

When telephoning, please ask for: Liz Reid-Jones
Direct dial 0115 9148214
Email lreid-jones@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Our reference: LRJ
Your reference:
Date: 29 December 2011

To all Members of the Council

Dear Councillor

A meeting of the CABINET will be held on Tuesday 10 January 2012 at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Pavilion Road, West Bridgford to consider the following items of business.

Yours sincerely

Head of Corporate Services

AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence
2. Declarations of Interest
3. Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 29 November 2011 (previously circulated).

Key Decisions

None

Non Key Decisions

4. Rural Broadband Capital Contribution
The report of the Chief Executive is attached (pages 1 - 3).
5. Leisure Facilities Strategy 2006-2016
The report of the Leisure Facilities Strategy Member Group is attached (pages 4 - 5).
6. Interim Report of the Environment and Waste Management Member Group
The report of the Deputy Chief Executive (CB) is attached (pages 6 - 10).

Budget and Policy Framework Items

7. Revenue and Capital Monitoring November 2011

The report of the Interim Head of Financial Services is attached (pages 11 - 15).

Matters referred from Scrutiny

8. Service Level Agreement with Rushcliffe Community and Voluntary Services and Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire

The report of the Head of Community Shaping is attached (pages 16 - 34).

Membership

Chairman: Councillor J N Clarke

Vice-Chairman: Councillor J A Cranswick

Councillors Chairman: D G Bell, J E Fearon, D J Mason, Mrs J A Smith

Meeting Room Guidance

Fire Alarm - Evacuation - in the event of an alarm sounding you should evacuate the building using the nearest fire exit, normally through the Council Chamber. You should assemble in the Nottingham Forest car park adjacent to the main gates.

Toilets - Facilities, including those for the disabled, are located opposite Committee Room 2.

Mobile Phones – For the benefit of other users please ensure that your mobile phone is switched off whilst you are in the meeting.

Microphones - When you are invited to speak please press the button on your microphone, a red light will appear on the stem. Please ensure that you switch this off after you have spoken.

**MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
CABINET
TUESDAY 29 NOVEMBER 2011**

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

PRESENT:

Councillors D G Bell, J N Clarke, J A Cranswick, J E Fearon, D J Mason,
Mrs J A Smith

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Councillors S J Boote, Councillor A MacInnes, Councillor G R Mallender

OFFICERS PRESENT:

C Bullett	Deputy Chief Executive (CB)
A Graham	Chief Executive
S Griffiths	Deputy Chief Executive (SG)
S Harley	Head of Planning & Place Shaping
R Mapletoft	Planning Policy Manager
C McGraw	Head of Community Shaping
D Mitchell	Head of Partnerships & Performance
P Randle	Deputy Chief Executive (PR)
L Reid Jones	Democratic Services Manager
P Sutton	Interim Head of Financial Services
D Swaine	Head of Corporate Services

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

There were no apologies for absence.

11 members of the public were also attendance.

30. Declarations of Interest

There were none declared.

31. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 11 October 2011 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

32. Local Development Framework – Core Strategy Proposals

Councillor Bell presented a report on the Local Development Framework – Core Strategy Proposals setting out the recommendations of the Local Development Framework Group (LDF). The report explained how the Core Strategy proposals had progressed since early 2010 and in particular, the influence of the election of the Coalition Government in May 2010. In reference to the report he said that until recently, the Council had been preparing an Aligned Core Strategy with the other local authorities in the Nottingham Housing Market Area. He said it had not been possible to reach

agreement on the distribution of new housing across the housing market area and Rushcliffe was now preparing a separate Core Strategy. The report explained the strategic locations where around 9,900 new homes could be built. This included major sites where planning permission already existed, such as Sharphill and Cotgrave Colliery, other sites under consideration such as Bingham and RAF Newton, and subject to the A453 being improved, land south of Clifton. Councillor Bell stated that the Chancellor's announcement in the Autumn Statement with regards to bringing forward the development of the A453 suggested that the 2,500 proposed dwellings at South Clifton could be brought forward. He said that growth was also proposed around the remaining 4 large settlements of East Leake, Keyworth, Radcliffe on Trent and Ruddington and this had been largely been considered acceptable by residents.

Councillor Bell reminded Members that this had been an extremely complex and detailed piece of work and recorded his thanks to the officers for their hard work and to the LDF Group for their deliberations over the past five years. He stated that the housing proposals were a contentious issue, but in reality these were only a small part of the Plan. He asked Members to bear in mind the implications of the new National Planning Policy Framework and the obligation to co-operate with neighbouring authorities.

Councillor Bell stated that the Council had no statutory development plan document at present and that it was vital for the protection of the Borough that one was in place as soon as possible. He reminded Members that the Regional Spatial Strategy was about to be abolished and the localism agenda was taking its place, but that the housing requirements needed to be based on evidence. He stressed that the Planning Inspector would have regard to the evidence base when making his judgement on the Plan. He stated that it was not possible for every proposal to meet with 100% public approval but that the inclusion of the land south of Clifton was considered to be necessary for the plan to be sound and to withstand scrutiny at the Examination in Public.

Councillor Bell stated that an amount of green belt land would have to be released to meet the objectives and this was a contentious issue. He said that less than 2% of the whole green belt area around Rushcliffe would be affected and that the proposals had been supported by the LDF Group at its meeting on 12 October 2011. He said that the remaining policies of the Core Strategy had not yet been considered by the LDF Group and it was proposed that this would happen prior to the Council Meeting on 15 December 2011.

Councillor Mason said that the number of homes being planned for were significantly less than the figure being proposed previously and this was to be welcomed. She was pleased with the hard work that the LDF Group had undertaken, and felt that the proposals had been thoroughly researched, with substantial consultation having been carried out. She was of the opinion that the prospect of the Core Strategy being approved by the Planning Inspector would be enhanced with the addition of the land south of Clifton. She felt it strengthened the Council's position. She mentioned the fact that the plan would ensure the unique character of Rushcliffe was preserved and protected.

Councillor Mason drew Cabinet's attention to other documents in the Core Strategy particularly those on the historic environment and transportation and noted that these would be good for the future of Rushcliffe.

Councillor Cranswick reminded Members of the need to have a Local Plan in place as it was a crucial guide to inform development. He asked those who were urging Cabinet not to pass the plan to look carefully at the alternatives and the risk this posed to the Borough as there would be no control over sites, including unpopular sites. However with the plan there was some clear control over what, where and when development took place.

Councillor Mrs Smith said she shared local people's concern regarding the land south of Clifton, however there was no alternative. She said that Bingham, Cotgrave, East Leake and Keyworth had accepted the need for larger housing developments and that other villages needed housing to keep local centres alive. She added that the school in Radcliffe was in danger of closing because of falling pupil numbers and that it was important to have an influx of young people to keep the villages going. Councillor Smith commented that the loss of green belt land was less than 2% and it was for the good of the Borough that the plan was endorsed.

Councillor Clarke stated that a lot of time had been spent by the LDF Group in considering the proposals and that the Council had campaigned hard for a reduction in the housing requirements. He said it was important to minimise the impact on residents as much as possible. With regard to the principal of co-operating with neighbouring local authorities Councillor Clarke said that it was important that housing need was met in Rushcliffe before looking at what could be done to cater for the needs of the Greater Nottingham area. Councillor Clarke continued by saying that if it was necessary to have limited development in the green belt to revitalise villages then the Council would have to allow this.

Commenting further Councillor Clarke reminded Cabinet that the proposals were based on recommendations of a cross-party working group and that they would be debated at Full Council. He said that the projections were in part subject to the A453 improvements, but although the Chancellor's announcement in the Autumn Statement had moved this forward, the reality of the road improvements was yet to be realised. He stated that there was still upward pressure on the Greater Nottingham Housing Market. In response, the Deputy Chief Executive (PR) confirmed that although the Regional Spatial Strategy identified a target of around 50,000 new houses for the Greater Nottingham area, the latest government projections based on 2008 figures suggested around 71,000 could be needed. Councillor Clarke stated that with 9,900 houses the Council had demonstrated it was playing its part in meeting the needs of the wider area and the work of the LDF Group had recognised this. He re-iterated the need for the local plan to be sustainable at public examination, with sound and robust evidence of sustainable development in Rushcliffe.

Councillor Fearon concurred with the remarks made and stated that the most important fact was an evidence based approach to protect the unique character and nature of the Borough.

Councillor Clarke concluded by stating that it was vital that Cabinet recommended the Core Strategy to Council and it was essential that policies were in place to protect against unwanted development.

RESOLVED that Cabinet:

- i. endorses the recommendations of the Local Development Framework Group in respect of housing growth as set out at **appendix A** and refers Core Strategy Policy 2 – the Spatial Strategy to Council on 15 December 2011 for approval and;
- ii. supports the remaining Core Strategy policies, attached as **appendix B**, but refers these to the Local Development Framework Group for consideration, prior to submission to Council on 15 December 2011 for approval.

33. **Electoral Review – Proposed Council Size Submission**

Councillor Clarke introduced a report detailing the Proposed Council Size Submission which was part of the electoral review being undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England. By referring to the report he reminded Cabinet that in March 2011 Council had agreed to ask the Commission to undertake a further electoral review of Rushcliffe. In May 2011 the Commission had confirmed they would undertake a review with a view to this commencing in January 2012. The decision was based on the fact that 32% of the Council wards had a variance of 10% above or below the average electoral per councillor. The review process required the Council to make a submission setting out its proposals for Council size evidencing the reasoning and rationale for this. Councillor Clarke reminded Cabinet that they were being asked to consider the proposed size and recommend it to Council for approval.

Councillor Cranswick informed Cabinet that the submission identified a Council size of 45 Members, and that based on the information set out in the submission a reduction in Council size of this nature would not affect the ability of Councillors to carry out an effective representation role. Furthermore he said that it would not be detrimental to the management of the Council, but such a reduction would require adjustment of the existing governance structure to evaluate the appropriate number and composition of the Council's committees.

Councillor Cranswick explained that if accepted by Cabinet, the submission would be sent to the Commission as the Council's provisional one, but would be subject to Full Council approval. He outlined the process following this, whereby the Commission would consider the submission and recommend a Council size which would be subject to consultation. Following this the Commission would look at how the new number could be achieved in terms of ward boundaries and Council structure. He anticipated that the Commission would be looking for as little disruption as possible to existing boundaries and relationships between communities. He continued by saying that any proposals would be finalised and in place in time for the next Borough elections in 2015.

Councillor Mason said that it was important for electoral representation to be fair and equitable, as the variance in some wards was over 10% in terms of the Councillor to electorate ratio. She felt that the submission was interesting and gave a good indication to what difference the reduction in Council size would make in terms of workload of Councillors. She stated that in her opinion the Council would be just as successful with 45 Councillors and she hoped that residents would think it a fair and clear way forward.

Councillor Mrs Smith had read the submission with great interest stating that she did not realise how much went on in the Council and what a good job Member Services staff do to service all of the meetings.

Councillor Cranswick reminded Members that the purpose of the review was to equate the number of Councillors per ward and that at present the average electorate per Councillor ratio was 1,700 but that with a proposed Council size of 45 this would be somewhere in the region of 1,975 and if this was achievable it would be a fair and satisfactory figure.

RESOLVED that:

- i. Cabinet endorses the proposed Council size and recommends it to Council for approval and;
- ii. In order to meet the timetable set by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, the Chief Executive make arrangements for the submission to be sent to the Commission as the Council's provisional submission prior to its consideration by Council on 15 December.

34. Revenue and Capital Monitoring – September 2011

Councillor Cranswick presented the Revenue and Capital Monitoring report as at September 2011. He reminded Members that in April 2011 the Council had implemented a new Finance system, however due to some unforeseen complexities there had been a delay in formal budget reporting to Cabinet. By referring to the report Councillor Cranswick pointed out that the format and content of the report had been reviewed to incorporate outturn projections and make the report more understandable.

With regard to the Revenue Budget Councillor Cranswick pointed out that monitoring for September 2011 reflected some significant underspends, which were unsurprising given the Council's drive for savings and efficiency. He drew Cabinet's attention to the significant success of the Green Waste scheme whereby £260,000 had been received above the original projections.

Commenting further Councillor Cranswick stated that the Revenues and Benefits Service review had delivered significant savings a year earlier than expected and the Council was bucking the national trend by maintaining income levels from search fees, car parking and industrial units. He continued, saying that the impact of this performance was that there was no longer a requirement to use general fund balances to support the budget this year.

In relation to the Capital Budget Councillor Cranswick informed Members that the projected outturn for the capital programme was currently significantly lower than budgeted. This, he said, was due to the timing of individual projects rather than real underspends.

Councillor Mason welcomed the new format for the report which she found to be understandable. She thanked officers for their hard work.

The Chief Executive re-iterated the progress made and congratulated the Finance Team, in particular Paul Sutton, the Interim Head of Finance for his input in achieving the objective to make the format more understandable for Members. He took the opportunity to thank staff and stated that they had done a good job, under considerable pressure.

Councillors Clarke and Cranswick endorsed the comments of the Chief Executive.

RESOLVED that:

- i. Members note the current projections for Revenue and Capital outturn as at September 2011;
- ii. Part of the budget for the IS Strategy scheme (£347,000) be re-phased to 2012/13 to reflect spending plans.
- iii. The budget for Community Contact Centre Spokes scheme (£450,000) be removed from the current programme but will remain earmarked for this purpose;
- iv. Part of the budget for Support for Registered Housing (£365,000) be removed from the current programme and be earmarked for the Cotgrave Masterplan Scheme;
- v. Part of the budget for Vehicle Replacement (£164,000) be re-phased into 2012/13 to reflect spending plans;
- vi. Part of the Alford Road Pavilion Redevelopment scheme (£384,000) be re-phased into 2012/13 to reflect spending plans.

35. Environmental Improvement Schemes Capital Programme Review

Councillor Bell presented a report outlining the future of the Environmental Improvement Schemes Capital Programme. He explained that the programme had been introduced in the nineties, with the aim of funding community initiated schemes to enhance the public realm. This had helped to protect and improve the environment but the five year rolling programme was about to end. Councillor Bell informed Members that the scheme had been considered by the Community Development Scrutiny Group in October 2010. The Group had queried the on-going value of the scheme and had considered that the future of the programme should be reviewed having particular regard to budget discussions. In referring to the report Councillor Bell pointed out that due to works already taken place there was not the same level of demand for quality

schemes that would deliver significant improvements and it would appear that the programme had run its course.

Councillor Cranswick stated that the scheme had been in operation for some time and had been successful. He continued, saying that in the present climate there was no option but to discontinue the scheme.

Councillor Mason stated that the scheme had made improvements, but there were other grants available which could make a difference to the Borough.

Councillor Clarke concurred with the comments concluding that it was right and proper for the scheme to end.

RESOLVED that:

- i. the Small Environmental Improvements Programme be discontinued and;
- ii. the Budget be amended to reflect this.

36. Bingham Health Centre – Potential Customer Services Access Point

Councillor Cranswick presented a report seeking a decision regarding the opportunity to provide a full time remote customer service access point within the proposed health centre in Newgate Street, Bingham. He acknowledged the success of the Customer Contact Centre in West Bridgford, stating that this was the next step in the Council's Hub and Spoke customer service model. He informed Cabinet that the Spoke would operate on a full time basis and that officers based in the Spoke would be able to answer phones on the customer services phone line when not dealing with customers in person. Councillor Cranswick stated that the Health Authority had approached the Council regarding a strip of land around the proposed health centre and he suggested that the land should be disposed of to the Health Authority at the current market value to allow them to continue with the scheme.

In terms of financial implications the report outlined that an arrangement had been negotiated to off-set part of the capital receipt against the on-going occupation and ten year running costs. Taking account of the running costs of £47,500 this option would still provide the Council with a capital receipt of £45,000.

Councillor Cranswick informed Members that paragraph 8 in the report referred to a lease arrangement but stated that this should be a licence agreement.

Councillor Mrs Smith said that the new health centre was very much needed and the people of Bingham had waited a long time for it. She said that it was good to have the bonus of the 10 year agreement and welcomed the proposal regarding financing.

Councillor Clarke said the financial arrangements presented a fair valuation of the land for both sides and it was a positive way of progressing the project and working in partnership.

Councillor Bell re-iterated that the proposal built on the success of the Customer Contact Centre in West Bridgford and was sure it too would be successful.

RESOLVED that Cabinet approve:

- i. the creation of a Customer Contact Point within the new Bingham Health Centre, based on a ten year licence arrangement with the benefit of additional monies associated with the land sale being paid to the Council;
- ii. the sale of the land marked in red on the plan circulated at the meeting on the terms set out in the report.

37. Olympics 2012 – Rushcliffe Borough Council’s Preparations

Councillor Mrs Smith presented a report detailing the Council’s preparations for the Olympics 2012. She said that it was a delight to announce that the Olympic Torch would travel through Rushcliffe, passing specifically through Radcliffe on Trent in Torch Bearer mode. She continued, saying that the Council would play a leading role in the celebrations and that it would provide a great opportunity for the whole community to become involved in the build up to this event. She explained that LOCOG (London Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games) had required each key partner involved in the Torch Relay, including the Council, to sign a confidentiality agreement to facilitate the torch on the respective part of the journey.

Councillor Mrs Smith informed Cabinet that there would be celebratory events in Rushcliffe on 28 June 2012, including mini Olympics for school children. In terms of a legacy Councillor Mrs Smith outlined the proposed Rushcliffe Young Ambassadors Group with the objective of establishing a Rushcliffe Social Network to engage with young people.

Councillor Clarke stressed that this was a Borough event, and although the torch was coming through Radcliffe it was a real opportunity to showcase the unique nature of the Borough.

Councillor Mason said she was happy that the Olympic torch was coming to Rushcliffe as there were great sporting traditions in the Borough. She said it was the most wonderful thing to happen, not just in terms of businesses but also the young ambassadors for whom it was aspirational. Furthermore it was important to be part of the Olympics as it was not just in London.

Councillor Cranswick supported the comments made.

In response to a question from Councillor Clarke, the Chief Executive confirmed that the Council had responsibility for the torch coming through the Borough. He explained that because of the confidentiality agreement he was not able to divulge any further detail. He could however confirm that the torch

would come through West Bridgford and would be in torch bearer mode part of this time.

RESOLVED that Cabinet approve the proposed Olympics 2012 celebratory events, the aspiration to create a Rushcliffe Young People's Social Network and the associated governance arrangements.

38. **Review of Scheme of Delegation**

Councillor Clarke presented a report setting out the findings of the review of the Scheme of Delegation and Article 12 – Officers, in the Council's Constitution which were considered by the Corporate Governance Group at its meeting on 22 November.

The Scheme of Delegation had last been reviewed in March 2008. The report indicated that the review process had not resulted in any significant changes to the Scheme of Delegation as its main focus was to ensure the Scheme accurately reflected existing roles and responsibilities.

With regard to Article 12 – Officers the revisions took into account the revised Officer Employment Procedure Rules within Part 4 of the Constitution. This ensured they accurately reflected the process for the approval of appointments to the roles of the Chief Executive, Deputy Chief Executives, the Monitoring Officer and the Section 151 Officer.

RESOLVED that Cabinet, having considered the recommendations of the Corporate Governance Group:

- i. endorses the revisions to the Scheme of Delegation - Part 3 – Responsibility for Functions and Article 12 – Officers within the Council's Constitution and
- ii. recommends these to Council for approval.

39. **Vote of Thanks - Deputy Chief Executive (SG)**

The Chief Executive informed Cabinet that this was the last meeting of Cabinet before the retirement of Sue Griffiths, Deputy Chief Executive. Councillor Clarke passed on his thanks for all the work Sue had done for Cabinet and Council and wished her well on behalf of the Cabinet.

The meeting closed at 8.10 p.m.

CHAIRMAN

REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

CABINET PORTFOLIO HOLDER – COUNCILLOR J A CRANSWICK

Summary

The Government wants to stimulate private sector investment to deliver the best superfast broadband network in Europe together with increased coverage across the UK by 2015. It is estimated that the private sector will cover approximately two thirds of premises with access to superfast broadband by 2015. This leaves approximately one third of premises potentially within scope for public sector intervention in superfast broadband. Nottinghamshire County Council has requested the district councils match fund its contribution in support of bidding for central Government funding to implement superfast broadband in Nottinghamshire.

The current County Council request and calculations are based upon the number of premises which would benefit within each district. Discussions are ongoing regarding how the match funding should be calculated and split between the relevant districts and an update will be provided at the Cabinet meeting.

Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that:

- a) Cabinet supports the principle that Rushcliffe Borough Council contributes up to £245,000 towards the Nottinghamshire County Council rural broadband project. This will be made up of £152,000 money from the Rushcliffe Community Partnership (subject to the local strategic partnership board approval), and a balance from Rushcliffe Borough Council capital resources;
- b) Provision be included in the Council's capital programme for this purpose;
- c) The Chief Executive be authorised to agree the sum of money in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Resources; and
- d) A presentation be made to the community development scrutiny group regarding the detail of the Government's scheme and the authority's requested contribution prior to the finalisation of the Council's budget.

Details

1. There are currently some 2 million households nationally who do not have access to a good level of broadband. In Rushcliffe approximately 10,000 individuals cannot access standard broadband connection. The main wards

within Rushcliffe which are detrimentally affected are Soar Valley, Stanford, Thoroton and Wiverton.

2. Where local authorities determine that improved access to broadband is an essential component of their development plans and where the market will not deliver, Broadband Delivery UK (BDUK) will aim to use public investment to provide funding towards a network infrastructure upgrade.
3. BDUK's purpose is to deliver the Government's policies relating to broadband rollout within the UK. Broadly, this will be achieved through two aims:
 - a. To facilitate the delivery of 'standard' broadband (2 Mbps minimum) across the UK; and
 - b. To stimulate private sector investment to deliver the best superfast broadband network in Europe by 2015. This will involve increasing access to high speed connectivity services (such as 'superfast broadband') for households, businesses and communities in poorly served areas across the UK.
6. Nottinghamshire County Council is leading a bid to BDUK for infrastructure investment in Nottinghamshire to deliver rural broadband in areas of market failure. An initial bid was submitted and Nottinghamshire County Council has been allocated an indicative sum of £4.25 million from BDUK. This is on the basis that matched funding of £4.25 million can be secured from Nottinghamshire County Council and the district councils, and that a further £8.5 million will be provided by the private sector. The total estimated cost of delivering the infrastructure to provide rural broadband across Nottinghamshire is £17 million.
7. Nottinghamshire County Council has requested district councils to match fund its contribution which equates to a total of £2 million of the £4.25 million public sector matched funding towards the project. The County Council has suggested that Rushcliffe's contribution be £245,000 based on numbers of rural households which would benefit from the implementation of superfast broadband.
8. The Rushcliffe Community Partnership received a Local Area Agreement reward allocation of £152,000 earlier in the year and the Local Strategic Partnership board indicated that this should be earmarked towards providing rural broadband in the borough. The board have not yet endorsed the proposal of allocating this funding to the Nottinghamshire County Council BDUK bid but it will be considered by them for their approval at the next meeting.
9. If approved this would leave a balance of £93,000 to be contributed from Rushcliffe Borough Council's own resources to meet our proportion of the £2million.
10. The Chief Executive is in discussions with district chief executive colleagues regarding the districts' contributions to the Rural Broadband scheme. Rushcliffe Borough Councillors will have the opportunity to scrutinise the Nottinghamshire County Council scheme at Community Development, 16 January 2012.

Financial Comments

The Council received £152,000 earlier in the year as a LAA reward allocation. If the recommendations are agreed this, together with the additional sum provided by the Council can be used to meet the contribution.

Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act

There are no Section 17 implications.

Diversity

The provision of rural broadband across the borough will assist residents and businesses. Businesses will benefit from higher levels of connectivity and being able to do transactions more efficiently.

Residents will be able to access Rushcliffe Borough Council online services as well as other online services which will assist in preventing rural isolation.

Background Papers Available for Inspection: Nil

REPORT OF THE LEISURE FACILITIES STRATEGY MEMBER GROUP

CABINET PORTFOLIO HOLDER – COUNCILLOR MRS J A SMITH

Summary

1. The Cabinet Member Group has completed the tasks set by Cabinet in September 2011. This has resulted in an addendum to the original leisure strategy being produced, which is included as a separate document.
2. The areas of investigation identified by Cabinet were:
 - Finalise the role of joint use facilities in conjunction with Nottinghamshire County Council;
 - Identify good practice examples of leisure facilities being operated by community/voluntary arrangements and consider which facilities in Rushcliffe could benefit from this type of management arrangement;
 - Consider a full audit of leisure facilities (indoor, outdoor, open space and play areas) and develop a minimum set of standards for the level of provision the council should be aiming to ensure is provided across all leisure activities;
 - Consider the emerging issues associated with housing growth including the level of contribution and land requirements from developers as part of section 106 agreements to enable the council to develop new facilities;
 - Identify how leisure facilities can be best future proofed to ensure they are adaptable to meet changes in leisure trends.
3. The Member Group were supported by the investigation work completed by the Community Development Group Member Panel between September 2009 - May 2011.
4. The Member Group arrived at a number of outcomes which have been translated into a future direction for each of the leisure centres. The addendum document brings together a summary of the work undertaken and the proposals for leisure centres in the future.
5. The Member Group considered that the original strategy proposal to reduce the number of leisure centres from six to three should be reviewed. The revised proposal is to seek to reduce the number of leisure centres from six to five with a consolidated enhanced facility in West Bridgford. The Group, however, agreed that there are key 'triggers' that need to be met before any changes could be initiated. The key ones being the availability of finance and the condition of the joint centre sites.

6. The following bullet points summarise the main outcomes for the Council's leisure centres:
- There should be one leisure centre in West Bridgford. This should be a modern enhanced facility covering a broad range of leisure activities including pools on the site of the Rushcliffe Arena;
 - At Bingham a site for a new leisure centre should be sought and there should be discussions with Bingham Town Council to explore the opportunity to include a 'community hall' within the facility;
 - Keyworth and Cotgrave leisure centres should be retained and the opportunity for 'community management' be considered;
 - East Leake Leisure Centre to continue subject to reaching agreement on the management costs when the current agreement ends in September 2013.
7. Should these changes be adopted an implementation plan will need to be developed.

Recommendations

It is RECOMMENDED that Cabinet:

- a) agree the Leisure Facilities Strategy Addendum that updates the Leisure Facilities Strategy 2006 – 2016; and
- b) develop an implementation plan to deliver the changes identified in the addendum.

Financial Comments

Currently there is no provision within the capital programme and any investment is clearly dependent upon funding being available. If the strategy is approved the financing of the proposals will become a key consideration for Cabinet.

Potential sources of capital finance include any uncommitted capital reserves, funds made available from housing growth, future capital receipts, borrowing and any available external grants or contributions.

The proposals are also likely to have a significant impact on revenue expenditure and this will also need to be a key consideration for Cabinet.

Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act

Leisure Centres offer a range of activities that can serve as diversionary activities and contribute to a reduction in crime and disorder.

Diversity

Leisure centres are used by a wide cross section of the community.

Background Papers Available for Inspection: Interim report to Cabinet September 2011- Refresh of the Leisure Facilities Strategy 2011
Interim reports to Community Development Group April 2010 and July 2011

LEISURE FACILITIES strategy



This document explains

Our vision

4

What's happened since 2006

6

**Leisure Strategy - Achievements
Since 2006**

7

Issues influencing decisions

9

Outcomes

10

West Bridgford

11

Bingham

11

Cotgrave

12

Keyworth

12

East Leake

12

**Standards for open Space, Sport
and Recreation Provision**

13

6



**What's happened
since 2006**

10



Outcomes

13



**Standards for open
Space, Sport and
Recreation Provision**

Introduction

Members and officers undertook the Leisure Facilities Strategy review over a 15 month period in 2010/11. Key to the review was a Cabinet Member Group comprising:



Councillor
J Smith Con Portfolio Holder
and Chairman of the Group



Councillor
R A Adair Con



Councillor
S J Boote Lib Dem



Councillor
B Buschman Con



Councillor
H A Chewings Lab



Councillor
J E Cottee Con



Councillor
J E Greenwood Con



Councillor
G R Mallender Green



Councillor
F A Purdue-Horan Con

The Cabinet Member Group was assisted in coming to its conclusions by the detailed investigation work that was carried out by a Community Development Scrutiny Group Member Panel that reported its findings to Cabinet on 9 August 2011.

Our vision

Rushcliffe Borough Council reviewed its Leisure Facilities Strategy 2006-2016. The review confirmed that the Leisure Service Vision

‘To enable and encourage healthy, accessible and sustainable alternatives for leisure time to enhance the quality of life of all Rushcliffe residents and visitors to the Borough’

is still valid as are the reasons why the Council provides leisure facilities.



Well-being



Community safety



Social inclusion

**Why does
Rushcliffe Borough Council
provide leisure facilities?**

Enhanced environment



Life lessons



The review also took into consideration the role that leisure facilities could play in delivering Sport England strategic aims to 'grow, sustain and excel in sport'. The review identified that the future of leisure provision should focus on the 'grow' and 'sustain' elements of increasing participation and that 'excel' aspect should be outside of the council's role. The review focused on the leisure facilities provided by the council, leisure centres and parks and playing fields. Five topics were identified as being crucial during the review. These topics are;

- Finalise the role of joint use facilities in conjunction with Nottinghamshire County Council
- Identify good practice examples of leisure facilities being operated by community/voluntary arrangements and consider which facilities in Rushcliffe could benefit from this type of management arrangement
- Consider a full audit of leisure facilities (indoor, outdoor, open space and play areas) and develop a minimum set of standards for the level of provision the council should be aiming to ensure is provided across all leisure activities
- Consider the emerging issues associated with housing growth including the level of contribution and land requirements from developers as part of section 106 agreements or any revised arrangements to enable the council to develop new facilities
- Identify how leisure facilities can be best future proofed to ensure they are adaptable to meet changes in leisure trends

The community halls in West Bridgford are subject to a separate review as part of the Council's 'four year plan' to 'do it differently' and this review will be completed in 2012.



What's happened since 2006?

Since 2006 there have been a number of significant developments that impact directly on the leisure facilities, these are;

- Increased costs of gas and electricity – the leisure centres are the Council's largest users of gas and electricity and, despite many initiatives to reduce energy use, the costs have increased significantly in this area. This is a particular concern at the leisure centres on school sites as these centres are much larger and older than the Council's other leisure centres.
- Changes in the nature of how schools are run – schools now have options as to how they are run. Schools are now opting to run themselves and some are no longer funded by the Local Education Authority. This change is important to the Borough Council as there are three leisure centres on school sites sharing facilities and costs with those schools. Changes to schools' management and funding results in individual arrangements rather than an overall joint use agreement. The increasing concerns of school governing bodies over safeguarding issues and pupil safety.
- The condition of the buildings at the three joint use leisure centres (Bingham, Keyworth and Rushcliffe leisure centres)
- Housing developments – although there has been no major growth in the number of homes in Rushcliffe since 2006 there are large planning proposals in the pipeline around the main areas of population in the borough. The council needs to plan its leisure provision to take account of these developments
- The Council is about to publish its core strategy which will allocate land for housing growth

One of the key tasks within the existing leisure facilities strategy was to reduce the number of leisure centres from six to three, yet at the time of writing all six centres remain open. This has largely been made possible by the savings generated from the councils' partnership arrangement with Parkwood Community Leisure who have operated the sites since August 2007 on behalf of the council.



Rushcliffe Arena



Keyworth Leisure Centre



Rushcliffe Leisure Centre

Leisure Strategy - Achievements since 2006

The following table identifies actions and the progress that has been made on key tasks identified in the leisure strategy.

ACTION	PROGRESS
Put the management of RBC managed leisure centres out to tender	A contract awarded to Parkwood Leisure commencing on 1 August 2007. The contract was awarded initially for a 10 year period but has been extended to 2022 on agreement of Parkwood Community Leisure establishing a Non-Profit Distributing Organisation.
Plan to improve, update and provide new play facilities especially for older children in West Bridgford to continue.	Play areas at West Park and Bridge Field for older children have been improved. Upgrades and improvements have taken place to other play areas at Greythorn Drive, Boundary Road, Oak Tree Close, Denton Drive and Bridgford Park. As part of the National Lottery Play funding programme ten other play areas across the Borough have been either installed or improved. All these improvements have been welcomed by residents
Provision of community facilities at Gamston, West Park and West Bridgford Community Hall to continue	These three facilities remain open and West Bridgford Community Hall was refurbished in 2010. West Bridgford Community Hall underwent a significant refurbishment in 2010 enabling it to re-open after a 2 year closure. Public feedback has been excellent and during the first 6 months of 2011 96% of hirers were satisfied with their booking. The facility has become established as the first choice community wedding venue in West Bridgford and is hired by a wide range of local groups.
Work in partnership to deliver improved facilities at Gresham playing fields as part of the scheme to build two new schools in the area.	This has been achieved with the council being provided with a new changing pavilion, full size 3G artificial turf pitch and improved natural turf pitches.



Gresham pavilion.



Work on other tasks within the original strategy is continuing as the table below illustrates;

ACTION	PROGRESS
<p>As the opportunities arise the Council move towards a vision of three main leisure centres across the Borough.</p>	<p>All six sites currently remain open. A four year management arrangement for the East Leake Leisure Centre (2009-13) has been put in place. Joint use arrangements are changing as schools become academies.</p> <p>Bingham and Rushcliffe Leisure Centres currently provide inadequate disabled access, are of a design and age that now cause concern and are in need of significant investment if they are to continue for the long term. Without significant investment it is anticipated that these two sites have a life of between three and seven years</p>
<p>Continue to manage community facilities, parks open spaces and playing pitches in house.</p>	<p>Within the Council's four year plan introduced in 2011, it has been identified that options for managing these facilities should be explored. This work will be completed in 2012.</p>
<p>The existing level of provision of parks and open spaces and playing pitches in line with Planning Policy Guidance 17, will be maintained and opportunities sought for extra provision where appropriate.</p>	<p>The audit of sports pitches and children's play areas was updated during 2010 along with a review of levels of demand.</p> <p>A summary of the requirements that will be placed on developers is contained later in this plan.</p>

Issues influencing decisions

The review identified a range of issues which needed addressing to progress the strategy. These issues were placed in one of three stages to ensure a clear and comprehensive assessment could take place.

Stage 1

This stage looked at the current issues affecting the councils leisure centres including the age and condition of the buildings, whether they will meet customer expectations in the future, potential housing growth and how easy is it to get to the facilities.

1. Condition and age of facilities – The detailed condition survey which was undertaken on each of the leisure centres in 2006 was revisited. These surveys have been updated and reveal that the two largest joint use sites (Bingham and Rushcliffe) are in the worst condition with many mechanical and electrical items requiring expensive solutions. The other sites are newer, in better condition and have a longer anticipated life.
2. School proposals for development - the changing status of schools means that there is a greater degree of uncertainty around the funding arrangements for the joint use sites. The joint use sites at Bingham and Rushcliffe schools allow public access into school areas and consequently raise increasing concerns about inappropriate access ('safeguarding' issues) for the schools at these sites. The layout of facilities at the Keyworth Leisure Centre allows for day time public access to the pool and fitness suite without compromising any associated safeguarding issues. The potential for large housing growth in West Bridgford and Bingham may also put pressure on space within the schools' campus for extra classrooms and other school facilities.
3. Impact of loss of facility - The review considered the potential impact on the community if any of the facilities was closed from both a local and borough-wide perspective. The impact of closing either of the facilities in West Bridgford and the potential for having one leisure centre to serve this area in the future was also considered.
4. Potential Housing Growth - The exact details relating to housing growth has been difficult to assess since 2006 and there has been no sizeable development. The Borough Council has recently finalised its housing plans (Local Development Framework). It is anticipated that new homes will be built in West Bridgford and around each of the larger villages in the borough. The latest housing figures suggest that 9,900 new homes will be built, subject to approval. Should these developments come to fruition the borough will seek to access section 106 monies for leisure provision, to include open space and play facilities, via the Community Infrastructure Levy when this is introduced in 2014 or any revised arrangements. The anticipated level of funding likely to be received from developer contributions will only be a small element of the overall cost of replacing a leisure centre.
5. Access and Travel - The review has considered, using Sport England guidance, travel times to leisure centres, availability of a car, public transport and walking.

Stage 2

This stage identified the resources that may be required in future.

6. Finance - The current running costs of the existing centres were assessed in terms of overall cost, cost per user and the potential for any capital development to build new or extra facilities.
7. Land availability - This item was considered for the sites identified by the Member Group as having the need or potential for redevelopment.

Stage 3

This stage looked at which management options should be considered in the future.

8. Management arrangements - The Member Group identified that the opportunities to introduce management arrangements other than by external contract, would be limited to the 'smaller' sites. There are some good examples of leisure facilities managed by the community which the Group felt could be explored in Rushcliffe.

Outcomes

Having researched and considered each of the above issues a framework for leisure provision in the future has been formulated. The framework is based on the reduction in the number of leisure centres from six to five which seeks to maintain a spread of provision across the borough with an enhanced consolidated leisure provision in West Bridgford. The timescale for implementing any changes is subject to a number of factors some of which may impact on all sites and others which may only impact on individual sites.

The overall economic position of the council will inevitably define its ability to deliver the revised strategy. The availability of finance and land for the proposed developments will be two key factors along with the condition of the building stock particularly the joint use sites; any major failure of mechanical or electrical plant items that require significant expenditure; termination of any of the joint use agreements by schools or County Council.

The details of what should be provided and where are identified on the following pages.



West Bridgford

Leisure facilities will be based at one site in the future. Rushcliffe Arena has been identified as a potential site. The existing facilities at the Arena have the potential to be expanded to include new swimming pool provision, expanded fitness suite and dance studios and use the surrounding land which is owned by the Council to accommodate outdoor artificial turf pitches. The site has distinct advantages including being on bus routes, and is a relatively new building in good condition. The facility if expanded would offer a wide leisure provision available and result in a more efficient leisure centre. The estimated cost of this proposal is £10M. Triggers to initiate this proposal include:

- Finance being available;
- Condition of Rushcliffe Leisure Centre;
- School plans for expansion linked to housing growth;
- Need to reduce revenue expenditure



Bingham

The potential for a new leisure centre to be provided at a new site within the town could be explored. As an outline the facilities should include a swimming pool, health and fitness facilities and sports hall. The council would hope to open negotiations with the town council to provide a joint facility that could also serve the needs of a community hall within the same building on the basis of sharing cost. The estimated cost of this proposal is £9M.

Triggers to initiate this proposal include :

- Finance being available
- Condition of Bingham Leisure Centre;
- School expansion linked to housing growth;
- Need to reduce revenue expenditure

Cotgrave

Cotgrave Leisure Centre is a good facility in good condition and has the potential to deliver the councils' aims for leisure in the future. This is one of the smaller leisure centres in the leisure portfolio and the opportunity for implementing a community management model could be explored.

Triggers to initiate a change in management include :

- Need to reduce expenditure
- Community interest in managing facility



Keyworth

Keyworth Leisure Centre is a good facility and subject to reaching an agreement with the South Wolds School for the continuing operation of the sports hall and artificial turf pitch and with the County Council for the continued operation of the swimming pool could deliver the Councils' aims for leisure in the future. This is the smallest leisure centre in the Councils portfolio and the opportunity to implement a community management model could be explored.

Triggers to initiate a change in management include :

- Need to reduce expenditure
- Community interest in managing facility



East Leake

East Leake leisure centre is the newest facility in the Councils portfolio and was constructed as part of a PFI arrangement. This centre would be retained subject to reaching an acceptable financial and operational agreement with the Contractor for the management of the leisure facilities. The Council is contracted, under the PFI arrangement, to continue to make payments for the provision of the leisure centre until 2026/7.

Triggers to initiate a change to the current arrangements include:

- Need to reduce expenditure
- Inability to reach an agreeable sum for the management of the centre when it comes up for renewal in 2013



Standards for Open Space, Sport and Recreation Provision

The Council's Local Development Framework group has approved a set of standards for the provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities. These standards which will be used for the purposes of negotiating open space, sport and recreation provision on new developments are as follows:

Type	Current Provision Ha/1000 population	National Guidelines Ha/1000 population	National Guidelines Ha/1000 population
Allotments	0.4	0.125	0.4
Playing Pitches	1.77	1.72	1.77
Formal and Informal Amenity Open Space, and Formal Parks and Gardens	0.72	No national guidelines	0.72
Play Areas – unequipped	0.19	0.55	0.55
Play Areas – equipped	0.13	0.25	0.25



REPORT OF THE DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE (CB)

CABINET PORTFOLIO HOLDER – COUNCILLOR D J MASON

Summary

The Environment and Waste Management Member Group has been reviewing the recycling2go, streetwise and garage services and proposes a number of initiatives that can be applied to the in-house service, changing the way the service is provided and achieving potential budgetary savings of £350,000 per annum plus. These initiatives are recommended to the Cabinet for approval and although a smaller sum (£270,000) should be incorporated into the budget for 2012/13 to allow for risk and further work to be done.

This is an interim report and a further report will be produced following further consideration by the Group of new service delivery models.

Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that:

- a) the initiatives in table 1 be supported and incorporated into the budget for 2012/13; and
- b) a procurement of garage services be undertaken.

Details

1. The Environment and Waste Management Member Group has been reviewing the recycling2go, streetwise and garage services in accordance with the Cabinet's terms of reference, which include:
 - identifying areas where efficiencies and the required savings of £375,000 per annum from October 2012 can be achieved, while still meeting customer needs;
 - identifying and considering in-house and alternative service delivery options, including, where appropriate, partnerships and community based initiatives.
2. It should be noted that originally the review of garage services was planned for 2012/13 with an additional savings target of £45,000.
3. The Group has made some important conclusions in considering in-house options for efficiencies and different ways of working and a proposed way forward for garage services. This interim report presents those findings to

Cabinet and makes a range of recommendations for Cabinet's consideration, with the aim of enabling the relevant projects to proceed and savings to be achieved as soon as possible and so that this can be reflected in the budget for 2012/13. The Group continues to work on the potential for more innovative service delivery models.

4. The Group considered it important to identify and realise efficiencies in the in-house provision of services before any more innovative service models were examined. Accordingly, managers identified a range of options which fell into two groups: those that were largely operational and which could be introduced without significantly impacting service delivery and those that potentially could have a wider impact and need Member's approval. In the first group, managers have identified savings amounting to £150,000 p.a. from changes such as rationalising the green waste rounds following the charge implementation and reductions in reliance on agency staff for example. These will be incorporated into the budget for 2012/13.
5. Members reviewed each of the initiatives in the second group and the table below details those that the Group wish to recommend to Cabinet for implementation.

Table 1

Initiative	How will the savings be made? Recommendation	Financial implications £
1. Review refuse collection rounds to maximise efficiency: could result in collecting different waste on different days of the week	The saving would be delivered through a reduction in vehicle/staff resource. Potential rounds would be modelled first to establish most efficient arrangements before implementation Recommended: model to establish whether savings achievable	Cost of modelling £20,000 Implementation costs £60,000 Potential annual savings £90,000 p.a.
2. Stop collecting clinical waste and contract out the service	Customer base has reduced and possible saving through outsourcing to private supplier and a saving of one vehicle and half a post Recommendation: implement	Net saving £3,000 p.a.
3. Remove around 10 hardly used bottle bank sites and only collect from 30 others when nearly full and continue regular collection from "top 10" sites (which yield 70% of total collected)	Saving on fuel usage etc. Current number of sites = 60 Recommendation: implement	Savings less than £10,000 p.a.
4. Creation of a competency based pay scheme for all front line staff	Salary savings and potentially an increase in flexibility allowing a review of staff resources Recommendation: implement	To be negotiated. Estimated savings up to £30,000 p.a.

Initiative	How will the savings be made? Recommendation	Financial implications £
5. Garage services provided by a third party	A procurement exercise would be necessary Recommendation: undertake a procurement to test the market	Savings of 5 – 15% thought possible, i.e. £10,000 - £30,000 p.a.
6. Approach Nottingham Forest to pay a contribution for litter collection after football games	Income from charging Recommendation: implement	To be negotiated.
7. Approach the Cricket Club to pay a contribution for litter collection during high profile events e.g. Tests	Income from charging Recommendation: implement	To be negotiated
8. Charge to remove graffiti & fly tipping from private property	Income from charging Recommendation: implement	£1,000
9. Review of grass mowing to decide if we do it in the most effective way. Consider contracting this service out	Saving on staff resources and equipment Recommendation: implement	Potential estimated saving £13,800 p.a.
10. Reduction in the number of cuts on open space mowing, change from rotary to flail	Savings on staffing and equipment used to undertake grass cutting Recommendation: implement	£18,400 p.a. saving if cutting reduced by 25%
11. Allow the large grass areas to become wild flower meadows, managed by the "Wildlife Trust" Rosewood, Saxon Meadow, Killerton Park, Swithland Drive, The Hook, the new Gamston site, Buckfast Way, Mill Hill- Bingham, Newbold Way- Kinoulton and Coach Gap Lane Langar	Savings on staffing and equipment used to undertake current grounds maintenance to the amenity standard Recommendation: implement	Estimated saving £7,800 p.a.
12. Limit landscaping on new developments which the council will subsequently take over	Prevents an increase in demand for new staffing resources to maintain areas particularly once commuted sum is finished Recommendation: implement	No savings on current budget – avoids future cost
13. Reduce the number of litter bins that we empty	Saving on staff time to be redirected to other core work Recommendation: conduct trials	minimal

Initiative	How will the savings be made?	Financial implications £
14. Approach businesses to pay a contribution for litter collection from their forecourts e.g. Melton road and Central Avenue?	Income from charging Recommendation: implement	To be negotiated
15. Installation and maintenance of bedding planting by friends groups	Saving on staff time to be redirected to other core work Recommendation: explore feasibility with relevant groups	Depends on willingness of friends groups

6. If approved, the initiatives in table 1 could generate maximum savings of over £200,000 p.a. However as some of the precise savings cannot be calculated until implementation and some consultation or negotiation is required, it is suggested that only £120,000 should be incorporated into the budget for 2012/13 at this time. These initiatives will be presented at the forthcoming budget workshops for comment by Members.
7. Approval is being sought to commence a procurement exercise for garage services to test whether this would yield benefits. This will need to be carried out in accordance with European rules and take at least 18 weeks to complete. Any additional costs of the exercise, not thought to be significant, will be met from the “invest to save” reserve. Evaluation of the bids may also need to take into account the longer term need to replace equipment and property.
8. Initiatives that the group did not support are shown as an appendix to this report.

Financial Comments

The financial implications are set out in paragraph 5 (table 1) and paragraph 6. The £270,000 savings will be incorporated into the budget for 2012/13, subject to any amendments agreed through the budget workshops.

Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act

Full consideration has been given to any impact on crime and disorder issues as a result of the recommendations contained within the report. The outcome is that there are no negative impacts and a small positive impact by offering the chargeable service to remove graffiti and fly tipping which if taken up will remove such issue more promptly which will help to prevent further occurrences.

Diversity

Following an initial equalities impact screening exercise there are no detrimental or disproportionate equality related impacts arising from these recommendations. It must also be stated that the Council will continue with its current service of removing “hate” related graffiti on public areas within 24 hours of reporting.

Background Papers Available for Inspection: Nil

Options not supported by the Member Group

Initiative	How will the savings be made?
Split shift operations and consideration of activities which can be carried out later at night/evening	Saving on resources particularly vehicle and equipment
Bringing your own waste to centre collection points for some isolated properties	Saving on staff resources and vehicle required for current isolated property round
Introduce a charge for new bins	Income from charging
Introduce a charge for replacement wheeled bins (possibly not green)	Income from charging
Remove recycling units from high footfall areas, proving not to be successful	Less staffing resource needed to empty and a saving on bin purchase costs
Grass growth retardant on all open space areas	Savings on staffing and equipment used to undertake grass cutting
Remove traditional planting at various sites	Saving on staff time to be redirected to other core work
Remove hedgerows at various sites	Redirection of SW staff time onto other core work
Do not install the hanging baskets in Central Avenue	Reduction in costs of flowers, equipment and staff time redirected etc
Do not install bedding plants in Bridgford Park	Reduction in costs of flowers, equipment and staff time redirected etc

REPORT OF THE INTERIM HEAD OF FINANCIAL SERVICES

CABINET PORTFOLIO HOLDER – COUNCILLOR J A CRANSWICK

Purpose

1. The purpose of the report is to present the budget position for revenue and capital as at 30 November 2011.

Recommendations

It is RECOMMENDED that:

Members note the current projections for Revenue and Capital outturn

Revenue Monitoring

2. The revenue monitoring statement by service area is attached at **Appendix A** with detailed variance analysis for November 2011 attached at **Appendix B**.
3. The budget monitoring for November 2011 reflects some significant variations. This is not surprising given the Council's drive for savings, efficiency and maximisation of income but is a significant success given the current economic climate.
4. A large part of the savings has been delivered by maximising income levels. The Green Waste scheme is expected to deliver nearly double the saving originally budgeted and income from search fees, industrial sites, land holdings and investment properties are all out performing budget.
5. The work associated with the four year plan is also starting to have a significant impact with savings from the revenues and benefits and streetwise service reviews starting to be delivered a year earlier than scheduled.
6. The impact of this performance is that there is no longer a requirement to use general fund balances to support the budget for this year. Whilst the use of reserves and balances can help to smooth funding issues when times are difficult their use is not sustainable in the medium and longer term.

7. This will place the Council in a strong financial position to cope with the new business rate reforms, the changes to council tax benefits and the universal credit from 2013/14. All are expected to place significant additional financial burdens on the Council making continued success of the service review programme critical.

Capital Monitoring

8. The updated Capital Programme monitoring statement for November 2011 is attached at **Appendix C**. A summary of the projected outturn and funding position is shown in the table below: -

	Current Budget	Projected Outturn	Projected Variance
	£	£	£
Expenditure			
Revenues & ICT	727,000	641,000	(86,000)
Partnerships & Performance	2,178,000	2,128,000	(50,000)
Environment & Waste	1,053,000	1,053,000	0
Community Shaping	779,000	781,000	2,000
Planning & Place Shaping	73,000	70,000	(3,000)
Contingency	374,000	0	(374,000)
	5,184,000	4,673,000	(511,000)
Financing			
Capital Receipts	(1,742,000)	(1,932,000)	(190,000)
Government Grants	(2,870,000)	(2,220,000)	650,000
Other Grants & Contributions	(111,000)	(100,000)	11,000
Contributions from Revenue	(461,000)	(421,000)	40,000
	(5,184,000)	(4,673,000)	511,000
Net Expenditure	0	0	0

9. The projected outturn for the capital programme is currently lower than budgeted, however the majority of the underspend relates to unused contingency. The remaining variance is 2.6% of the total budget.

Earl Howe Sewage Treatment Plant

10. Final contract costs are lower than originally estimated giving rise to a saving of £11,000 on this scheme. However as the scheme is part funded by contributions the amount to be recovered will also reduce by £11,000.

IS Strategy

11. The projected variance of £40,000 arises from potential savings on the new HR System £17,000, slippage of £8,000 on the Website development project, and the unallocated sum of £15,000 in the year. A significant sum of this budget has been re-phased to 2012/13.

Car Park Resurfacing

12. Potential saving of £12,000 if no further works commissioned.

Park Lodge Structural Repairs

13. This scheme was included to address long standing, although not progressive, structural repairs to the property and the intent was to undertake the works whilst the property was vacant. Following the departure of Rushcliffe CVS, a new short-term tenant was quickly identified so the works have not been undertaken. There are potentially some enhancement works required to be done this year and these are currently under consideration along with the need to undertake the planned structural repair work at a future stage.

Rushcliffe Community Contact Centre

14. The final main contractor sum is still to be agreed and the self-service elements of the project determined. There is likely to be a saving of £50,000 on the scheme at the year-end this would be in addition to the saving of £50,000 achieved at the end of the last financial year.

Financial Comments

Financial comments are included within the body of the report

Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act

There are no section 17 implications

Diversity

There are no diversity implications

Background Papers Available for Inspection: Nil

Revenue Variance Analysis by Service Area
April 2011 - November 2011 (8 Months)

	Actual vs Profile			Projected vs Budget			
	Budget YTD	Actual YTD	Variance (Under)/Over	Current Budget	Projected Outturn	Variance (Under)/Over	%age Variance
Community Shaping	827,295	677,034	(150,261)	1,607,950	1,565,950	(42,000)	2.6%
Environment & Waste	2,298,555	1,801,437	(497,118)	3,728,701	3,153,701	(575,000)	15.4%
Planning & Place Shaping	146,051	147,069	1,018	180,970	187,970	7,000	-3.9%
Partnerships & Performance	887,775	894,033	6,258	1,545,640	1,580,640	35,000	-2.3%
Corporate Services	902,375	871,505	(30,870)	1,532,480	1,518,480	(14,000)	0.9%
Financial Services	1,258,935	1,284,415	25,480	1,994,540	1,897,540	(97,000)	4.9%
Revenues, Property & ICT	1,390,763	1,223,428	(167,335)	1,711,030	1,593,030	(118,000)	6.9%
Total	7,711,749	6,898,921	(812,828)	12,301,311	11,497,311	(804,000)	6.5%

RUSHCLIFFE BOROUGH COUNCIL - REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING

April 2011 - November 2011 (8 Month)

	YTD Variance	Projected Variance
ADVERSE VARIANCES	£000	£000
Planning & Place Shaping		
- Development Control fees are currently at target due to a single large fee. The projection to year end is that the budget will not be achieved.	18	75
- Income from Building Control fees is down however this is being partially offset due to additional income from a staff sharing arrangement.	36	34
Financial Services		
- The costs of bank charges are higher than budgeted mainly due to the increase in transactions caused by going "cashless."	25	38
- Insurance costs are higher than budgeted as savings expected to be achieved won't be realised until 2012/13.	16	22
Partnerships & Performance		
- Income from Car Parking is projected to be higher than budgeted.	30	35
Total Adverse Variances	125	204
FAVOURABLE VARIANCES		
Planning & Place Shaping		
- Staff savings within Development Control and Building Control.	(43)	(52)
- Income from Search Fees is higher than budgeted.	(32)	(50)
Corporate Services		
- The budget for consultations is projected to be underspent although this is partly offset by higher photocopying costs.	(33)	(14)
Financial Services		
The projected outturn for superannuation backfunding and drainage levies are lower than budgeted.	(16)	(157)
Revenues, Property & ICT		
- Rents from industrial sites and land holdings are projected to be greater than budgeted due to the high levels of occupancy.	(43)	(50)
- Savings have been achieved through the early implementation of the Revenues and Benefits service review.	(75)	(58)
- The projected outturn for service and maintenance costs on the civic centre are lower than budgeted.	(12)	(10)
Community Shaping		
- The projected outturn reflects underspends in employee costs in Community Development, Community Safety and Environmental	(45)	(33)
- Additional income, which wasn't originally budgeted for has been received from the PCT to support Community Development.	(9)	(9)
Environment & Waste Management		
- Income from the Green Waste Service is higher than originally budgeted.	(289)	(289)
- Savings from ceasing the Trade Waste service.	(45)	(45)
- The projected outturn reflects savings achieved through the Fleet & Garage.	(44)	(87)
- Savings have also been achieved through the early delivery of part of the service review objectives in the Streetwise service.	(127)	(154)
Total Favourable Variances	(813)	(1,008)
Sum of Minor Variations	(125)	0
TOTAL VARIANCE	(813)	(804)

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - NOVEMBER 2011

	H/M/L	Budget YTD £000	Actual YTD £000	Variance £000	Current Budget £000	Projected Outturn £000	Variance £'000
REVENUES & ICT SERVICES							
Earl Howe Sewage Treatment Plant	H	59	44	(15)	59	48	(11)
Walcote Drive Watercourse	M	0	0	0	180	180	0
Making Borough Council Car Parks Safe	M	41	37	(4)	54	54	0
IS Strategy	M	148	153	5	240	200	(40)
Public Conveniences Bridgford Park	L	39	36	(3)	39	39	0
Bingham Toilets Security Enhancements	L	0	0	0	6	6	0
Civic Centre Energy Efficiency	L	0	0	0	40	40	0
Civic Centre Enhancements level 1	L	20	19	(1)	20	20	0
Car Park Resurfacing	L	12	7	(5)	19	7	(12)
Park Lodge Structural Repairs	L	0	0	0	23	0	(23)
Footpath Enhancements	L	24	18	(6)	47	47	0
		343	314	(29)	727	641	(86)
PARTNERSHIPS & PERFORMANCE							
Community Contact Centre Spokes	H	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cotgrave Masterplan	H	0	0	0	2,000	2,000	0
RLC Gym Heating/Ventilation/Equipment	M	15	11	(4)	15	15	0
ELLC Energy Efficiency Measures	M	0	0	0	22	22	0
Rushcliffe Community Contact Centre	L	42	10	(32)	100	50	(50)
Car Park Pay & Display Machines	L	21	21	0	21	21	0
EGC Enhance Bar/Lounge Facilities	L	13	0	(13)	20	20	0
		91	42	(49)	2,178	2,128	(50)
ENVIRONMENT & WASTE MANAGEMENT							
Disabled Facilities Grants	H	367	394	27	550	550	0
Decent Homes Grants	L	74	60	(14)	74	74	0
Wheeled Bins Acquisition	L	40	28	(12)	60	60	0
Vehicle Replacement	L	59	54	(5)	369	369	0
		540	536	(4)	1,053	1,053	0
COMMUNITY SHAPING							
Support for Registered Housing	H	15	11	(4)	369	369	0
Partnership Grants	H	83	36	(47)	125	125	0
Alford Road Pavilion Redevelopment	M	5	2	(3)	5	5	0
West Bridgford Community Hall Upgrade	M	10	12	2	10	12	2
Community Partnership Reward Grants	L	23	15	(8)	34	34	0
Gresham Pavilion Legionella Work	L	8	8	0	12	12	0
Bridgford Park Trim Trail	L	121	118	(3)	121	121	0
Play Facilities	L	0	0	0	100	100	0
Staff Welfare Facility West Park	L	2	0	(2)	3	3	0
		267	202	(65)	779	781	2
PLANNING & PLACE SHAPING							
Environmental Improvements	M	68	52	(16)	73	70	(3)
		68	52	(16)	73	70	(3)
CONTINGENCY							
		0	0	0	374	0	(374)
TOTAL		1,309	1,146	(163)	5,184	4,673	(511)



CABINET

10 JANUARY 2012

SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENT WITH RUSHCLIFFE COMMUNITY AND VOLUNTARY SERVICE AND RURAL COMMUNITY ACTION NOTTINGHAMSHIRE

8

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF COMMUNITY SHAPING

CABINET PORTFOLIO HOLDER – COUNCILLOR MRS J A SMITH

Summary

This report sets out the Council's approach to developing a single Service Level Agreement (SLA) with Rushcliffe Community and Voluntary Service (RCVS) and Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire (RCAN) for 2012-2015 to deliver services on the Council's behalf.

Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Members approve the attached Service Level Agreement with RCVS and RCAN for 2012-2015.

Background

1. In 2008 Rushcliffe Borough Council entered into a Service Level Agreement (SLA) with RCVS and RCAN to deliver services on the Council's behalf over a three year period (2008-2011). The Council agreed to pay RCVS £131,042 and RCAN £126,317 respectively over the three year period. Both SLAs have since expired, although the Council has agreed an extension to the SLA with RCVS to 31 January 2012.
2. As part of the Council's Four Year Plan to address budget savings required and to improve services to customers the Council has undertaken a review of these Service Level Agreements. In addition, the Council's Rural Officer (funded through the SLA with RCAN) retired on 31 July 2011, which presented an opportunity for reviewing future partnership working.
3. Members of the Community Development Scrutiny Group considered and made comments on two reports (18 July 2011 and 19 September 2011) on the outcome of the service level agreements. Members endorsed proposals to develop one joint service level agreement between the Council and both organisations, improving services to our residents and making 10% savings.

RCVS Service Level Agreement Outcomes 2008-2011

4. The key services delivered by RCVS in the past three years include:
 - setting up and facilitating over 100 voluntary and community groups across the Borough
 - attracting more than £600,000 into the Borough to support voluntary and community groups
 - 1200 volunteers registered with RCVS receiving support with volunteering placements
 - delivering a range of projects including First Contact Signposting scheme, Housing Choices project, working with Activity Friends
 - delivering the Community Cohesion Network
 - delivering Rushcliffe Voluntary Transport Scheme
 - delivering the visitor centre at HMP Whatton
 - delivering the Community Outreach Advisor Service
 - working in partnership with Principia
 - working as a key partner in the Community Partnership to deliver the partnership priorities

RCAN Service Level Agreement Outcomes 2008-2011

5. The key services delivered by RCAN in the past three years include:
 - the delivery of 8 parish plans and a further 4 plans in development
 - £1.6m accessed in funding to support a wide range of projects across our rural communities
 - support provided for the development of 1 community shop, 9 play areas, 4 new developments of affordable homes, and a range of allotments
 - support provided to setting up a range of community groups, such as local choirs, walking groups, etc
 - a range of training services provided including Vetting and Barring, setting up community groups, playground inspections etc
 - supporting 12 Town and Parish Forums and 3 Town and Parish Conferences

Review process

6. Nationally, voluntary and community groups are merging and consolidating to ensure resilience and adaptability to save money and best meet local residents' needs. In Rushcliffe, RCAN and RCVS are already working together as part of the South Notts Alliance. However, at present both organisations have clearly defined roles and remits and historically the Council has had two separate SLAs, with both organisations delivering distinct roles.
7. In the last six months the Council has been working with both organisations to discuss our priorities with them and to look at the potential to deliver a single service level agreement in partnership. The benefits of a single SLA are increased resilience, shared knowledge and expertise, and reduced cost to the Council. RCVS and RCAN welcome the opportunity to work more closely together whilst assisting the Council in delivering its priorities.

8. The review process has considered the Council's changing needs, including the Four Year Plan and transformation agenda. In the current climate commissioned services need to be measurable and outcome focused, but they must also be sufficiently flexible to incorporate changing times. Whilst the Council continues to support the excellent work which both organisations have undertaken in the community there is a need to develop this relationship further.
9. As part of the Big Society agenda, central government is increasingly looking to the voluntary sector to provide services in the future. This may be through volunteering or commissioned services. The Localism Act seeks to give communities and therefore voluntary groups new powers to deliver local services for themselves. Many community and voluntary groups do not have the infrastructure to support the work they wish to undertake, such as assistance with administration, legal advice, procurement advice, etc. The voluntary sector will fulfil a role in ensuring these groups are 'fit for purpose' supporting their development and the delivery of services. Additionally, they will fulfil an important role of empowering communities to act for themselves through advice and assistance. In Rushcliffe, this may be translated to communities taking on and running services which have previously been provided by the Council.
10. In order to create capacity to take on this additional work, it has been necessary to reduce certain aspects of the SLA. This includes work supporting the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP.) The LSP is currently undergoing a review which may result in a significant reduction in its work programme in the future, with a renewed focus on task and finish groups. This will create some additional capacity for RCVS and RCAN in the future. It is also anticipated that joint working will also reduce administration which will in turn increase capacity.

Service Level Agreement 2012-2015 Outcomes

11. It is proposed that the new Service Level Agreement with RCVS and RCAN will fund five specific activity outputs (Appendix A):
 - Deliver infrastructure services to voluntary and community groups, including direct provision of support services to individual volunteers and voluntary and community organisations.
 - Support town and parish councils and community groups in the development and delivery of community led plans, neighbourhood plans and market town initiatives. This will include the provision of advice and guidance to town and parish councils and community groups on community led planning, undertaking two community led plans per year, supporting the development of Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan and leading on the delivery of a 'market town initiative.' The SLA will also fund the important assistance provided to our communities to access grants.
 - Assist the Council in developing and implementing its Transformation Agenda. As this is still in the early stages of development it is envisaged that the Council will work with RCVS and RCAN to develop an action plan in 2012-2013 to incorporate partnership involvement into transforming Council services.

- Assist the Council in implementing its Equality Scheme- including managing the Rushcliffe Community Cohesion Network, which provides an opportunity for engagement with diverse groups across Rushcliffe.
 - Communication
12. The SLA also incorporates a payment of £10,475 per year which RCVS then pay to the Council for accommodation at Bridgford House.

Monitoring and evaluation

13. The SLA sets out specific annual outcomes to be reviewed on a quarterly basis. This allows flexibility to be built into the SLA to ensure the partnership continues to meet the needs of the Council and residents in changing times.

Financial Comments

The cost of the revised service level agreement will be £249,346. This represents £13,123 to be paid for the period 1st February to 31st March 2011. There will then be three further annual payments of £78,741 between 2012 and 2015.

This represents a saving of 12% (£28,000) on the current service level agreement when incorporating rental income. The original service review target was a saving of 10% (£26,000).

Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act

RCVS and RCAN work closely with the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership and consider community safety in appropriate aspects of their work.

Diversity

RCVS and RCAN actively work to promote equality opportunities and diversity in all aspects of their work. The SLA will specifically fund the Rushcliffe Community Cohesion Network which brings together diverse and hard to reach groups from all over Rushcliffe to ensure they have a voice in the Borough.

Background Papers Available for Inspection:

Review of Service Level Agreements - Report to Community Development Group July 2011

Review of Service Level Agreement with RCVS and RCAN – Report to Community Development Group – September 2011.



SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENT

BETWEEN

RUSHCLIFFE BOROUGH COUNCIL

AND

RUSHCLIFFE COMMUNITY & VOLUNTARY SERVICE

AND

RURAL COMMUNITY ACTION NOTTINGHAMSHIRE

2012-2015

Service Level Agreement between
RUSHCLIFFE BOROUGH COUNCIL
& RUSHCLIFFE COMMUNITY & VOLUNTARY SERVICE/ RURAL COMMUNITY
ACTION NOTTINGHAMSHIRE

TOTAL 2011/12.....	£13,123*
TOTAL 2012/13.....	£ 78,741
TOTAL 2013/14.....	£ 78,741
TOTAL 2014/15.....	£ 78,741
<u>GRAND TOTAL 2012-2015.....</u>	<u>£249,346</u>

*This represents two months payments from 1st February 2012 to 31st March 2012.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF AGREEMENT between
RUSHCLIFFE BOROUGH COUNCIL and RUSHCLIFFE
COMMUNITY & VOLUNTARY SERVICE/ RURAL
COMMUNITY ACTION NOTTINGHAMSHIRE

Date of Commencement:- 1 February 2011 Period – 3 years and 2 months

This agreement relates to:

- the provision of services in Rushcliffe
- services provided by Rushcliffe Community & Voluntary Service and Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire
- the above period only.

NB. Reference throughout this document to **the Council** shall mean, **Rushcliffe Borough Council**, to **RCVS** shall mean, **Rushcliffe Community & Voluntary Service** and to **RCAN** shall mean, **Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire**.

1. Rushcliffe Community Strategy

All activity undertaken must help Rushcliffe Community Partnership achieve its objectives as stated in the current Rushcliffe Community Strategy and its annual action plans.

2. The Council's Corporate Plan

All activity undertaken by **RCVS/RCAN** and funded through this agreement must assist in helping **the Council** achieve its priorities as set down in **the Council's** Corporate Plan.

3. Local Authority Compact

Both parties are committed to fulfilling their obligations under the agreement within the framework of the current Compact and are committed to the development and implementation of a new style joint framework for partnership working.

4. General Conditions

RCVS and RCAN shall:

- a) provide to **the Council** the services as set out in Schedules A & D, these shall be in accordance with the terms and conditions of this Agreement.
- b) ensure that in providing the services, it complies with and achieves the activities as set out in Schedule B.
- c) perform to the standards as set out in Schedule C.
- d) perform in accordance to appropriate professional standards.

e) exercise all reasonable skill, care and diligence in the performance of the services.

f) comply with all applicable statutory and other legal requirements, regulations and all relevant voluntary and compulsory codes of conduct.

g) provide activity monitoring reports to **the Council** 4 times per year (see Schedule D).

h) provide to **the Council** any other such reports in relation to the provision of services or this agreement as **the Council** shall reasonably require. **The Council** will give adequate notice in such cases.

5. Duties of the Provider

It is the duty of **RCVS** and **RCAN** as joint service providers to:

a) ensure that all necessary measures are taken for the protection and safekeeping of any staff or volunteers, together with any items of property, to be used or employed by **RCVS and RCAN**, in connection with the provision of services under this agreement.

b) indemnify and keep **the Council** indemnified against all liability, loss, damages, costs and expenses (including legal expenses) awarded against or incurred or paid by **the Council** as a result of, or in connection with:-

- any breach by **RCVS or RCAN** of any of the provisions of this agreement; or
- any act or omission of its employees, agents or sub-contractors (including, but without limitation, voluntary workers) in connection with the provision of services by **RCVS and RCAN** under this agreement; or
- any claim brought against **the Council** by any third party which arises in connection with the provision of services under this agreement.

c) without prejudice to the provisions of sub-clause 5b) take out, and throughout the period of this agreement, maintain policies of insurance with an insurance company of good repute against any liability for which **RCVS and RCAN** may be responsible in connection with the provision of services under this agreement (including, but without limitation, employer's liability), such insurance shall be in a minimum amount of £5,000,000 for any one incident or series of connected incidents. **RCVS and RCAN** shall upon request by **the Council**, at any time, produce such policies of insurance together with the receipt for the current year's premium.

6. Monitoring and Evaluation

RCVS and RCAN shall comply with the monitoring and evaluation arrangements as set out in the conditions.

RCVS and RCAN shall allow **the Council** reasonable access to the premises/sites where the service is provided and to financial information and other documentation relevant to the monitoring requirements set out in Schedule D.

The clause above does not relate to statutory rights of access of the client, or government or other authority or regulatory body who may have legitimate rights to information.

7. Service Agreement Management

The Council and **RCVS/RCAN** shall each nominate a Service Agreement Manager to act on their behalf. Any decision, notice, information or communication given or made by a Service Agreement Manager or his duly nominated representatives (such nomination being advised in writing) shall be deemed to have been given by **the Council** or **RCVS/RCAN** as the case may be.

8. Assignment

RCVS/RCAN shall not assign any element of this Agreement, or sub-contract its duties and obligations within this Agreement, without the prior written consent of **the Council**.

9. Agreement Reviews

Reviews of the Agreement may be initiated by either party for the duration of the Agreement

10. Financial Management

a) **The Council** agrees to commission the services of **RCVS/RCAN** as detailed in Schedule A at the costs detailed in Schedule D for the duration of the Agreement.

b) Payment will be made in four installments, in advance on the following dates:

- 1st February 2012
- 1st April 2012
- 1st April 2013
- 1st April 2014.

c) If **RCVS/RCAN** shall fail to meet the service specifications or standards **the Council** may bring this agreement to an end and require immediate repayment of all or part of the pre-paid funding.

11. Duration and Termination

This Agreement shall come into force on 1 February 2012 and subject to the provisions below shall continue in force until 31 March 2015.

a) It may be terminated by either party at any time on giving to the other party not less than 6 months notice in writing.

b) Either party shall be entitled to terminate this Agreement if :-

i) the other party commits any continuing or material breach of any of the provisions of this Agreement and, in the case of a breach capable of remedy, fails to remedy the same within 28 days after receipt of a written notice giving full particulars of the breach and requiring it to be remedied

ii) another party, or individual with which there is not an Agreement takes possession or a receiver is appointed over any of the property or assets of that other party

iii) that other party makes any voluntary arrangement with its creditors or becomes subject to an administration order

iv) a petition is presented, or a resolution is passed, for the winding up of that other party

v) that other party ceases, or threatens to cease, to carry on the services of this Agreement.

c) During the period of Termination the parties shall:-

i) Work to ensure that the interests and needs of users are met;

ii) Endeavour to reconcile all financial matters including sums outstanding;

iii) Return any property of the other party.

12. Entire Agreement and Variation

a) This Agreement (together with the Schedules hereto) sets forth the entire agreement between the parties with respect to the subject matter herein and supersedes and replaces all prior communications, representations, warranties, stipulations, undertakings and agreements whether oral or written between the parties.

b) The Council will seek an agreement with the provider for compliance with **the Council's** Equal Opportunity, Community Safety and Environmental Policies, particularly its procurement provisions.

c) No variation shall be made to this Agreement unless such variation is in writing and agreed to by duly authorised representatives of both parties.

13. Settlement of Disputes

a) A difference or dispute arising out of this Agreement shall be dealt with as follows:

i) the aggrieved party shall notify the other party via the Service Agreement Manager in writing giving details of the dispute or difference

ii) **The Council** will work with **RCVS/RCAN** to identify the causes of the problems and make recommendations to enable a resolution (this would not prevent **the Council** exercising its rights to end the agreement).

iii) within 14 days of such notification the Service Agreement Manager of **the Council** and Service Agreement Manager of **RCVS/RCAN** (or in their absence a duly authorised representative) shall meet to attempt to resolve the dispute or difference

iv) if within 28 days after any notification given pursuant to clause a) i) above the dispute or difference in question has not been resolved, the matter shall be referred to the Deputy Chief Executive for a decision

b) Nothing within this clause shall prevent the parties at any time agreeing to settle any difference or dispute arising out of this Agreement without recourse to arbitration.

THIS AGREEMENT IS SIGNED ON BEHALF OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OF RUSHCLIFFE BOROUGH COUNCIL BY:

.....(Head of Community Shaping)

Date

And

Signature

Designation

Date

On behalf of Rushcliffe Community and Voluntary Service

And

Signature

Designation

Date

On behalf of Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire

SERVICES

In broad terms, **RCVS/RCAN** agrees:

- To provide services to community organisations and individuals engaged in voluntary work in Rushcliffe
- To provide a service to Rushcliffe rural community groups and Town and Parish Councils on behalf of Rushcliffe Borough Council to assist them in meeting the corporate goals set down in the Councils Corporate Strategy 2012-2016.

In more specific terms, **RCVS/RCAN** will:

- provide services to Rushcliffe Borough Council to assist them in meeting the Councils corporate goals as laid down in the Council's Corporate Strategy 2012-2016

The following five services will be provided:

Service 1: Delivery of infrastructure services to voluntary and community groups

Service 2: Supporting town and parish councils and community groups in the development and delivery of community led plans, neighbourhood plans and market town initiatives.

Service 3: Assist the Council in developing and implementing its Transformation

Agenda

Service 4: Assist the Council in implementing its Equality Scheme

Service 5: Communicate with voluntary and community organisations throughout Rushcliffe

ACTIVITY OUTPUTS

Service 1: Deliver infrastructure services to voluntary and community groups

1. Work to initiate, support and develop voluntary and community action across Rushcliffe
2. Work with voluntary and community agencies to develop and deliver services to meet identified need. Services will include:
 - securing funding
 - establishing legal structures
 - a programme of face to face interviews with representatives from local groups and organisations
 - management issues
 - training
 - provide practical resources available to voluntary and community groups including photocopies, IT equipment and display panels
3. Promote and facilitate volunteering across Rushcliffe:
 - work with local organisations to promote good practice in volunteering
 - make contact with groups with a view to placing volunteers and recruiting potential volunteers
 - maintain an up to date database of volunteer opportunities and of volunteers seeking placement
 - follow up contacts with potential volunteers to check satisfaction level
 - offer training opportunities to volunteers and organisations involving them
4. Work in conjunction with partner agencies to respond to community and voluntary action emerging from strategic work led by parish and town councils
5. Attract additional funding into the Borough in the support of voluntary and community activity:
 - support organisations applying for funding
 - organise one 'funding workshop' per year for voluntary and community organisations
 - work with organisations to help them identify and secure funding for their work
 - RCVS will generate income from a variety of sources

Service 2: Supporting town and parish councils and community groups in the development and delivery of community led plans, neighbourhood plans and market town initiatives.

1. Provide rural advice to any rural community group or town and parish council, with a particular focus on community led plans
2. Work with town and parish councils to support the development and delivery of community led plans

3. Work with Keyworth Parish Council to support the development and delivery of a Neighbourhood Plan
4. Work with town and parish councils to lead on the delivery of 'market town initiatives'
5. Provide an efficient grant finder scheme, attracting additional funding into the Borough in support of rural communities:

Service 3: Assist the Council in developing and implementing its Transformation Agenda

1. Work with the Council to support the delivery of its Four Year Plan, specifically on the Transformation Agenda.
2. Develop an annual plan of action to transform services relating to the development of community asset transfers/social enterprises
3. Support the Council in promoting and delivering Localism to encourage community engagement and support local community initiatives
4. Work with the Council to promote rural broadband in Rushcliffe

Service 4: Assist the Council in implementing its Equality Scheme

1. Maintain and improve a database of organisations across Rushcliffe from all sectors of the community
2. Enable excluded individuals and organisations to engage in voluntary and community activity and in local decision making processes
 - ensure that publications and website conform to agreed accessibility criteria
 - contribute to Borough-wide initiatives aimed at promoting and facilitating diversity and inclusion
 - promote and support initiatives aimed at enabling hard to reach groups and individuals to enable their needs to be heard
3. Deliver the Rushcliffe Community Cohesion Network
 - bring together networks of organisations and individuals concerned with diversity, equality and social capital

Service 5: Communication

Contribute to Council efforts to develop two way communication with individuals and organisations in Rushcliffe

- make available provision for information exchange in RCVS/RCAN publications and other media and event
- Regular newsletters (250-300) per mailing (mainly electronic versions)
- 'piggy-back information in media delivered by other organizations
- direct mailings as required
- website up dated weekly

PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES (Annual)

Service 1: Deliver infrastructure services to voluntary and community groups

1. One to one contact with at least 35 voluntary and community groups
2. Work with at least 5 organisations to help them identify suitable funding opportunities and helping them to secure at least £25,000 additional funding
3. At least 95% of organisations helped by RCVS and responding to user survey express satisfaction with the service received
4. Advice and support provided to at least 400 potential volunteer successfully place at least 90 volunteers
5. Work is done with at least 12 voluntary and community groups to promote good practice in volunteering
6. The Volunteer Centre achieves and maintains accreditation with Volunteering England
7. At least 95% of people using the Volunteer Centre and responding to user survey express satisfaction with the service
8. Volunteer Centre engages with Centers elsewhere in the County to develop collaborative initiatives aimed at improving efficiency and effectiveness
9. RCVS will generate additional period income to provide new services to users

Service 2: Supporting town and parish councils and community groups in the development and delivery of community led plans, neighbourhood plans and market town initiatives.

1. Rural community groups and town and parish councils receive appropriate advice and guidance, with a particular focus on community led plans
2. Two community led plans are produced per year
3. Ongoing development of a Neighbourhood Plan in Keyworth
4. Lead on the delivery of one 'market town initiative'
5. Work with at community groups and town and parish councils to help them identify suitable funding opportunities and helping them to secure additional funding
6. Engage with partners in up to 4 town or parish council community initiatives and attendance at, up to 10 events.

Service 3: Assist the Council in developing and implementing its Transformation Agenda

1. As the Council is in the early stages of developing its transformation agenda and undertaking the Four Year Plan Redesign it is too early to establish clear outcomes. It is therefore anticipated that the Council will work with RCVS and RCAN to develop an action plan in 2012-2013 in respect of supporting the Councils goals set out in Schedule A. This will then be updated on an annual basis as the transformation agenda evolves.

Service 4: Assist the Council in implementing its Equalities Scheme

1. Database is seen to reflect our diverse population

2. At least 10 key networks are engaged in the Community Cohesion Network (CCN)
3. Contribute to at least one CCN event
4. Contribute to at least one initiative with the BME community
5. Methods developed to enable Asian elders to more easily access community services – numbers reached
6. At least 10 volunteers with additional support needs are successfully placed

Service 5: Communication

1. Our database of voluntary opportunities is updated regularly
2. At least 10 electronic news bulletins are circulated
3. Database entries increase by at least 10% per annum
4. Those responding to an annual survey will show at least 90% overall satisfaction with the news bulletin
5. Circulate 10 regular newsletters (250-300) per mailing (mainly electronic versions)
6. 'piggy-back information in media delivered by other organizations
7. carry out at least 4 direct mailings as required
8. website up dated weekly

EVALUATION AND MONITORING

All parties will monitor the Service Level Agreement performance on a quarterly basis. All party may call a meeting to discuss any part of the performance of the Service Agreement and where appropriate amendments to the Service Level Agreement will be made.

RCVS/RCAN will provide Activity Monitoring reports with evidence of outcomes to Rushcliffe Borough Council 4 times per year. **The Councils Service Agreement Manager** and the **RCVS/RCAN** Service Manager will meet on an annual basis, at which these reports will be discussed. The reports will focus on the progress of the five services, any relevant developments and recommendations for future work.

PAYMENT

Subject to meeting all of the outcomes shown in Schedule C, Rushcliffe Borough Council will pay **RCVS/RCAN** £249,346 for the period 2012 – 2015 in four annual installments of £13,123 (relating to two months payment for the period 1st February 2012- 31st March 2012), £78,471, £78,471, and £78,471 respectively, annually in advance.

RCVS/RCAN then agree to pay the Council £10,475 per year for accommodation provided at Bridgford House on an annual basis.

Any and all sums paid or payable to the provider, under or pursuant to this agreement, shall be exclusive of Value Added Tax (where appropriate).

