

When telephoning, please ask for: Viv Nightingale
Direct dial 0115 914 8481
Email vnightingale@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Our reference:
Your reference:
Date: 6 January 2010

To all Members of the Council

Dear Councillor

A meeting of the PARTNERSHIP DELIVERY GROUP will be held on Thursday 14 January 2010 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. Notes of the Meeting held on Wednesday 4 November 2009 (pages 1 - 9).
4. Update on Partnership with Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club

The report of the Head of Community Shaping is attached (page 10).
5. South Nottinghamshire Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership – Update by Chief Superintendent John Busuttil

The report of the Head of Community Shaping is attached (pages 11 - 12).
6. Work Programme

The report of the Head of Partnerships and Performance is attached (pages 13 - 14).

Membership

Councillors Chairman: N C Lawrence, Vice-Chairman: B G Dale, T D S Barlow, R L Butler, L B Cooper, Mrs C E M Jeffreys, R M Jones, Mrs M Stockwood, T Vennett-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.



**NOTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
PARTNERSHIP DELIVERY
WEDNESDAY 4 NOVEMBER 2009**

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

PRESENT:

Councillors N C Lawrence (Chairman), S J Boote (substitute for Councillor T Vennett-Smith), R L Butler, L B Cooper, B G Dale, R M Jones and B Tansley (substitute for Councillor Mrs M Stockwood)

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Mr G Hall Regional Manager, Parkwood Leisure Ltd
Mr J Palfrey Contract Manager, Parkwood Leisure Ltd

OFFICERS PRESENT:

D Banks Head of Environment and Waste Management
S Cairns Protection & Safety Manager
N Carter Partnerships and Projects Manager
S Griffiths Deputy Chief Executive (SG)
S Harley Head of Planning and Place Shaping
B Knowles Leisure Contracts Manager
V Nightingale Senior Member Support Officer

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

Councillors T D S Barlow, Mrs M Stockwood and T Vennett-Smith

20. Declarations of Interest

Councillors L B Cooper and R L Butler declared an interest in item 7 – West Bridgford Community Hub.

21. Notes of the Previous Meeting

The notes of the meeting held on Wednesday 30 September 2009 were accepted as a true record.

22. Leisure Centre Contract – Annual Report by Parkwood Leisure Ltd

The Leisure Contracts Manager introduced the report outlining the Council's leisure provision by Parkwood Leisure Ltd. He explained that the contract had been let in August 2007 and that it was for an initial 10 year period with a further option to extend by 5 years. He informed Members of the monitoring process and how the Council worked with Parkwood Leisure Ltd to address customers' concerns.

Mr Hall gave a presentation informing Members of the work carried out by Parkwood. He stated that all the leisure centres had been accredited by Quest, a nationally recognised leisure standard, with Bingham Leisure Centre achieving a very high first time assessment score. Also all sites had been

accredited with the environmental ISO 14001 award, and that Parkwood Leisure were committed to operating environmentally friendly systems and to reduce their carbon footprint. He informed Members of the refurbishment of the fitness suite at Rushcliffe Leisure Centre and how this had increased the number of customers. In fact over all the centres there had been an increase of 5,496 visits.

Mr Hall explained that they had been working in partnership with many agencies. One partnership was with the Primary Care Trust to improve the GP referral scheme and the health of cardiac patients, with the work of a dedicated co-ordinator. Another partnership was with the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership to improve accessibility to activities to disadvantaged groups and to combat anti-social behaviour. With regard to holiday activities for children they were working with the YMCA and Excel to provide a wide range of activities. Parkwood Leisure Ltd were working with the South Nottingham College for Further Education to introduce a Modern Apprenticeship scheme and with FUSION and Lifetime to introduce NVQ training to staff.

Members were informed of the current activity programme and how this was being developed from a loyalty scheme ranging from Run Riot to free swimming lessons for the over 60's and disabled. Mr Hall outlined the many ways that Parkwood collated customer feedback and how the satisfaction levels were increasing from last year. Finally he explained how the company were going to develop the service in the future including working towards the Investors In People accreditation.

Members had raised five questions to be answered by Parkwood. These were:

- Outside leisure facilities including hockey, netball etc and how the company provide these facilities

The Leisure Contracts Manager stated that the replacement of outdoor surfaces did fall under the remit of the Borough Council and that there were a number of issues that needed to be considered. The artificial pitch and athletics track at Bingham Leisure Centre were in fairly good condition and the larger artificial pitch at Rushcliffe Leisure Centre although not suitable for league hockey was well used for football. One issue was that the children from the school attached to Rushcliffe Leisure Centre used the pitch at break times. Another issue was that both centres were part of the Joint Use Agreement and as yet there was no information on what would happen when the current agreement finished, or whether the school's would go for foundation status. It was unlikely that the Council would wish to spend approximately £300,000 per pitch with such an uncertain future. He reminded Members that a Member Panel were considering the leisure provision in the Borough at present. The Chairman felt that it would be beneficial to have a report next year from the Member Panel.

- Parkwood's holiday activity schemes and their partnership with the YMCA

Councillor Jones stated that residents had been concerned that the holiday activities last year had been less available than in previous years. He asked if the Partnership with the YMCA had improved the situation.

Mr Palfrey explained that the partnership with the YMCA was operating in Rushcliffe and Bingham Leisure Centres and Excel at Keyworth Leisure Centre. He said that the schemes were well subscribed and that feedback was excellent. Following a question he informed Members that Cotgrave Leisure Centre were working heavily with Nottinghamshire County Council's Youth Services and the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership and the initial 10 week programme had surpassed itself and the Council's Sports Development Officer was now involved in continuing the project further. Councillors Butler and Tansley stated that they had received very positive feedback from parents and residents.

- Systems in place to deal with problems regarding cleanliness across the sites

Members had expressed concerns about the level of customer dissatisfaction with cleanliness across the sites, especially in the 'wet' changing rooms. It was felt that Councillors received the most complaints on this issue. Mr Palfrey explained that there were a number of mechanisms in place to address cleaning, including daily check sheets which had to be signed off by the duty manager. The Quest accreditation would not have been possible if the centres did not show a high level of commitment to cleanliness. It was pointed out that the Leisure Contracts Manager also regularly monitored the sites. It was recognised that there were a number of issues surrounding the 'wetside' operations but that the company were trying to resolve these issues. Mr Hall explained that they had been in touch with a dedicated swimming pool supplier of cleaning products and had challenged them to find a solution. He also stated that 3 new cleaning machines had been included in next year's capital programme.

Following a question Mr Palfrey explained that overnight 'deep cleans' were factored into the cleaning schedule as it was recognised that this assisted with keeping a site clean.

The Leisure Contracts Manager reminded Members that this was an on-going problem, especially in the joint use sites, as the buildings were becoming old and tired and constantly used by many school children as well as customers. He informed Members that Bingham Leisure Centre was the first community leisure centre to be built on a school site and that its design had always caused management problems. Mr Hall told Members that they did have a good working relationship with the schools and did try to keep the problems to a minimum.

- Parkwood's long term strategy with the flooring at Bingham Leisure Centre

The Leisure Contracts Manager explained that the Sports Hall floor fell under the remit of the County Council as part of the Joint Use maintenance budget. Borough officers had undertaken some initial work to identify the problem and had discovered that there was severe damp under the floor. The screed of the floor was old, the membrane was now ineffectual and the layer above the screed was not designed to deal with the current water levels. Holes had been drilled and following the results they would hold discussions with Nottinghamshire County Council to resolve the issue. Officers agreed that this was a frustrating situation and that they would continue to monitor it and work, with the other agencies involved, towards resolving it.

- Problems surrounding Rushcliffe Leisure Centre's car park including crime and disorder

Officers explained that they had met with the police and other agencies to look at car crime over the last three years. With regard to Rushcliffe Leisure Centre there had been 49 thefts from vehicles with no obvious trends of either season or time. At its peak there had only been 7 in one month, and lately there had been 2 in July and 0 in August 2009. There was however a spate of cycle thefts and officers were working with the school to introduce preventative measures, such as postcoding cycles. Following discussions with Parkwood Leisure new signage had been agreed. The police were undertaking another survey of the car park for the safety car park award.

Councillor Jones stated that the figures given were not as reported to another scrutiny group. He felt that there was problem with the lighting and that this led to people, especially women, feeling vulnerable at night. The Leisure Contracts Manager acknowledged that the design of the car park was poor and that the capability of the lighting was not as bright as modern lighting would be. Again with the uncertainty of the joint use agreement and foundation status it would be a substantial amount of money that the Borough Council would need to spend on a site that was not theirs.

Councillor Boote queried if the published poor performance of Parkwood Leisure's holding company impacted on the leisure division and its servicing of the Rushcliffe contract. Mr Hall stated that the Parkwood Group had had disappointing 6 monthly accounts but that they were not the only company in the present climate to have poor figures. He informed Members that Parkwood Leisure was stronger than ever and was on target to deliver a higher end of year profit. The Group had a strategy to improve by selling off a section which would leave them with a zero overdraft.

Questions were asked regarding the company's commitment to 2 user group meetings per year at each leisure centre. Mr Palfrey stated that it was Parkwood's culture to hold club and customer forums. He explained that at Cotgrave Leisure Centre comments from an Aquaforum had led to a new scheme being developed. At present there was a poor response to Manager's

question time however they were trying to promote and develop this. Mr Hall informed Members that the forums were minuted and that they actually held more forums than they were committed to. He also stated that part of the Quest process was to look at, and audit these minutes to ensure that customers were involved.

Councillor Boote asked if Parkwood Leisure had any plan to increase the provision of services now that the contract had been in place for over 18 months. Mr Hall explained that they would continue to corporately market the sites as this was having a positive impact on usage. He explained that the corporate marketing plan was developed in September each year and then each site developed its own in November. As a company they had to deliver a commercial return and would evolve the facilities and programmes to ensure this happened. With regard to pricing Parkwood proposed the changes to the Council for approval by Members. He stated that they were proposing to freeze the price for fitness when paid by direct debit for another year.

Members queried the apprenticeship scheme and were informed that Parkwood were working with South Nottinghamshire College on a modern apprenticeship scheme. This involved day release for staff to gain qualifications and on the job training, which was beneficial for recruitment. They were also developing an Advanced Apprenticeship to assist in taking this initiative further.

Following questions regarding crèches Members were informed that usage had fallen, especially at Rushcliffe Leisure Centre. Following a review and consultation more 1st Steps classes had been introduced and matched to aerobic classes. This had led to an increase in usage and very positive feedback. Members requested that this issue was reported on again at next year's review.

Members were interested in the company's views on how to reduce its carbon footprint. Mr Hall explained that they were the only private contractor to have attained ISO14001. They had trialled a variety of methods and considered what the outlay would be compared to the savings. Some of the simplest solutions were to:

- have a procurement lock on non energy saving light bulbs
- introduce toilet bags into cisterns
- have an energy warden at each site.

23. Building Control Review of Partnership Working Options

The Head of Planning and Place Shaping explained that the Group had received a presentation the previous year which had outlined various partnerships that were being considered. Unfortunately the Shared Services project was not progressing and no partnerships with other local authorities had come to fruition. She stated that the Building Control service had been kept in house and was performing strongly. However, due to the present economic climate the number of applications, and therefore the income, had decreased. The service was in direct competition with private companies, who were taking on more conventional local authority work. She explained that

staff had moved into other areas of work, including planning enforcement and property database.

Following a discussion the majority of Members were pleased to note that staff were being fully employed, trained and supported to carry out alternative work where it was felt there was synergy and in collaboration with other staff. It was felt that it was very advantageous that staff were flexible.

Officers explained that the Council was undertaking a 'fit for purpose' review over 40 projects of which Building Control was one. The Deputy Chief Executive (CB) was leading the review and any outcomes would be presented.

The Group decided that as this was not a service working in partnership that this issue should be referred to the Chairmen/Vice Chairmen's meeting for further reviews.

It was AGREED that

- a) a partnership arrangement for the delivery of the service was inappropriate at this time, and
- b) the service would form part of the Council's 'Fit for Purpose' programme and the findings be reported as per the governance arrangements for that programme

24. Update on the South Notts Home Improvement Agency and Options for Future Service Delivery

The Head of Environment and Waste Management presented a report outlining the current performance of the South Notts Home Improvement Agency. He explained that both Broxtowe and Gedling Borough Councils had withdrawn from the Partnership and that the Borough Council had decided to deliver the Discretionary Grants service back in house, but to leave the Agency to deliver the Disabled Facilities Grant service for the remainder of the contract period. He explained that Supporting People had the primary role of monitoring the Agency's performance however the Council also monitored the delivery of the grants. He informed the Group that satisfaction levels were high and that the evidence suggested that the service was offering good value for money.

Issues that needed to be considered were that the contract was due to end at the end of March 2010 and Supporting People were also reviewing the current provision of home improvement agency services across Nottinghamshire. They were proposing to change their current funding and concentrating on preventative schemes and ensuring there was a fairer system across the whole county.

He explained that there were two options for future service delivery, either the current grant work could be brought back in house or remain with the Agency to ensure a consistent delivery for a further year.

Members were concerned about the average time taken to complete the work. They noted that the national average was 34 weeks and that the Agency had

been achieving 22 weeks but still felt that this was not acceptable, especially as these works were undertaken for vulnerable people. Officers explained that the customers rated the service highly.

Following a question Members were informed that Spirita ran the Agency and that if there were any problems or issues Members could either contact them directly or through the Protection and Safety team in the Environment and Waste Management service area. They were reminded that Spirita were part of the Metropolitan Housing Trust who had a vast knowledge of home improvement agencies.

Whilst considering the 2 options Members were concerned about the role of the Occupational Therapist. Officers explained that if the service was brought in house the therapists, from Nottinghamshire County Council, would need to undertake additional work than at present as Spirita already had officers who were able to help customers through the process. Members felt that Occupational Therapists would not perceive this work to be a priority.

With regard to financing the 2 options officers explained that if the service was brought in house then it would be extremely unlikely that the Council would attract Supporting People funding which equated to £37,000.

It was AGREED that

the Group's decision to support the South Notts Home Improvement Agency to deliver the Council's Disabled Facilities Grant service be forwarded to Cabinet, and

The Group agreed that this was now not really a partnership and any future scrutiny should be discussed at a future Chairmen/Vice Chairmen meeting in order that it is presented to the most appropriate group.

25. West Bridgford Community Hub

The Partnerships and Projects Manager informed the Group that Nottinghamshire County Council had withdrawn from the project. A report outlining proposals was being presented to Cabinet on 10 November 2009. One of the proposals was to extend the present partnership with the Police to provide access points by including West Bridgford. Members were disappointed that the project would not be progressing and that the information had been released to the public first.

Other concerns were that the Hub building would have provided public toilets on Central Avenue and what future scrutiny arrangements would be for Customer Services, officers explained that these details were included in the report to Cabinet.

26. Rolling 2 Year Work Programme

The Group discussed its work programme and were informed of the decisions reached at the last meeting of the Chairmen and Vice Chairmen.

Members considered the external partners who would be attending the next meeting. The Deputy Chief Executive (SG) explained that Chief Superintendent John Busuttil, Divisional Commander for the South Nottinghamshire Division, would be attending on behalf of the South Nottinghamshire Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership.

Members queried a recent notification that the police did not consider that dealing with disorder was not part of their role and it was agreed that this would be an opportunity for clarification. Also further clarification could be sought on the use of confiscated vehicles and proceeds.

Officers stated that if Members had any questions to put to either the South Nottinghamshire Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership or the Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club they should be sent to the Partnerships and Projects Manager or Member Services. It was felt it would be beneficial for Members to have a brief outline of the work of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership.

The meeting closed at 9.30 pm.

Action Sheet

PARTNERSHIP DELIVERY - WEDNESDAY 4 NOVEMBER 2009

Minute Number	Actions	Officer Responsible
22 -Leisure Centre Contract – Annual Report by Parkwood Leisure Ltd	<p>Members concerns regarding the artificial pitches and the Joint Use Agreement be fed through to the Leisure Facilities Strategy Member Panel</p> <p>Cleanliness of the sites to be monitored and a report be contained within the 2010 review</p> <p>After all investigations officers to present a follow up report regarding the sports hall floor at Bingham Leisure Centre</p> <p>The 2010 review to contain information regarding the 1st Steps initiative</p> <p>A further report be presented to the Group regarding Rushcliffe Leisure Centre car park following the Police's review</p>	<p>Partnerships and Projects Manager</p> <p>Leisure Contracts Manager</p> <p>Leisure Contracts Manager</p> <p>Leisure Contracts Manager</p> <p>Leisure Contracts Manager</p>
23 -Building Control Review of Partnership Working Options	The Issue be forwarded to the Chairmen/Vice Chairmen's meeting	Councillor Lawrence
24 -Update on the South Notts Home Improvement Agency and Options for Future Service Delivery	For any future scrutiny the issue be forwarded to the Chairmen/Vice Chairmen's meeting for discussion	Deputy Chief Executive (SG)
26. - Rolling 2 Year Work Programme	<p>Questions regarding the visits by Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club and South Nottinghamshire Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership to be emailed to the Partnerships and Projects Manager or Member Services</p> <p>Officers to circulate a brief outline of the work of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership</p>	<p>All Members of the Partnership Delivery Group</p> <p>Community Safety Officer</p>

**SOUTH NOTTINGHAMSHIRE CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION
PARTNERSHIP (CDRP) - UPDATE BY CHIEF SUPERINTENDENT JOHN
BUSUTTIL**

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF COMMUNITY SHAPING

Summary

1. In 2008 the Rushcliffe Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP) merged with the Broxtowe and Gedling CDRP's to create a South Nottinghamshire CDRP. The partnership includes Rushcliffe Borough Council, Nottinghamshire Police, Nottinghamshire Police Authority, Nottinghamshire County Council, Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue, the Primary Care Trust and a number of other non-statutory and voluntary organisations.
2. The partnership has five key areas for priorities, these are:
 - Serious acquisitive crime (dwelling burglary, vehicle crime and robbery)
 - Youth issues
 - Drug and alcohol related anti-social behaviour
 - Safer neighbourhoods and community engagement
 - Violence
3. Reducing levels of crime and anti-social behaviour to make people feel safe is a corporate priority for Rushcliffe Borough Council within the Corporate Strategy 2007-2011.
4. The Chief Superintendent for South Nottinghamshire, John Busuttill will be making a presentation to Partnership Delivery on behalf of the CDRP which will include:
 - The roles and responsibilities of the key partners involved in the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership
 - An update on the work undertaken by the CDRP in 2009, including the key achievements of the partnership
 - An update on the work programme and priorities for action for 2010/11
4. Members have also requested additional information be provided on the following areas, community policing in rural areas of the Borough, work underway to tackle the increase in thefts from vehicles and dwelling burglary and further information on the work of CDRP initiatives in the Cotgrave area and elsewhere to tackle anti-social behaviour perpetrated by young people.

Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that the improvements in performance made by the South Nottinghamshire CDRP over the past year are acknowledged and that the

partnership be congratulated for the effective work that has taken place to tackle crime and disorder across South Nottinghamshire.

Financial Comments

In addition to funding provided by Rushcliffe Borough Council to fund three mainstream posts within the Community Safety Team, the CDRP receives funding from Nottinghamshire County Council to fund partnership development, anti-social behaviour and domestic violence work. The CDRP also receives area based grants to fund anti-social behaviour co-ordination. It is not clear what funding will be allocated in 2010/11 due to the current review of financial resources ongoing at the County Council.

Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act

Section 17 is incorporated into all aspects of the work of the CDRP.

Diversity

Equality and diversity is incorporated into all aspects of the work of the CDRP.

Background Papers Available for Inspection: Nil

ROLLING 2 YEAR WORK PROGRAMME

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PARTNERSHIPS AND PERFORMANCE

Summary

1. The work programme for the Partnership Delivery Group is developed around the corporate priorities that fall within its remit and takes into account the timing of the Group's business in the previous municipal year and any emerging issues and key policy developments that may arise throughout the year.

2. The following table sets out the latest version of the Group's rolling 2 year work programme.

Date of Meeting	Item
14 January 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership – Update (including domestic violence)* • Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club – Progress on community benefits • 2 year rolling work programme
31 March 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Review of Scrutiny • Review of Bingham Leisure Centre Sports Hall floor • Update on the implementation of the Local Strategic Partnership improvement plan • 2 year rolling work programme
10 June 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve Work Programme • Local Area Agreement update • 2 year rolling work programme
14 September 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual review of partnership with Spirita Ltd • Review of Children and Young People partnerships and initiatives, e.g. Surestart • 2 year rolling work programme
3 November 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leisure Centre Contract – Annual report by Parkwood Leisure Ltd • 2 year rolling work programme
13 January 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership – Update (including domestic violence) • Nottinghamshire Cricket Club – Progress on community benefits • 2 year rolling work programme

Date of Meeting	Item
24 March 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Review of Scrutiny • Progress report on the Rushcliffe Sustainable Community Strategy action plans • 2 year rolling work programme
June 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve Work Programme • 2 year rolling work programme
September 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual review of partnership with Spirita Ltd • 2 year rolling work programme
November 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leisure Centre Contract – Annual report by Parkwood Leisure Ltd

Financial Comments

No direct financial implications arise from the proposed work programme

Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act

In the delivery of its work programme the Group supports delivery of the Council's Section 17 responsibilities particularly in relation to the performance of the Council.

Diversity

The policy development role of the Group ensures that its proposed work programme supports delivery of Council's Corporate priority 6 'Meeting the Diverse needs of the Community'.

Background Papers Available for Inspection: Nil