



**NOTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
PARTNERSHIP DELIVERY GROUP
MONDAY 19 MARCH 2012**

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

PRESENT:

Councillors R Hetherington (Chairman), Mrs D M Boote, B Buschman (substitute for Councillor A M Dickinson), R L Butler, H A Chewings, E J Lungley, F A Purdue-Horan, Mrs M Stockwood and T Vennett-Smith

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Councillor J E Greenwood.

OFFICERS PRESENT:

| | |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| C Bullett | Deputy Chief Executive (CB) |
| N Carter | Partnerships and Projects Manager |
| D Hayden | Acting Community Engagement Manager |
| C McGraw | Head of Community Shaping |
| V Nightingale | Senior Member Support Officer |

APOLOGY FOR ABSENCE:

Councillor A M Dickinson

18. Declarations of Interest

There were none declared.

19. Notes of the Previous Meeting

The notes of the meeting held on Monday 23 January 2012 were accepted as a true record.

20. Progress Report on the Rushcliffe Community Strategy Action Plans

The Head of Community Shaping presented a report summarising the Local Strategic Partnership's progress on the Action Plans contained within the Rushcliffe Community Strategy. She explained that there were six theme groups and that each was led by a different key organisation. Although the Borough Council was not involved in every group officers had an overseeing role with regards to performance. With regards to funding £349,000 had been received from the Local Area Agreement grant in 2009/10 which had been distributed to all the themed groups. Performance was reported to the Executive Group on a quarterly basis and was then forwarded to the Strategic Board.

For each themed group Members were presented with the action plans and the group's performance to date, including highlights and exceptions. It had been noted that not all the groups were progressing well and a review had been undertaken. This would be considered by the Strategic Board on 25

April 2012. It was being proposed that the Building Stronger Communities and the Environment groups should be disbanded. The Head of Community Shaping explained that the Building Stronger Communities group was led by the voluntary sector and the reduction in funding experienced by that sector was impacting on delivery.

a) Community Safety Group

Members were informed that this had been a very productive year and that the Partnership Delivery Group had scrutinised the Local Strategic Partnership, and in particular community safety, at its last meeting. The successes in the Cotgrave and Trent Bridge Wards had led to a reduction in the crime figures. However, it was felt that as the crime and fear of crime had reduced people were less inclined to become engaged. Another exception was that the Fire and Rescue Service had not been able to access local schools so that they could deliver their fire safety package.

Members were concerned that the Fire and Rescue Service were not engaging with schools and asked if this could be because of how they were marketing this or was it due to a lack of resources. Officers explained that a new Station Manager had been appointed and they would raise this issue with him. The Head of Community Shaping agreed to report back to Members regarding the meeting with the new Station Manager.

The Group asked about the amount of resources allocated to the rest of the Borough. Officers explained that resources, which included both funding and officer time, were allocated to the areas of highest demand, which at the present time were the Cotgrave and Trent Bridge wards. However, all the other areas of the Borough were discussed on a monthly basis by the Partnership and resources were allocated as required; this could be either funding, officer time or further work by one of the partners, ie the police. Members asked that this information should be included in future reports.

Following a question, officers explained that the Borough Council was responsible for the use of the community safety trailer, the installation of CCTV, talks and coordinating the Partnership's response to compliment the work undertaken by the Police.

The Group felt that it could be beneficial for the Fire and Rescue Service to be involved in next year's scrutiny of the Partnership, rather than the Police. It was felt that this could help develop a better relationship between the Council and the Service.

b) Health Issues

The Head of Community Shaping explained that over 90% of the action plan had been completed. She informed Members that there was one officer that was jointly funded by the Borough Council and the Primary Care Trust. She highlighted the MEND project which tackled obesity in children and the Perkins project which had recruited two apprentices.

Concerns were expressed that the work of the Borough Council was duplicating the work of the Health Service and therefore this was not an area for the Borough Council to be involved with. Officers explained that most of the work was closely linked to the delivery of sports and leisure, arts and events and sports development. Also with the introduction of Health and Well Being Boards this was a new area for district councils to become engaged.

c) Rushcliffe Business Partnership

The Group was informed that since the production of the report the Business Group had now completed 100% of its tasks and that it had been a very productive year for the group. Members of the business group sat on both the executive group and the strategic board as they felt that the Partnership was a valuable resource. Officers explained that within the new Corporate Strategy one of the priorities was the economy and working with local businesses.

Following a question Members were informed that the Council was considering the range and depth of knowledge officers had to help promote economic development, as well as identifying what assistance local businesses needed.

With regard to the 'brite tool' officers stated that this was a system for managing events.

In response to a question about the monthly networking meetings officers stated that these were for small to medium enterprises with attendance having grown from 18 in 2010 to over 40 businesses now. The 20 largest businesses in the area also met annually.

Members queried how many businesses there were in the Borough and it was agreed that this was a very difficult figure to ascertain as Business Rates did not capture everyone. Members felt that a complete list would be beneficial for both officers and the businesses.

d) Building Stronger Communities

The Head of Community Shaping explained that this group was co-ordinated by the Rushcliffe Community & Voluntary Service. It had not been performing very well for a number of reasons. One of the highlights was the Community Cohesion Network which enabled organisations to contact the 'hard to reach' groups. She explained that the Network would help the Council engage with the community on its single equality duty. As part of the review the Strategic Board were being asked to disband this group.

Members were informed that there would be a new service level agreement between the Council and Rushcliffe Community Voluntary Service /Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire. This new arrangement would hold the organisations to account and would be

scrutinised by the Community Development Group initially and then passed to the Partnership Delivery Group.

Following a question the Group was informed that Rushcliffe Community & Voluntary Service had access to approximately £11,000 of grant funding, but unfortunately this had not been allocated. Following a question, officers explained that the Strategic Board could recoup the unallocated money. Officers also stated that there was a need to look at how these projects/funds were promoted. Members felt that some of the titles of the projects were misleading and should be made more obvious, although it was recognised that the groups named their own projects.

Members were concerned that by disbanding this group the public might perceive that the Council did not want to promote stronger communities. They felt that this should be handled with care and marketed correctly, possibly through working with the parishes.

e) Children and Young People

In relation to this Group Members were informed that Nottinghamshire County Council was the lead authority, however, it was felt that all district authorities could make a contribution. Officers stated that the Council was initiating a project to engage with young people concerning social media. It had been agreed that this group had been successful and added value to the work undertaken by the Partnership.

Following a question, Members were informed that there were seven sure start centres spread throughout the Borough. With regard to the apprenticeship places at the centres this had only been deemed unsuccessful as, in the current economic climate, any future years were uncertain and there was not a guaranteed programme. Officers stated that it was hoped that after the review had been presented to the Strategic Board the programme could be finalised, although this would be outside of the current timescale.

Members queried the marketing of the Wheels to Work scheme and the apprenticeships as it was recognised that young people needed employment and often a lack of transport was a primary consideration when looking at opportunities. Officers explained that Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire delivered the scheme and that anyone could qualify for the scheme if they were between 16-19 years of age and in receipt of benefit. However it was noted that a proportion of this age group was unable to access any benefits. Officers agreed that new ways of engagement should be explored to ensure that this scheme was widely available.

f) Environment

With regard to the Environment Group Members were informed that there had been some successes with approximately 60% of the tasks contained within the action plan completed. The membership of the group fluctuated as people were often only interested in a single issue.

It was recognised that the majority of the work was being carried out by Borough Council officers and therefore it was being recommended to the Strategic Board that this group be disbanded. Members were assured that, as this was a priority within the Council's current Corporate Strategy, officers would continue working in this area, possibly in partnership with the Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. Members agreed that people often became involved at the beginning of a project but very few continued to make it sustainable.

Following a question regarding grant funding Members were informed that the Biodiversity Nature Conservation Group had informed parishes that there was approximately £1,000 of funding left. The Group was concerned that there was insufficient publicity regarding funding. The Partnerships and Projects Manager stated that information would be placed in Rushcliffe Reports and on the Council's website. Again the Group felt that some of the language used was not self explanatory and officers agreed to work with the Communications Team to give further clarification. It was also recognised that all Councillors could publicise these grants and officers agreed to provide more information upon request.

It was AGREED that the performance of the Rushcliffe Community Strategy Action Plans had been considered and Members endorsed the work undertaken as part of the review programme

21. Annual Review of Work Programme 2011/12

The Partnerships and Projects Manager presented the Group's annual report. He explained that a report would be presented to Council on 21 June which would incorporate all the scrutiny group's reports. He stated that the Group had agreed at the beginning of the year to only invite one external body to attend any particular meeting and this approach had worked well and had been beneficial for both parties. The Partnerships and Projects Manager would update the report with the discussions from this meeting.

It was noted that the Group would not be considering the work of the Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club until its meeting in July and therefore it would not be in this municipal year. Officers agreed to amend the document.

It was AGREED that the Partnership Delivery Group approved the report and it be forwarded on to Council for consideration.

22. Rolling 2 Year Work Programme

The Group discussed its rolling work programme. It had been proposed at the recent Scrutiny Chairmen and Vice Chairmen's meeting that the annual scrutiny of the Service Level Agreement between the Council and Rushcliffe Community Voluntary Service and Rural Community Action Network should pass from the Community Development Group to this Group.

With regard to the scrutiny of housing provision Members felt that this should not just focus on the work of Metropolitan Housing Trust but should include some of the smaller providers eg Waterloo.

Members requested that there should be an update on the Sure Start Centres and scrutiny of the Advice Networks in the Borough. Officers agreed to provide a paper on both these items for the Group to discuss at the next meeting to ascertain if these should be included in the work programme.

The Partnership Delivery Group agreed the proposed work programme for 2011/12.

The meeting closed at 8.50 pm.

Action Sheet

PARTNERSHIP DELIVERY GROUP - MONDAY 19 MARCH 2012

| Minute Number | Actions | Officer Responsible |
|--|---|--|
| 20 Progress Report on the Rushcliffe Community Strategy Action Plans | <p>a) The Head of Community Shaping agreed to report back to Members regarding the meeting with the new Station Manager.</p> <p>b) Officers to include information regarding the use of resources in relation to community safety outside of the hotspots in future reports.</p> <p>c) The Fire and Rescue Service, as a representative of the Partnership, be invited to attend the Group's meeting when the Group scrutinises the Local Strategic Partnership.</p> <p>d) Careful consideration be given to the communication of the disbanding of the Building Stronger Communities group.</p> <p>e) Consideration be given to the promotion and marketing of all available grants</p> <p>f) Consideration be given to the marketing of the Wheels to Work initiative</p> | <p>Head of Community Shaping</p> <p>Head of Community Shaping</p> <p>Head of Community Shaping</p> <p>Head of Community Shaping/ Partnerships and Projects Manager</p> <p>Head of Community Shaping</p> <p>Head of Community Shaping</p> |
| 21. Annual Review of Work Programme 2011/12 | The Partnerships and Projects Manager to update the report with the discussions from this meeting. | Partnerships and Projects Manager |
| 22. Rolling 2 Year Work Programme | <p>a) Officers to produce papers regarding the Sure Start Centres and the Advice Networks in the Borough for the Group to decide if these should be scrutiny topics</p> <p>b) Work programme be updated to include the annual review of the Service Level Agreement between the Council and Rushcliffe Community Voluntary Service and Rural</p> | <p>Partnerships and Projects Manager</p> <p>Partnerships and Projects Manager</p> |

