerned that the number of winter deaths in vulnerable older people was higher in Rushcliffe compared to the other Nottinghamshire districts. It was agreed that this issue should be presented to a future meeting of the Board.

Regarding the partnership with the parishes the Board were informed that the Partnership Delivery Group would scrutinise this document.

Councillor J Stockwood pointed out that the 07/08 returns for LICSH07 and LICSH10 had been verbally corrected at one of the Board's meeting and that in June 2009 he had requested that the data be corrected. He stated that this would then show that the numbers of crime recorded were below the target.

Following a query regarding indicators NI180 and NI181 concerning council tax/housing benefit Members felt that as the Department of Works and Pension had not supplied any data this indicator should be removed. Officers explained that NI180 had been abolished and that regarding NI181 this was measured locally and the performance was very good.

7. Appointment of Scrutiny Member Panel – Review of the Council's Constitution

The Chairman explained that, as part of its remit, the Performance Management Board should consider any revisions to the Constitution before they were presented to full Council. She outlined the terms of reference and the need to ensure that the Panel was politically balanced. It was felt that a Panel of nine (6 Conservatives, 2 Liberal Democrats and 1 from either the Green or Labour party) would be advantageous, Councillor Bennett was appointed as the Chairman.

AGREED that

a Member Panel comprising nine Members with terms of reference and composition agreed as set out in the report be appointed.

8. Rolling 2 Year Work Programme

The Board considered their work programme for the next two years. The Deputy Chief Executive (SG) explained that there would be a meeting of the Chairmen/Vice Chairmen Group this week and that any recommendations for scrutiny were well supported.

Councillor J A Stockwood requested two future agenda items:

1. Discussion on fuel poverty and what actions were being taken to achieve the targets set in the Renewable Energy Policy.
2. an item on the Corporate Scorecard, what targets were included within this, how these were set and what changes were being made to managing performance.

Councillor J A Stockwood also asked when the Board would be monitoring the performance of East Leake Leisure Centre. He explained that the Partnership Delivery Group had considered a list of partners on 10 June 2010 and the document had stated that the Performance Management Board would consider an annual report on East Leake Leisure Centre. He also informed the Board that at the Chairmen/Vice Chairmen Group in March 2010 the issue of monitoring Parkwood Leisure had been discussed and agreed that responsibility would transfer from the Partnership Delivery Group to the Performance Management Board in 2011.

Councillor Jones was concerned that there were still aspects of the relationship with Parkwood Leisure that needed to be considered before passing the item to the Performance Management Board.

Officers agreed to consider the timing of these issues and to inform Members.

AGREED that

the proposed rolling work programme for 2010/11 and 2011/12 be agreed.

The meeting closed at 8.45 pm.

Action Sheet

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT BOARD - TUESDAY 29 JUNE 2010

Minute Number	Actions	Officer Responsible
5. Nottinghamshire Local Area Agreement 2008 - 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Officers to clarify the data relating to crime statistics b. Officers to ensure that the data on NI186 be available for the Board's meeting in August 2010 c. Officers to investigate the number of local indicators displayed on the LAA's website 	<p>Performance and Reputation Manager</p> <p>Performance and Reputation Manager</p> <p>Performance and Reputation Manager</p>
6 Performance Monitoring – Outturn – 2009/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Officers to produce a briefing note on planning enforcement as collected by the Head of Planning and Place Shaping. b. Members to be kept updated on any changes made to performance monitoring nationally. c. The issue of Fuel Poverty be presented to a future meeting of the Board. 	<p>Deputy Chief Executive (SG)</p> <p>Deputy Chief Executive (SG)</p> <p>Performance and Reputation Manager</p>
8. Rolling 2 Year Work Programme	Officers agreed to consider the timing of these issues and to inform Members.	Deputy Chief Executive (SG)