

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

**Our reference:**  
**Your reference:**  
**Date:** 28 March 2013

To all Members of the Community Development Group

Dear Councillor

A meeting of the COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GROUP will be held on Tuesday 9 April 2013 at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Pavilion Road, West Bridgford to consider the following items of business.

Yours sincerely

Executive Manager Operations and Corporate Governance

### ***AGENDA***

1. Apologies for absence
2. Declarations of Interest
3. Notes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 5 February 2013 (pages 1 - 9)
4. Economic Assessment

The report of the Executive Manager - Transformation is attached (pages 10 - 14). Officers will make a Presentation.

5. Feedback & Update Regarding the Borough Council's Relationship with the Parishes

Officers will make a Presentation.

6. Work Programme

The report of the Executive Manager - Neighbourhoods is attached (pages 15 - 16).

### **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 and G R Mallender

## Meeting Room Guidance

**Fire Alarm Evacuation:** in the event of an alarm sounding please 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** are located opposite Committee Room 2.

**Mobile Phones:** For the benefit of others 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**  
**TUESDAY 5 FEBRUARY 2013**

Held at 7.00 pm 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

**OFFICERS PRESENT:**

D Banks	Executive Manager - Neighbourhoods
D Mitchell	Executive Manager - Communities
V Nightingale	Senior Member Support Officer
P Randle	Deputy Chief Executive (PR)

**APOLOGY FOR ABSENCE:**

Councillor M G Hemsley

**15. Declarations of Interest**

There were none declared.

**16. Notes of the Previous Meeting**

The notes of the meeting held on Thursday 6 December 2012 were accepted as a true record following a minor amendment to paragraph 9 of Note 13- Draft Allocations Policy. It was requested that the words "which was" should be replaced with "as".

Councillor Boote asked for further clarification on the impact of the changes to Housing Benefit, as this was to be reduced for under occupancy. He stated that this was being described as a bedroom tax. He had concerns that as there were not enough one or two bedroomed properties people could be penalised for living in a three bedroomed property. Officers agreed to investigate this further and to provide Members with an update, including whether existing tenants were protected.

Councillor Combellack explained that she had recently attended a meeting with Metropolitan Housing Trust regarding this subject. She felt that the tone of the discussion had been quite alarming.

With regards to the actions from the previous meeting Members were informed that the Executive Manager Operations and Corporate Governance had evaluated the concerns of the Group in respect of the Community Right to Challenge prior to the matter being considered by Cabinet. However, legislation did set out specific requirements in terms of bodies that could challenge and these had been reflected in the policy, which had been based on all relevant Government guidance. Cabinet had decided that the Community Development Group should review the procedure after a year and

this would give Members an opportunity to recommend any necessary changes.

In respect of the Draft Allocations Policy a briefing session had been organised as part of the Member Development Programme in March 2013 and this would include information on the Choice Based Lettings Scheme.

The Group were informed that the questionnaire for the Town and Parish Councils was included on tonight's agenda.

## **17. Relationship with Town and Parish Councils**

As part of the Group's remit it was responsible for scrutinising the Council's relationship the town and parish councils/meetings. Following a request by the Group the topic had been included within this year's work programme and the Executive Manager - Communities had produced a report which highlighted some of the many ways in which the councils had worked together. Members were also presented with a draft questionnaire that would be circulated to all town and parish councils/meetings following the Group's approval.

The Executive Manager - Communities gave a presentation which outlined the Partnership with the Parishes agreement that had been introduced in 2005 and reviewed in January 2011. He explained that the document gave a detailed approach of what was available, ie training, information, communication, etc. It was noted that there was a varying level of support given as not all parishes contacted the Borough. He explained that one full time post was shared with Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire and that the officer worked closely with the parishes. He asked Members to consider any potential gaps in the partnership with the parishes and what questions should be included in the questionnaire. He anticipated raising this issue at the parish forum on 7 February.

The Group noted that many of the activities undertaken were statutory, ie street naming. It was felt that the Group would need to understand what the parishes would like out of the relationship and also how it could benefit both the Borough and the parishes.

Members stated that Nottinghamshire County Council also worked with the parishes and that there could be an opportunity for collaboration with the County Council. Several Members mentioned the lengthsman scheme which had been introduced by the County Council, although some felt that it was asking the parishes to carry out duties, such as roadside hedge trimming, that should be carried out by the County Council.

Following a question the Executive Manager - Communities explained that the Council did not have a dedicated officer for the parishes. This had been considered previously but it had been agreed that this was not viable. There were various officers who had a very good working relationship with the parishes within service areas. Members felt that many of the parishes found it difficult to ascertain who they needed to contact. Officers pointed out that the Call Centre was an excellent first point of contact. Members were also

informed that, following the restructure, a letter would be sent to the parishes in the near future that would outline contact details for the Executive Managers. Members stated that when they were first elected onto the Council they were given a management structure, it was felt that this might be beneficial for the parishes.

Members pointed out that previously, senior officers would attend parish meetings and the parish forums and conference. This had been welcomed by the parishes as it allowed them to speak to officers on areas of concern. Officers agreed that this was still possible, however there had not been any recent invitations to parish meetings. The Group agreed that the parish forums and annual conference were the main opportunities for the Borough and parishes to meet together and learn from others.

With regard to assistance Councillor Cooper asked if the Borough Council offered advice and support on constitutional issues. The Chairman stated that there was a best practice constitution that could be adapted and adopted. Members noted that the Borough offered advice on human resource issues, however, they felt that most parishes would contact the National Association of Local Councils. In respect of complaints it was noted that the Borough could be contacted if it was felt that a parish councillor had breached the Code of Conduct, however this did not apply to parish employees. Members felt that each parish should have their own procedure for this type of complaint. Members noted that the Borough Council was required to publish the registers of interest for all parish councillors. Following a question officers agreed to ascertain how many parish councillors there were in the Borough as it was felt that this could be an onerous task.

In relation to community safety Members queried the information given for the Trent Bridge Ward as this review would not be considering issues relating to West Bridgford, which was unparished.

Whilst considering the document Members felt that many of the parishes would not be aware of all the help and assistance that the Borough Council offered, including grant applications. It was felt that the Partnership with the Parishes document was very detailed but quite tedious. They also felt that putting everything on the Council's website was good but required too much examination to learn about everything that was on offer. Members asked for officers to consider a two page 'marketing' document which would give parishes the gist of the information and then if they wanted to learn more the information was available via the other communication methods. The Deputy Chief Executive (PR) said that there could be one area on the Council's website just for parishes. This could be considered if the parishes felt that this would be useful. However, communication was an area that would need to be investigated. Members felt that this topic should be included in the questionnaire. It was also felt that the questionnaire should be sent to Borough Councillors of parished areas who were often aware of the issues.

In respect of communication Members asked whether there could be a short weekly/monthly communication prepared that would just give an outline of what's happened. The Executive Manager - Communities explained that the Borough used to send out an electronic parish news. When this had ceased

there had been no complaints received. Councillor Cooper stated that the County Council often included local parish news in its quarterly newspaper.

With regard to parish meetings Members realised that the 'clerk' was often an unpaid volunteer and therefore the paperwork emanating from the Borough Council could appear daunting. It was suggested that they could liaise with the bigger parishes and receive help. However, although this had worked in one instance it was pointed out that most parish councils and meetings were fiercely independent and often did not wish to seek assistance. Councillor Lawrence stated that if there was a problem the parishes in his ward came to him as they felt it was part of his role to act as a conduit.

In response to a question the Executive Manager - Neighbourhoods explained that the Borough Council had maps detailing areas of grass and who was responsible for cutting them. He said that these were provided upon request.

Members felt that there was a large amount of work undertaken by Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire on behalf of the Borough that was often unappreciated by people. The Executive Manager - Communities stated that this was one reason why the Borough Council part funded a post. He said that the officer concerned signposted parishes to the correct officer

The Group was concerned that there was no evidence if the partnership was working well or not. They felt that it could be beneficial to learn from other local authorities. Officers said that following the analysis of the questionnaire and the identification of the issues then they could investigate best practice, although there could not be any exact comparisons as every area was different.

Members recognised that the Borough Council needed to find out what suited each parish as you would not achieve equality by treating them all the same.

With regard to the questionnaire Members asked that

- Questions 1 and 3 should be split so that answers could be given for both officers and members
- Delete if anything from Question 1
- Include questions on
  - how the parishes wanted to communicate with the Borough Council and on what issues
  - What were the main reasons the parishes contacted the Borough Council

The Group agreed that the questionnaire, when amended, should be sent to all town and parish councils and meetings in order that a further discussion could take place at their meeting on 9 April 2013.

## 18. **Work Programme 2013/14**

The Group discussed its work programme. It was felt that the Group should review the topics it had considered over the last eight meetings. Economic Development would be considered in October and this work should include

work undertaken by Nottinghamshire County Council. Members were reminded the meeting on 2 July 2013 was a joint meeting with the Partnership Delivery Group as the scrutiny of Rushcliffe Community Voluntary Service and Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire would be undertaken by that Group in future. It was also felt that the work programme should be extended to cover at least the next fifteen months.

The meeting closed at 8.50 pm.

## Action Sheet COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GROUP - TUESDAY 5 FEBRUARY 2013

Minute Number	Actions	Officer Responsible
16. Notes of the Previous Meeting	Officers agreed to investigate whether the new housing benefit system would be detrimental to tenants who have a 3 bedroomed house but only need 2, including whether existing tenants were protected.	Executive Manager - Neighbourhoods
17. Relationship with Town and Parish Councils	a) Officers to liaise with Nottinghamshire County Council and seek opportunities to collaborate  b) Officers to ascertain how many parish councillors there were in the Borough  c) Officers to investigate whether parish councils have to have a procedure for complaints against staff  d) Send agreed questionnaire to parishes for comment	Executive Manager - Communities  Member Services  Executive Manager - Neighbourhoods  Executive Manager - Communities
18. Work Programme 2013/14	Officers to provide a list of topics covered by the Group at previous meetings	Member Services

Minute Number	Actions	Officer Responsible	Response
16. Notes of the Previous Meeting	Officers agreed to investigate whether the new housing benefit system would be detrimental to tenants who have a 3 bedroomed house but only need 2, including whether existing tenants were protected.	Executive Manager - Neighbourhoods	<p>From April 2013, households in social housing with one spare bedroom will have 14% of the rent deducted from their Housing Benefit (508 households affected), and those with two spare bedrooms will have 25% deducted (91 households affected). This does not apply to anyone over the state pension credit age of 61.</p> <p>Existing tenants are not protected.</p> <p>Tenants who are under-occupying social housing properties are awarded the highest priority band on Homesearch (Choice Based Lettings Scheme) to bid for smaller properties as they become vacant. This alongside other interventions will minimise the incidence of homelessness.</p> <p>There are significantly more three bedroom than two bedroom properties in the borough. As part of the S106 negotiations any new sites delivering affordable housing provide for a mix of properties, including increased proportions of two bedroom properties to reflect the changes arising out of the Localism Act.</p> <p>These changes have been brought in to more closely align the social rented sector with the private rented sector.</p>



Minute Number	Actions	Officer Responsible	Response
17. Relationship with Town and Parish Councils	<p>a) Officers to liaise with Nottinghamshire County Council and seek opportunities to collaborate</p> <p>b) Officers to ascertain how many parish councillors there were in the Borough</p> <p>c) Officers to investigate whether parish councils have to have a procedure for complaints against staff</p> <p>d) Send agreed questionnaire to parishes for comment</p>	<p>Executive Manager - Communities</p> <p>Member Services</p> <p>Executive Manager - Neighbourhoods</p> <p>Executive Manager - Communities</p>	<p>This will be ongoing.</p> <p>If every parish vacancy was filled there would be 339. There are 2 Town Councils, 36 Parish Councils and 17 Parish Meetings</p> <p>Whether a parish council has a complaints procedure regarding the council or its staff is a matter for each parish council to decide. It should also be noted that there is no Ombudsman jurisdiction in respect of parish councils and, contrary to popular belief, the Borough Council does not have any jurisdiction either – except in relation to complaints about alleged breaches of the council’s code of conduct for members.</p> <p>This has been sent out for parishes to complete</p>
18. Work Programme 2013/14	Officers to provide a list of topics covered by the Group at previous meetings	Member Services	See attached sheet

## Community Development Group – List of topics covered at previous meetings

Meeting date	Report title	Report author
05/02/2013	Relationship with Town and Parish Councils	Executive Manager Communities -
06/12/2012	Draft Allocations Policy	Strategic Housing Manager
30/10/2012	Assets of Community Value -Draft Procedure	Head of Corporate Services
30/10/2012	Community Right to Challenge	Head of Corporate Services
17/07/2012	Choice Based Lettings Progress Report 2012	Strategic Housing Manager
17/07/2012	Planning Application -Public Notification Process	Development Control Manager
26/03/2012	Draft Tenancy Strategy and Affordable Rents	Head of Community Shaping
26/03/2012	Service Level Agreement with RCVS and RCAN	Head of Community Shaping
26/03/2012	Annual Review of Work Programme 2011/12	Deputy Chief Executive (PR)
16/01/2012	Request for Scrutiny of Planning Application Notification Process	Deputy Chief Executive (PR)
16/01/2012	Rural Broadband	Head of Partnerships and Performance
16/01/2012	Localism Act 2011	Head of Community Shaping
21/11/2011	Request for Scrutiny of Public Conveniences	Deputy Chief Executive (PR)
21/11/2011	Introduction to Flexible Tenancies and Affordable Rents	Head of Community Shaping
21/11/2011	Green Waste Scheme	Head of Environment and Waste Management
26/10/2011	Call In New Homes Bonus	
19/09/2011	Review of Service Level Agreements with Rushcliffe Community& Voluntary Service and RCAN	Head of Community Shaping
19/09/2011	Preventing Homelessness	Head of Community Shaping
19/09/2011	Nottingham and Notts Waste Core Strategy Preferred Approach Consultation	Deputy Chief Executive (PR)
18/07/2011	Role and Remit	Deputy Chief Executive (PR)
18/07/2011	Review of Service Level Agreements	Head of Community Shaping
18/07/2011	Choice Based Lettings Progress Report	Head of Community Shaping
18/07/2011	Leisure Facilities Strategy Member Panel Update	Head of Partnerships and Performance
18/04/2011	Nature Conservation	Head of Community Shaping

Meeting date	Report title	Report author
18/04/2011	Annual Review of Work Programme	Deputy Chief Executive (PR)
24/01/2011	Leisure Strategy Review 2 <sup>nd</sup> Interim Report	Leisure Facilities Strategy Member Panel
24/01/2011	Review of Homelessness	Strategic Housing Manager
26/10/2010	Small Environmental Improvements Programme	Head of Planning and Place Shaping
26/10/2010	Affordable Housing in Rural Areas	Head of Community Shaping
26/07/2010	Climate Change Action Plan	Head of Community Shaping
26/07/2010	Children and Young People	Head of Community Shaping
26/07/2010	Glass Recycling -Final Update	Head of Environment and Waste Management
26/07/2010	Community Led Planning	Head of Community Shaping
19/04/2010	Draft Customer Access Strategy	Performance and Reputation Manager
19/04/2010	Annual Report 2009/10	Deputy Chief Executive (PR)
19/04/2010	Leisure Strategy Review -interim report	Panel
19/04/2010	Choice Based Lettings Scheme and Draft Housing Allocations Policy	Strategic Housing Manager
25/01/2010	Choice Based Lettings	Head of Community Shaping
25/01/2010	Climate Change Action Plan and Strategy	Head of Community Shaping
19/10/2009	Report from the Off Street Parking Member Panel	Panel
19/10/2009	Draft Customer Insight Strategy 2009-2012	Head of Partnerships and Performance
19/10/2009	Housing Strategy 2009-2016	Head of Community Shaping
27/07/2009	Draft Local Waste Strategy for Rushcliffe 2009-2015	Head of Environment and Waste Management
27/07/2009	Parking Review -Update on Actions Following Cabinet Decision November 2008	Head of Partnerships and Performance
27/07/2009	Review of Leisure Facilities Strategy Member Panel	Head of Partnerships and Performance
27/07/2009	The Role and Remit of the Community Development Group	Head of Corporate Services

## Report of the Executive Manager Transformation

### Summary

1. Supporting economic growth to ensure a sustainable, prosperous and thriving local economy is now one of the three corporate priorities within the Corporate Strategy. Within the priority the key tasks are:
  - Adopting the Local Plan
  - Supporting the regeneration of Cotgrave
  - Undertaking an economic assessment of the Borough's potential for economic growth.
2. This report includes background information on the delivery of economic development within the Borough, an update on the current situation and the proposed areas of work. The accompanying presentation will outline the wider context for economic development, including what is being delivered by Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottingham City Council and provides some of the current data that is available as well detailing proposed areas of work for the next year.

### Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that

- a. Members are informed of the strategic context and current data
- b. Members note the actions and priorities proposed within the table at **Appendix A** for the coming year.
- c. Members recognise the work officers are doing to progress this strategic priority within the resources available.

### Background

3. Economic Development has not previously been identified as a key priority of the Council within its corporate plan. Rushcliffe has generally benefitted from a buoyant local economy with the market driving growth. The borough is the most affluent area in the county and does not have the same scale of issues as other boroughs such as worklessness, empty units, low educational attainment etc. There is also a minimum level and distinct lack of availability of large amounts of brownfield land requiring redevelopment compared with the city and other areas of the county.

4. Despite some local regeneration and improvement programmes Rushcliffe has not been seen as a priority for support and funding from Central Government. Nottingham city and other more deprived areas of the county have benefited most from funding to support economic development.
5. The limited intervention approach adopted by the Council has been successful over many years however, times are changing and there are pressures on Local Authorities to support economic growth and prosperity. From April 2013 changes to the way business rates are collected will have a significant impact on the Borough Council. The Council will keep the business rates collected rather than paying them to Central Government, as previously happened, and receiving a proportion back (our revenue support grant which is calculated using a formula). Therefore if we do not collect business rates or if a large business closes this will have a direct impact on the amount of money the Borough Council receives.
6. In the last few years, on a national scale, the economic climate has changed dramatically with the country suffering a recession resulting in the closure of a large number of businesses, significant reductions in public sector funding and reductions in borrowing and lending. Therefore the Borough Council has now identified supporting and encouraging economic growth as a key priority within the Corporate Strategy. It is important to fully understand what businesses need and what we can do to assist with the limited resources available.
7. Based on the resources available to the Council and the current work streams being undertaken, an indicative plan of work has been prepared for 2013/14. By the end of April it will be possible to see what the response to the questionnaire to businesses sent out with the annual billing has been and this may further influence the work plan.
8. **Appendix A** details the proposed themes of work for 2013/14 for economic development work
9. A presentation will be delivered to Members covering:
  - The strategic background to economic development work
  - Public sector-led economic development
  - Other business support available
  - A data update

Business Development / Supporting the Economy in Rushcliffe - Proposed plan for 2013/14

Item	Details	Actions	Outcomes
<p>Local Plan/ development in the Borough</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adopt and implement the local plan</li> <li>2. Bring forward housing sites and employment land</li> <li>3. Work on viability of developments</li> <li>4. Consider the use of the New Homes Bonus</li> </ol>	<p>Review following inspection</p> <p>Consider the use of Council Investment to bring forward sites. Promote Sites. Instigate project to develop and implement Community Infrastructure Levy.</p> <p>Review S106 agreements as required</p> <p>Need to estimate potential receipt levels, model against potential budget demands via the MTFF and establish what, if any, earmarking there will be for community led initiatives and the implementation of the Leisure Strategy. Following this an assessment needs to be made of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential funding substitution for existing schemes (for example to match fund rural broadband expenditure)</li> <li>• Potential allocations in support of business activity (links to the commercial loan scheme as NHB could provide the seedcorn capital for support).</li> <li>• Additional infrastructure priorities, what do we need to fund to keep Rushcliffe moving forward?</li> <li>• What requirement is there for council led</li> </ul>	<p>Housing and development is planned over the next 15 years.</p> <p>Houses are built in the Borough – more housing, more trade to support local businesses, more employment opportunities in the borough from the employment sites</p> <p>If S106 are affecting viability they may need renegotiating.</p> <p>New Homes Bonus money is carefully included in MTFF</p>

Item	Details	Actions	Outcomes
		<p>support and grants for new / small businesses? What could be done to unlock affordable housing?</p>	
Support for businesses	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rushcliffe Business Partnership</li> <li>2. Big business events/network</li> <li>3. Commercial loan scheme</li> </ol>	<p>Continue to support partnership and events. Survey of business needs going out with business rates in Feb</p> <p>Community Engagement manager to put together an outline of current activity</p> <p>Develop an option appraisal around five key options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No proactive engagement, current approach.</li> <li>• RBC led investments and grants (the Newark and Sherwood model)</li> <li>• Partnership / support for a “Community Development Finance Association” charity or organisation e.g. Fredericks Nottinghamshire.</li> <li>• Linkage to Nottinghamshire Credit Union</li> <li>• Linking to crowd funding approach to business, e.g. Funding Circle.</li> </ul> <p>These are not mutually exclusive options and the final support package could see the council being engaged and signposting to a variety of solutions and providers.</p>	<p>Businesses are engaged and are proactive in advising the Council of areas it can support the local economy</p> <p>Loans available to businesses – interest rates may be higher than those achieved for investments.</p>
Property and estates	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Acquisitions and disposals</li> <li>2. Management of</li> </ol>	<p>When considering acquisitions and disposals to have regard for best benefit to local economy and employment implications</p> <p>Relevant sites include the Point, Gresham, the Depot</p> <p>Consider the business case for the council providing small business accommodation from the</p>	<p>Maximise local benefits from the Council’s acquisitions and disposals</p> <p>Small flexible spaces could be available</p>

Item	Details	Actions	Outcomes
	assets	Civic New builds – depot, civic, leisure	for hire if viable. Further support for local businesses. The Council's capital programme should benefit the local economy to maximum effect.
Rushcliffe offer: produce tourism Infrastructure	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Experience Nottingham business fair</li> <li>2. Food/Country fair at RCP</li> <li>3. Markets and town centre/night time economy</li> <li>4. A453, A46, Broadband</li> </ol>	<p>Start promoting Rushcliffe more as a home of business, connectivity and cheese/pies/wine. Food fair.</p> <p>Look to organise an event this year.</p> <p>Review Bingham/farmers market for competition issues. Highlight the value of night time economy</p> <p>Promote Rushcliffe as accessible for business</p>	<p>Local business prospers, Rushcliffe capitalises on its food links (ref Melton)</p> <p>Celebrate Rushcliffe produce and increase the spend in Rushcliffe.</p> <p>Markets start to thrive and encourage rather than stifle competition.</p> <p>Employment land is developed</p>
Regeneration	1. Cotgrave	Work on viability of town centre regeneration	Cotgrave becomes village of choice and aspiration





**Community Development Group**

**9 April 2013**

**Work Programme**

**6**

**Report of the Executive Manager - Neighbourhoods**

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 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
9 April 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback &amp; update regarding the Borough's relationship with the parishes</li> <li>• Review of the Group's work</li> <li>• Work Programme</li> </ul>
2 July 2013 Joint meeting with the Partnership Delivery Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of service level agreement with RCVS and RCAN</li> <li>• Annual Review of Scrutiny</li> <li>• Work Programme</li> </ul>
29 October 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic Development</li> <li>• Work Programme</li> </ul>
21 January 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work Programme</li> </ul>
18 March 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work Programme</li> </ul>
6 May 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work Programme</li> </ul>
July 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work Programme</li> </ul>
October 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work Programme</li> </ul>
January 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work Programme</li> </ul>

**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**