

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

Our reference:
Your reference:
Date: 19 September 2011

To all Members of the Community Development Group

Dear Councillor

A meeting of the COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GROUP will be held on Monday 19 September 2011 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 Monday 18 July 2011 (pages 1 - 6)
4. Cabinet Member Questions
5. Review of Service Level Agreements with RCVS and RCAN

The report of the Head of Community Shaping is attached (pages 7 - 10).

6. Preventing Homelessness

The report of the Head of Community Shaping is attached (pages 11 - 19).

7. Nottingham and Notts Waste Core Strategy Preferred Approach Consultation

The report of the Deputy Chief Executive (PR) is attached (pages 20 - 25).

8. Work Programme

The report of the Deputy Chief Executive (PR) is attached (page 26).

Membership

Chairman: Councillor N C Lawrence

Vice-Chairman: Councillor T Combella

Councillors S J Boote, N K Boughton-Smith, L B Cooper, J E Greenwood,
M G Hemsley, Mrs M M Males, G R Mallender

| |
|------------------------------|
| 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
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GROUP
MONDAY 18 JULY 2011**

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

PRESENT:

Councillors N C Lawrence (Chairman), S J Boote, N K Boughton-Smith, T Combellack, L B Cooper, J E Greenwood, Mrs M M Males, G R Mallender and D G Wheeler (Substitute for M G Hemsley)

OFFICERS PRESENT:

| | |
|------------|--------------------------------------|
| A Goodman | Member Support Officer |
| C McGraw | Head of Community Shaping |
| D Mitchell | Head of Partnerships and Performance |
| P Randle | Deputy Chief Executive (PR) |

APOLOGY FOR ABSENCE:

Councillor M G Hemsley

1. Declarations of Interest

Agenda Item 8 – Review of Service Level Agreements – Councillor T Combellack declared a personal interest – Council’s representative on Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire (RCAN)

Agenda Item 8 – Review of Service Level Agreements – Councillor L B Cooper declared a personal interest – Council’s representative on Rushcliffe Community Voluntary Service (RCVS)

2. Notes of the Previous Meeting

The notes of the meeting held on Monday 18 April 2011 were accepted as a true record.

In respect of the review undertaken by the Community and Local Government advisors on the Council’s Homelessness Service, Members were informed that Officers were working to summarise the report and that an action plan would be presented to the Group at the next meeting in September.

Action The Head of Community Shaping to provide a report and action plan on the Council’s Homelessness Service to the meeting in September

Nature Conservation - Councillor S J Boote informed the Group that the land adjacent to a disused railway line, designated as a SINIC, was owned by the Heritage Centre.

3. **Cabinet Member Questions**

There were none received.

4. **Role and Remit**

The Deputy Chief Executive (PR) gave a presentation outlining the role of scrutiny and in particular the remit of the Community Development Group. He explained that scrutiny was the method for the 'non executive' Members to influence policy development and service delivery. It was also an opportunity to examine the Council's Cabinet decisions and look at issues that affected the wellbeing of the Borough and the Community.

The Community Development Group was a forward looking scrutiny group that helped develop the Council's policies. A key element of the Group's role was understanding the issues that were important to residents and ensuring policies were developed to empower and not constrain.

In order to maintain influence and accountability, each of the four scrutiny groups had its own work programme. In determining this programme the Group needed to consider how to best to inform and influence policies in line with the Council's Corporate Priorities. Only items that were consistent with the Group's remit and terms of reference could be included in the programme. Any actions arising from meetings would be recorded in the minutes and reported to the next meeting.

In response to a question, the Chairman informed the Group that where there was uncertainty surrounding which scrutiny group should consider a specific partnership, this would be resolved at the meeting of the Scrutiny Chairmen and Vice Chairman.

5. **Leisure Facilities Strategy Member Panel Update**

The Head of Partnerships and Performance informed Members that at its meeting in July 2009, Cabinet requested that the Community Development Scrutiny Group set up a Member Panel to undertake a review of the Leisure Facilities Strategy. The Member Panel had completed its investigatory work and now the challenge was to translate its findings into a strategic policy that would guide the development of leisure facilities in the future. Since the development of this strategy would require a series of decisions by Cabinet, it was felt that a Member Group, chaired by the portfolio holder for Community Services, would be the most effective way forward.

It was acknowledged that the Panel had developed a complex understanding of leisure services, therefore to ensure some continuity, it was recommended that it would include many of the same Members.

It was AGREED that;

- a) Cabinet be requested to set up a Cabinet led Member Group to develop and finalise the leisure facilities strategy, and

- b) subject to Cabinet agreeing to set up a Member Group, the Leisure Facilities Strategy Member panel be closed down.

6. **Choice Based Lettings Progress Report**

The Head of Community Shaping presented a progress report on the implementation and the first three months operation of the Choice Based Lettings scheme. The scheme was a partnership between Rushcliffe, Gedling and Broxtowe Borough Councils and 14 Registered Providers of social housing and had gone live on 28 March 2011. The scheme provided benefits for both landlords and applicants by providing greater consistency and improved choice through the use of a commons allocations policy and housing register.

Members were informed that each property was advertised on the Homesearch website and at the end of the cycle, bids would be analysed and properties allocated according to the prioritisation levels within the Allocations Policy. The property would then be offered to the applicant in the highest band, who has been registered the longest. It was noted that after three months 13,006 individual bids had been received from 1,878 different applicants. Officers had proactively contacted applicants who had not yet made a bid to establish if there were any barriers and to assist them to engage with the process.

With regard to the method of bidding Members were informed that 12,392 (95%) of bids were placed via the website in comparison to 394 text messages, 85 via the phone or 135 using the autobid facility. Vulnerable customers, which included the homeless, could use the autobid facility or appoint a proxy to bid on their behalf.

Members questioned the viability of the newsletter distributed to various locations across the three Boroughs and were informed that it would be reviewed after a year.

In response to a question Members were informed that residents were given priority within their own Borough, however there were special arrangements for cases involving domestic violence or threats of violence.

The Head of Community Shaping stated that positive feedback regarding the scheme had been received from focus groups, partner organisations and via the website.

Regarding the number of applicants on the waiting list Members were pleased to note that the figures could be accurately measured from the number of registrations, removing the uncertainty of the "double counting" on the old waiting list. The Head of Community Shaping explained that when transferring to the new scheme some people who were included in the old waiting list had not reapplied, as they no longer required housing.

In respect of members of the Armed Forces Members were informed that they could potentially be included in Band 1 depending on their personal circumstances and could apply under the local connection category.

Members were concerned that it appeared that 65% of applicants in Band 1 had not accessed the scheme. The Head of Community Shaping informed the Group that this was an area for future consideration and officers had been investigating this issue. However, it was felt that there could be a number of reasons for this including the potential location of the housing availability, as most applicants wanted to be in the urban rather than rural areas.

It was AGREED that an annual report should be presented in March 2012.

Action The Head of Community Shaping to present the Choice Based Lettings Annual Report to the Group in March 2012

7. Review of Service Level Agreements

The Head of Community Shaping reported that as part of the Four Year Plan, the Council was undertaking a review of its Service Level Agreement's (SLAs) to ensure that they supported the Council's Corporate Priorities and met the needs of the community. As part of this review, Members' views were being sought on how the Council achieved service delivery through working with the voluntary sector. Currently the Council provided £131,042 of funding to Rushcliffe Community Voluntary Service (RCVS) and £126,317 to Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire (RCAN), to deliver services on the Council's behalf. These funding arrangements were agreed for a period of three years from 2008-2011 and the details were set out in Service Level Agreement's (SLAs) between both organisations.

The Group was informed that the RCVS worked with community and voluntary groups within Rushcliffe and that the SLA included:

- Promoting and facilitating volunteering across Rushcliffe
- Identifying funding streams and assisting groups in accessing them
- Assisting the Council in delivering the diversity and inclusion agenda, such as the Community Cohesion Network
- Promoting and managing the Voluntary Transport Scheme
- Assisting with the delivery of the Rushcliffe Community Strategy
- Communication with community organisations.

RCAN worked with rural communities and groups to provide a range of services including a dedicated rural officer in Rushcliffe. The SLA included:

- Providing advice and assistance to rural groups, including town and parish council's on behalf of the Borough Council in relation to parish planning
- Providing an efficient grant finding scheme
- Providing input and assistance with the Local Strategic Partnership

The Head of Community Shaping explained that as part of the Big Society the Government were looking to the voluntary sector to provide services in their communities. As part of the Localism Bill communities would be given new powers to deliver local services, however at present many do not have the infrastructure to carry out these roles. RCVS ensure that these groups are fit for purpose by giving legal advice, assisting with administration, supporting

development and the delivery of services. Additionally RCAN assist in empowering groups by providing advice and assistance which will be enhanced following the adoption of the Localism Bill. She stated that, in future, both partners would need to work closely together to avoid potential duplication.

The Group considered the report in detail and felt that more information regarding the work of RCVS was required to make a more informed decision. Members requested statistics for the ratio of paid officers to volunteers, the number of projects undertaken and whether these were provided only in West Bridgford or throughout the Borough.

Action: The Head of Community Shaping to provide further information regarding the activities of RCVS and the ratio of paid officers to volunteers.

The Group felt that RCAN, through the provision of a Rural Officer, provided a valuable resource to the rural community. It had enabled parishes to access a wide knowledge base and to develop parish plans. Working with residents the Rural Officer has provided access to 'Grantfinder' which has helped benefit rural communities by generating approximately £1,000,000 over the last three years.

It was AGREED that a further report be submitted to the Group in September 2011 to allow Members to provide comments to Cabinet.

Action The Head of Community Shaping to provide a further report to the Group in September 2011

8. Work Programme

The Group considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive (PR) that set out details of the proposed work programme for the municipal year 2011/12.

Members were informed that the Group's work programme was developed around the Council's Corporate Priorities that fell within its remit and the priorities identified in the four year plan for budget savings. The programme also took into account the timing of the Group's business in previous municipal years, key policy developments and any emerging issues that arose throughout the year.

The Chairman invited Members to put forward items that they wished the Group to consider. He explained that any suggestions would be subjected to the scrutiny matrix at the Chairmen and Vice Chairmen's meeting and if deemed suitable, would be added to the work programme. The following topics were put forward; broadband coverage in rural areas, six month review of the Garden Waste Scheme, provision of public toilets and grass cutting.

As agreed by Members earlier in the meeting, Homelessness Service and Review of Service Level Agreements were added to programme for September 2011 and Choice Bases Lettings Annual Report to March 2012.

The Group AGREED the Work Programme as set out below;

| Date of Meeting | Item |
|-------------------|---|
| 18 July 2011 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role and Remit of the Community Development Group • Leisure Facilities Strategy Member Panel Update • Choice Based Lettings Progress Report • Review of Service Level Agreements • Work Programme |
| 19 September 2011 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homelessness Service • Review of Service Level Agreements • Work Programme |
| 21 November 2011 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable Rents • Work Programme |
| 16 January 2012 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work Programme |
| 26 March 2012 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Choice Bases Lettings Annual report • Work Programme |

The meeting closed at 8.55 pm.

Action Sheet

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GROUP - MONDAY 18 JULY 2011

| Minute Number | Actions | Officer Responsible |
|---|---|---------------------------|
| 2 Notes of the Previous Meeting | Provide a report and action plan on the Council's Homelessness Service to the meeting in September 2011 | Head of Community Shaping |
| 6 Choice Based Lettings Progress Report | Provide an Annual Report for the meeting in March 2012 | Head of Community Shaping |
| 7 Review of Service Level Agreements | a) Provide further information regarding the activities of RCVS and the ratio of paid officers to volunteers. | Head of Community Shaping |
| | b) Provide a further report to the Group in September 2011 | Head of Community Shaping |



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GROUP

19 SEPTEMBER 2011

REVIEW OF SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENTS WITH RCVS AND RCAN

5

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF COMMUNITY SHAPING

Summary

In July 2011 the Community Development Group considered a report on the work of Rushcliffe Community Voluntary Service (RCVS) and Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire (RCAN.) The Council has had Service Level Agreements (SLAs) in place with both organisations from 2008-2011 to deliver services on its behalf. As part of the Four Year Plan a review of the SLAs is underway. Members were asked at the July meeting to provide their comments on the services that the two organisations provided. Members requested further information on RCVS. This report sets out the information requested and seeks further views as to how both organisations could assist the Council in delivering its future priorities.

Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Members provide direction to assist in the development of future working arrangements with RCVS and RCAN.

Background

1. In 2008 Rushcliffe Borough Council entered into a service level agreement 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. Both SLA's 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 to review 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 ideal opportunity for reviewing future partnership working.
3. On 18 July 2011 Members of the Community Development Group received a report on the review of the SLA's. Members were asked to comment on the services that RCVS and RCAN provide to meet the needs of residents. At the meeting Members requested additional information on the activities and staffing levels of RCVS.

RCVS

4. RCVS is a voluntary organisation with charitable status. The organisation works to promote and develop voluntary and community action across Rushcliffe. RCVS activities include training, advice and practical help to voluntary groups, giving information about local voluntary activity and issues affecting voluntary groups,

helping local groups to put forward their views on local and national decisions and helping to build partnerships between sectors, agencies and groups.

5. RCVS has 10 full time equivalent members of paid staff, including 4 delivering core services and a further 6 delivering projects. The six project officers are all funded specifically to undertake project work, this has resulted in RCVS making redundancies in the past 12 months as projects have ceased. There are also 82 unpaid workers, including 56 volunteer drivers as part of the Voluntary Transport Scheme.
6. Managed by RCVS, Rushcliffe Voluntary Centre matches volunteers with appropriate volunteering opportunities in the local community. RCVS work closely with local organisations who utilise volunteers assisting with the training and development of volunteers. In 2010/11 RCVS had 1,241 volunteers wanting to work in the Rushcliffe area, this figure has doubled since 2006/07.
7. In 2010/11, RCVS supported and developed 61 voluntary groups, attracting funding into the Borough of £571,490 to benefit Rushcliffe residents. In total RCVS has 178 voluntary groups registered, of which only a third are based in the West Bridgford area. Many of these groups are formed following a need identified within the Parish Plan. RCAN have a clear role in setting up and facilitating the development of plans, whilst RCVS become involved once the need has been established to assist in setting up community and voluntary groups. A few examples of the projects RCVS have been involved with are:
 - the East Leake Befriending Scheme- RCVS were involved in the setting up of this group, giving advice on necessary structures, facilitating steering group meetings with different sectors of the community, supporting development of publicity, funding advice, referral processes, recruiting and supporting volunteers. The project was launched in 2008 and has involved 23 volunteers. As a result of RCVS involvement the project became a success launching the East Leake Transport Scheme
 - the Hickling Good Neighbour Scheme- the need for this group emerged from the Parish Plan. RCVS assisted in drafting the terms of reference and advice was given regarding vulnerable adults and the need for CRB checks. RCVS developed an action plan to direct the resources of 15 volunteers.
 - the Cropwell Bishop Youth Group- RCVS were asked by Cropwell Bishop Parish Council to undertake a consultation with young people in the village to determine their needs in order that they could develop youth facilities in the area. RCVS assisted the parish council in developing a steering group, supported them in developing a constitution and provided advice on funding. The group now meets on a weekly basis and has over 70 members
 - the Aslockton Over 60's Group. RCVS worked with the committee in 2008 to help them to set up more formal structures. This included drafting a constitution for the group, governance and funding
 - Willowbrook Pre School in West Bridgford. RCVS worked with Willowbrook Pre School in St Paul's church to help them develop a formal structure and obtain Community Interest Company status, this helped provide the organisation with the structure and security it needed to continue to provide a valuable service in the community.

8. In addition to the work RCVS do to support and develop voluntary and community groups they also provide a range of services directly to the community , these include:
- Activity Friends- to encourage the over 50's to be more active
 - Community Outreach Advisor Service- service for the over 50's to assist them in staying safe and independent in their own homes
 - First Contact Signposting Scheme – working with the over 60's on practical issues, such as smoke alarms, arranging home repairs, keeping your home warm, etc
 - Health Development Work – working with Principia to facilitate their patient involvement work
 - Rushcliffe Voluntary Transport Scheme- this is a County Council funded scheme.
9. RCVS also co-ordinate the Rushcliffe Community Cohesion Network (RCCN) this assists the Borough Council in delivering its equality and diversity agenda. The RCCN is a network of 90 people and 67 organisations representing the diverse communities in Rushcliffe, they are connected through regular e-bulletins and an annual event.
10. Additional information regarding the work undertaken by the RCVS has been requested and if available, will be reported at the meeting.
11. RCVS are now located within Bridgford House, the Borough Council provides this accommodation as part of the SLA.

RCAN

12. RCAN works with rural communities and groups to provide a range of services including:
- Community planning, such as parish plans and 'planning for real'
 - Working with groups to bring about real changes, such as new village halls, new affordable housing etc
 - Advice on accessing funding to enable parish plans to be bought to life, eg for new play facilities
 - Enabling rural communities to access advice on a wide range of issues,
 - Undertaking research and providing information and advice on all aspects of rural living.
13. At the last meeting Members received detailed information on the work of RCAN and the outcomes generated for residents of Rushcliffe, it is not therefore intended to repeat the detail of the previous report. Members supported the work that had taken place and expressed a view that this should continue in the future.

Review Process

14. 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.

15. In the last three months the Council has been working with both organisations to discuss our priorities with them and to look at the potential to discuss a single service level agreement, which RCVS and RCAN will work together to deliver. 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.

RBC Priorities

16. The Council's priorities for a joint service level agreement with RCVS and RCAN could be:
- To deliver at least two parish plans per year
 - To support town and parish council's in developing initiatives and accessing funding advice to bring plans to life
 - To assist the Council in developing Neighbourhood Planning
 - To support the Council in developing the Third Sector as part of the Council's Four Year Plan
 - To provide assistance to market town initiatives
 - To deliver infrastructure services to voluntary and community groups and individuals
 - To recruit and place volunteers in the Rushcliffe Community Volunteer Centre
 - To facilitate the Rushcliffe Community Cohesion Network on behalf of the Council, ensuring that the Council complies with the new Equality Act.

Next steps

17. The next steps are for officers to continue to work with RCAN and RCVS to develop a SLA setting out clear targets for performance. Following on from this a report will go to Cabinet seeking approval for this.

Financial Comments

From 2008-2011 the combined cost of the service level agreements with RCVS and RCAN was £87,490 per year. The Four Year Plan envisages a 10% reduction should be achieved as part of the review.

Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act

There are no direct implications for Section 17 within this report

Diversity

RCVS and RCAN are both committed to the equality and diversity agenda and incorporate it in all aspects of their work.

Background Papers Available for Inspection: Nil

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF COMMUNITY SHAPING

Summary

This report provides Members of the Community Development Group with an update on the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) Healthcheck assessment undertaken in December 2010. The report also provides an updated action plan of the issues and recommendations made by the DCLG and the work undertaken to address these.

Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Members consider the report and action plan on the DCLG Healthcheck assessment and make any additional recommendations for its further development.

Background

1. Rushcliffe has a statutory duty to households considered to be homeless. A substantially revised Homelessness Strategy 2008-13 was adopted in November 2008. The strategy sets a framework for continued improvements of the Housing Options and Homelessness Services with an over-arching emphasis on the prevention of homelessness.

DCLG Healthcheck Assessment

2. The DCLG were invited by the Council to undertake an informal assessment of the Council's Homelessness and Housing Options Services on 6-8 December 2010.
3. The purpose of the Healthcheck is to ensure that the best outcomes can be achieved within current resources. It aims to identify any gaps in service delivery, highlight poor service provision, recognise good practice and make recommendations for service improvement.
4. The assessment was carried out over two days from 6 – 8 December 2010. During this time interviews were undertaken with internal colleagues and a range of external partners including Spirita, Friary, Surestart, Youth Offending Team, Citizen's Advice. Visits were undertaken to Elizabeth House and the Council's temporary accommodation at Hound Lodge. Interviews were observed at Customer Services and Housing Options preventions. One to one interviews took place with frontline staff, team leaders and managers. Case files and statistical data were also reviewed.

Issues Affecting Rushcliffe Borough Council

5. Prior to the Healthcheck we had highlighted the following areas as potential issues:
 - High staff turnover during 2010.
 - Introduction of sub-regional Choice Based Lettings (CBL) Scheme by the end of March 2011.
 - Reductions to the Supporting People Programme. A reduction in the programme has significant potential to impact on local homelessness services
 - 16 & 17 Year homelessness applicants and implementation of a County wide protocol between the County Council and district councils.
 - Move to the Customer Contact Centre and review of services to enable front facing advice and homelessness services to be available at the Contact Centre.
 - Affordable Housing development and the Government's announcements that the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) will no longer fund new social rented housing alongside the slowdown in the housing market has restricted the number of affordable homes provided.

Issues arising out of the Assessment

6. The findings of the assessment and actions undertaken are set out in detail in the Action Plan (**Appendix 1**). In summary the main findings relate to:
 - The CLG noted that the Council had made excellent progress in reducing the numbers in temporary accommodation. Officers were polite and courteous and there was a willingness to improve the service using available resources.
 - The need to have a clear plan of action for the service to adapt to changes proposed as part of the welfare reform, Localism Bill and Big Society. This may require a review of the homelessness strategy and consideration as to what role our service users will have to play in this.
 - Considering outsourcing the Council's temporary accommodation to another service provider.
 - Continuing to develop the role of the private sector, particularly in light of the proposed changes in the Localism Bill.
 - Maximising the use of existing staff resources by reviewing the current team structure and ensuring staff are fully trained and up to date in all aspects of legislation and new prevention tools.
 - Considering the potential for further assistance from other areas within the Council, such as the Community Contact Centre.
7. In light of the proposed recommendations officers have proposed whether these should be accepted or declined, what the potential impact of not accepting the proposals may be, timescales and what further action is

required. In addition to this review, as part of the Four Year Plan, the Housing Option Service will also be subject to detailed scrutiny in 2012/13.

Conclusion

8. There is a real risk that the economic pressures we will inevitably face in 2011/12 and 2012/13 could lead to an increase in homelessness and the need for more temporary accommodation.
9. Homelessness prevention is a core element in tackling homelessness and making better use of limited public resources and ensuring value for money. The actions contained within the Action Plan will enable the Council to provide a range of housing options to assist households in securing good quality housing in a timely and planned approach.

Financial Comments

Actions planned for the current year will be funded from existing budgets. Actions planned for future years are subject to appropriate internal and external funding streams being identified.

Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act

The Homelessness Strategy aims to develop a more strategic approach to delivering against our Section 17 obligations and help in the reduction of crime and anti-social behaviour.

Diversity

An Equality Impact Assessment was undertaken in 2009. The needs of various community groups who experience homelessness/ are at risk of homelessness have been taken into consideration in the formulation of this strategy.

Background Papers Available for Inspection: Nil

DCLG Healthcheck Assessment Action Plan

| | Recommendation | Accept | Reasons for non-acceptance and Impact | Timescales | Action to be Taken |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------|--|
| 1 | A clear plan of the future service and what the changes are aiming to achieve. Include staff in determining the vision within the parameters set. | Accept –actions already implemented | | Ongoing | <p>Actions already implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Team/Service plan regularly reviewed at Strategic Housing team meetings. ii) Two service/team planning events undertaken twice a year iii) PDR¹ and monthly 1-2-1 support sessions are structured to achieve objectives in homelessness and housing strategies |
| 2 | Review Homeless Strategy in light of welfare reform changes, Localism and Big Society. Encourage partners to join up in a Big Society Localism way. | Accept - actions already underway | | Ongoing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) On-going monitoring and review of homelessness strategy to ensure actions reflect changes at national and local level and ensure joint outcomes are achieved |
| 3 | Create a South Notts Homeless Forum to give partners a voice to encourage them to be an active partner in reviewing the Homelessness Strategy (Big Society). | Accept – actions underway | | Ongoing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Discussions underway with Gedling B Borough Council to join Broxtowe and Rushcliffe Borough Councils Homelessness Forum to develop sub-regional homelessness forum to progress joint actions and outcomes |

¹ PDR = Personal Development Review

| | Recommendation | Accept | Reasons for non-acceptance and Impact | Timescales | Action to be Taken |
|---|---|---------------------------|--|---|---|
| 4 | Consider out-sourcing management of the Council's temporary accommodation (Hound Lodge and Rushcliffe Lodge) to provide higher level of support to vulnerable tenants | Under consideration | Impact - resources are not used to optimum capacity | Service Review scheduled for 2012 | i) Homelessness & Housing Options Service review as part of the Four Year Plan due to take place 2012. The provision of temporary accommodation will be considered as part of the review |
| 5 | Review of housing options staffing structures. Temporary Accommodation Supervisor post could become a generic post taking on Housing Options Advisor responsibilities thereby increasing capacity across the team | Considered- not accepted | Review undertaken current structure would not lend itself to generic arrangements. Impact – resources are not used to optimum capacity | Interim Review of temporary accommodation supervisor post completed June 2011 | i) Review of post supports 37 hour post (support provision for all residents i.e. form filling, rent chasing, assisting with bidding and grants for furniture, property maintenance, health & safety etc). ii) Current structure and rota arrangements requiring officers to be available at RCCC would not lend itself to a further division in roles |
| 6 | Continue private sector tenant/landlord liaison officer (First Lets) in partnership with partner boroughs and benefit departments to respond to changes in Housing Benefit Homelessness reforms | Considered – not accepted | Council decision not to proceed with First Lets project as part of budget setting. | | i) First Lets incorporated into Choice Based Lettings. |

| | Recommendation | Accept | Reasons for non-acceptance and Impact | Timescales | Action to be Taken |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| 7 | Greater utilisation of Customer Service Team to assist with basic process tasks i.e. form filling | Accept – actions already implemented | | Completed March 2011 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Relocation of frontline services to Customer Contact Centre and greater cross working with Customer Service Team ii) Duty Officer available at RCCC² for emergency appointments and advice. Officers on call for queries from Customer Services staff iii) Regular training provided. to Customer Services staff, options to shadow and CS CBL³ Champion nominated. |
| 8 | Need for ongoing training and development in homelessness legislation, welfare and housing benefits to ensure team has an up to date knowledge | Accept – actions implemented | | i-iv - Ongoing v – December 2012 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Ensure training needs are assessed as part of induction process and technical training undertaken within the first 3-6 months of new officer in post ii) Ensure PDR process identifies training requirements and is reviewed regularly at 1-2-1s iii) Shadowing and ongoing training and development also being undertaken in-house iv) Ensure exit interviews are undertaken v) Review of staffing resources and salary scales to ensure sufficient resilience in the team |

² RCCC = Rushcliffe Community Contact Centre

³ CS CBL = Customer Services Choice Based Lettings

| | Recommendation | Accept | Reasons for non-acceptance and Impact | Timescales | Action to be Taken |
|----|--|---------------------------|---|---|--|
| 9 | Joint commissioning of accommodation with Social Services to provide accommodation for 16/17 year olds | Considered – not accepted | RBC provides suitable accommodation for 16/17 yr olds at Elizabeth Housing Impact – risk if Elizabeth House is full no other suitable alternative accommodation | i) implemented June 2010 – review ongoing | i) Joint protocol for young people leaving care and homeless 16 and 17 year olds implemented. Protocol under review to establish accommodation needs between partner based on statutory obligations |
| 10 | Consider potential to expand toolkit of housing options available to frontline staff to prevent homelessness | Accept | | Ongoing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Rushcliffe Homelessness Strategy 2008-13 demonstrates commitment to develop options ii) Enhanced Housing Options Module commissioned. iii) Ensure full use of CLG Homelessness Prevention Fund to enable full range of prevention options |

| | Recommendation | Accept | Reasons for non-acceptance and Impact | Timescales | Action to be Taken |
|----|---|----------------------|--|--|---|
| 11 | Inability to sustain current performance in reduction of numbers in temporary accommodation in light of welfare reforms | Under consideration | Impact - Increased homelessness and use of temporary accommodation | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Training for staff in new welfare reforms. ii) Partnership working with Revenues and Benefits Team to assess potential impact of reforms. iii) Lottery funding secured Utilise Rushcliffe Advice Network ii) Support provided to Revenues and Benefits to bid for Local Housing Allowance (LHA) transitional fund to assist with implementation of reforms. |
| 12 | Some stakeholders are unaware of the full implications of Benefits reforms | Accept - implemented | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Oct 2011 ii) Completed iii) Feb 2011 iv) Completed | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Benefits section to feed into Universal Credit consultation process. ii) Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire and Rushcliffe Borough Council have secured external funding for 3 members of staff to provide professional support and training to volunteer advice workers in Rushcliffe. iii) All stakeholders contacted to advise of LHA changes. iv) Housing Options Team advisors have undertaken benefit and welfare training. |

| | Recommendation | Accept | Reasons for non-acceptance and Impact | Timescales | Action to be Taken |
|----|---|---------------------------|---|-------------------|--|
| 13 | Changes at Rushcliffe Borough Council going cashless potentially impacts on households ability to make payments for their temporary accommodation | Considered - not accepted | System implemented and customers advised of payment facilities | March 2010 | i) Customers advised of outlets where cash payments can be made. Support provided to vulnerable residents in temporary accommodation both during and after transition period |
| 14 | Partners who attended forum did not appear to have been consulted in Rough Sleeper estimate | Considered - not accepted | Annual homelessness watch exercise includes estimates of rough sleepers in the County and is used to inform rough sleeper estimates. All key partners in the County are consulted and asked to participate in the Homelessness Watch exercise | Ongoing | |



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GROUP

19 SEPTEMBER 2011

**NOTTINGHAM AND NOTTS WASTE CORE
STRATEGY PREFERRED APPROACH
CONSULTATION**

7

REPORT OF THE DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE (PR)

1. Nottingham City Council and Nottinghamshire County Council are developing a joint Waste Core Strategy that will set out the overall vision of how and where all the waste produced will be managed over the next 20 years.
2. Following a consultation exercise in 2010 the two authorities have now produced a 'preferred approach' document. The consultation period for the 'preferred approach' finishes on the 16 September but a holding reply has been sent by the Council pending any comments received at this meeting.
3. It should be noted that at this stage the proposals are very strategic and generally not site specific. Consequently, there is reference to facilities being located in the major urban areas but there are no specific references to Rushcliffe in the document.
4. Attached as an appendix to this report is a summary of the key proposals with officers' comments in relation to any potential impact on the Council or the Rushcliffe area. Members are asked to comment and in particular, to determine whether there is strong agreement or disagreement with any of the proposals.

Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Members endorse the comments made on the consultation paper by officers to help inform the Council's response to the consultation

Financial Comments

The potential financial implications of the strategy are not known at this time.

Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act

There are no direct issues

Diversity

There are no direct issues

Background Papers Available for Inspection: Nil

**Nottingham and Notts Waste Core Strategy
Preferred Approach consultation and officers' response**

Background to the report

1. The first informal consultation on the Waste Core Strategy was carried out at end of 2006. Changes to the national guidance on the preparation of development plans led to a further Issues and Options consultation following improvements to the evidence base in September and December 2010. Responses received from these consultations have now been used to inform the Preferred Approach. The Portfolio holder, Cllr Mason has been consulted on both the previous and current draft of the Waste Core Strategy. The recommendation for this group is therefore to endorse the consultation comments from Rushcliffe Officers on this final preferred option paper.

2. The Waste Core Strategy (WCS) will set out the overall vision of how and where the waste produced is managed, this vision will be supported by a set of objectives which will aim to strike a balance between environmental, social and economic issues. These objectives can be summarised as follows:-
 - **Strengthen our economy** – minimise waste production and maximise re-use, recycling and recovery of waste by making the most of opportunities for businesses, local authorities and communities to work together and use waste as a resource.
 - **Care for our environment** – protect our landscape from harmful development, protect water, soil and air quality across the county, look after our heritage assets and settings.
 - **Community well-being** – ensure local people have the chance to be involved in decisions about new waste management facilities, protect local amenity and quality of life from impacts such as dust, traffic, noise and odour
 - **Energy and climate** – promote waste as a resource to be re-used, minimise energy use and encourage use of combined heat and power
 - **Sustainable Transport** – encourage alternatives to road such as water and rail where practical, locate sites close to sources of waste and/or end-markets to reduce transport distances
 - **Meet our future needs** – aim to be self sufficient, providing enough sites to manage the equivalent of Nottinghamshire's waste over the plan period, meet current and future targets for recycling and recovering waste, move away from landfill
 - **High quality design and operation** – make sure all facilities are designed and operated to the highest standards

3. The WCS aims to ensure the right facilities are in the right places and whilst it will not identify specific sites, it will set out a broad approach which will guide site specific documents in future. A 20 year horizon until 2031 is proposed including detailed proposals for the first ten year period with an outline of longer term aspirations for the remainder.

Officer's Comments

Rushcliffe supports the vision outlined on page 14 of the WCS and in particular welcomes the focus on waste prevention wherever possible, followed by recycling and recovery, and as a last resort, disposal.

The objectives outlined on pages 15/16 are welcomed and there is support for the emphasis placed on local decision making and ensuring our residents have the opportunity to be involved in decisions on any new waste management facilities.

Key Issues

A Estimating future needs

- Amount of waste produced has decreased over the last 3-4 years due to the changes in the economy, however it is not considered sensible to ignore the possibility of future growth when estimating annual waste production. Careful wording will be used in the WCS to allow for additional facilities where there is clear evidence of need that was not foreseen when the Strategy was prepared

B Planning for the future

- Recycling - WCS will include an overall target of recycling **70% of municipal, commercial and industrial waste by 2025**. At current rates this means recycling at least another 300,000 tonnes of waste each year BUT could be as high as 450,000 tonnes if waste levels increase as forecast. It would be the **equivalent of 5 large new recycling, anaerobic digestion or composting plants OR a larger number of smaller sites**.

Officer's Comments

Page 29 Rushcliffe consider that the target of recycling 70% of municipal, commercial and industrial waste by 2025 is ambitious. Whilst recognising that the WCS runs up to 2031, given that Rushcliffe currently recycles or composts nearly 55% of waste collected, contributing significantly to the County Council's overall recycling and composting rate of 42% (2008/09), in the current economic climate the council would be unable to substantially increase its recycling and composting rate without investing costs in additional collection methods.

It is considered that there could be the opportunity to offer the facility for the recycling of additional materials to assist our residents. In particular the council would support the following:

- Increasing the sorting facilities at the Mansfield MRF to allow for the acceptance of other recyclable materials in our blue (dry) recycling bin. These could include glass, all plastic types, tetrapak and textiles.
- Ensuring suitable, local composting facilities are available to allow not only garden waste but also certain food wastes to be placed in our green (compost) recycling bin

3. The County and City Councils are working together to explore the possibility of a shared facility to manage food waste which is currently sent to landfill. The WCS will encourage methods such as anaerobic digestion or in-vessel composting to manage this waste. Although anaerobic digestion is strictly

classed as a form of energy recovery, the resulting material does count towards recycling targets for municipal waste.

Officer's Comments

Page 28 – 4.20 Rushcliffe would support the County and City Councils in their investigation into the possibility of a shared facility locally to manage food waste. Rushcliffe recognises that the strategy focuses in the main on the 600,000 tonnes of municipal waste produced across Nottinghamshire. However, it is important that in respect of commercial and industrial waste greater emphasis should be placed on waste prevention through support for less packing etc.

C. Recovery

Need for **some additional energy recovery** to manage waste that cannot be recycled and otherwise goes to landfill. Currently large energy from waste plants are seen as the most economic option for dealing with non-recyclable mixed waste. A series of smaller sites however would give greater flexibility as their development could be phased according to need. Propose to word policies to **encourage smaller local sites where viable but accept there may be a need for larger more central sites in some cases.**

D. Disposal

Nottinghamshire has 4 non-hazardous landfill sites, their combined capacity is estimated to be around 8 years. There is a need to find additional disposal capacity to meet long term, residual needs. Possible options are limited and the more promising possibilities are likely to be fairly distant from the main sources of waste.

- Virtually no existing or proposed mineral voids that are environmentally suitable
- Options put forward were to overtip/extend three existing landfill sites and to re-engineer an old colliery tip
- Evidence of possible capacity in Lincolnshire/Yorkshire but concept of remote disposal outside the county raises issues of sustainability
- Option of landraise on derelict/greenfield land had some public support as a fallback

E. Where should new development go?

- No individual sites promoted
- Identified broad areas of search backed up by criteria based policies to narrow down possible allocations at the site specific stage.
- Survey of land allocated within district plans for employment and existing employment/industrial areas and brownfield sites carried out
- Call for sites launched to landowners, developers, waste industry and local councils

F. Recycling/energy recovery

Develop larger more central facilities first, supporting these with smaller, more local sites as needed. Major facilities within main urban areas of Nottingham, Mansfield, Sutton in Ashfield, Kirkby in Ashfield and Hucknall. Smaller towns of Newark, Worksop and Retford will play a role but require some smaller/medium sized facilities. Former colliery sites are recognised as being potentially suitable for re development but it is not appropriate to identify

these as strategic sites in every case. They are located because of local geology not because of proximity to waste producing areas.

Officer's Comments

Rushcliffe would endorse efforts to encourage recycling of commercial waste and would support any action to ensure that the recycling (rather than landfill or incineration) of commercial waste can be made financially viable.

Rushcliffe notes that in general the document refers to any potential areas for development of new sites being focussed mainly in the North of the County. The Council would want to see the provision of suitable local transfer stations to ensure the best practical environmental option is taken into account when disposing of the waste from Rushcliffe. The Council would support the additional of a third household waste and recycling centre within the Borough around the Cotgrave area to enable residents to dispose of their waste without having to travel to either West Bridgford or Langar.

As mentioned in our response to the earlier 'issues and options' consultation of the WCS we would strongly encourage and support the County Council in considering expanding capacity at the Stragglethorpe composting site to ensure the benefits of collecting Green Waste in Rushcliffe are not outweighed by the costs and environmental impact of travelling to Oxtun.

G. Combined Sites

Potential for either a **single large site or several smaller sites**, there are a number of sites within the county that could perform this role – key considerations are the areas they would serve and proximity to main sources of waste.

H. Disposal

It is proposed that a sequence of search is adopted:

- 1) Look at **over tipping at the four existing active sites**, could include limited extension
- 2) **Develop new capacity at other types of site that will result in long term environmental benefits** i.e. reclamation of derelict or poorly reclaimed colliery tips where landfill provides the only viable reclamation option
- 3) Allow land raising on green field sites **where this can be shown to be more sustainable than relying on waste being landfilled at sites outside the county**

I. Criteria based policies

These provide guidance on the type of location likely to be suitable for waste development, the following are suggested:

- Community Sites: could be suitable for small scale recycling/bring sites
- Employment Land: suitable for a wide range of larger recycling activities, and waste transfer
- Derelict land/other brownfield sites: potentially suitable for large resource recovery, recycling, energy transfer and recovery uses. Where sites are in need of restoration there may also be potential for waste disposal

- Open Countryside/agricultural land: opportunities for smaller scale, possibly community based facilities. Larger open air composting schemes might also be acceptable where they fit in with the character of the area
- Green Belt: only small scale composting and transfer facilities might be appropriate.

J. Safeguarding sites

Propose to include a general policy to **safeguard existing waste sites from other sensitive uses in order to make the best use of existing waste management infrastructure**

K. Extensions to existing sites

Propose to include a policy which **encourages the extension of existing sites subject to proposals being environmentally acceptable**. This would not remove the need to apply for planning permission and for the proposal to be assessed in the same detail as a new site.

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GROUP****19 SEPTEMBER 2011****WORK PROGRAMME****8****REPORT OF THE DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE (PR)**

The work programme for the Community Development 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. It is anticipated that the work programme for the new year will be developed in line with the priorities identified in the 4 year plan for budget savings.

Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that the Group notes the report.

| Date of Meeting | Item |
|------------------------|---|
| 19 Sept 2011 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review of Service Level Agreements with RCVS and RCAN• Nottingham and Notts Waste Core Strategy Preferred Approach Consultation• Preventing Homelessness• Work Programme |
| 21 November 2011 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Affordable Rents• Work Programme |
| 16 January 2012 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• |
| 26 March 2012 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• |

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.

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