

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

**Our reference:**  
**Your reference:**  
**Date:** 25 June 2012

To all Members of the Partnership Delivery Group

Dear Councillor

A meeting of the PARTNERSHIP DELIVERY GROUP will be held on Tuesday 3 July 2012 at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Pavilion Road, West Bridgford to consider the following items of business.

Yours sincerely

Head of Corporate Services

### ***AGENDA***

1. Apologies for absence.
2. Declarations of Interest.
3. Notes of the Meeting held on Monday 19 March 2012 (pages 1 - 6).
4. Annual Scrutiny of Partnership with Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club

The report of the Head of Community Shaping is attached (pages 7 - 9).

5. Request for Scrutiny of SureStart in Rushcliffe

The report of the Head of Community Shaping is attached (pages 10 - 12).

6. Request for Scrutiny of Advice Networks

The report of the Head of Community Shaping is attached (pages 13 - 15).

7. Rolling 2 Year Work Programme

The report of the Head of Partnerships and Performance is attached (pages 16 - 17).

### **Membership**

Chairman: Councillor R Hetherington  
Vice-Chairman: Councillor F A Purdue-Horan  
Councillors Mrs D M Boote, R L Butler, H A Chewings, A M Dickinson,  
E J Lungley, Mrs M Stockwood, T Vennett-Smith

## 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  
PARTNERSHIP DELIVERY GROUP  
MONDAY 19 MARCH 2012**

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

**PRESENT:**

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

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

Councillor J E Greenwood.

**OFFICERS PRESENT:**

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

**APOLOGY FOR ABSENCE:**

Councillor A M Dickinson

**18. Declarations of Interest**

There were none declared.

**19. Notes of the Previous Meeting**

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

**20. Progress Report on the Rushcliffe Community Strategy Action Plans**

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

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

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

**a) Community Safety Group**

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

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

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

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

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

**b) Health Issues**

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

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

**c) Rushcliffe Business Partnership**

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

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

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

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

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

**d) Building Stronger Communities**

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

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

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

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

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

**e) Children and Young People**

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

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

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

**f) Environment**

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

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

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

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

#### **21. Annual Review of Work Programme 2011/12**

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

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

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

#### **22. Rolling 2 Year Work Programme**

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

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

Members requested that there should be an update on the Sure Start Centres and scrutiny of the Advice Networks in the Borough. Officers agreed to provide a

paper on both these items for the Group to discuss at the next meeting to ascertain if these should be included in the work programme.

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

The meeting closed at 8.50 pm.

## Action Sheet

### PARTNERSHIP DELIVERY GROUP - MONDAY 19 MARCH 2012

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





## PARTNERSHIP DELIVERY GROUP

3 JULY 2012

## ANNUAL SCRUTINY OF PARTNERSHIP WITH NOTTINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY CRICKET CLUB

# 4

### REPORT OF THE HEAD OF COMMUNITY SHAPING

#### Summary

Tracey Francis the Community Sports Trust Manager from Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club will give a presentation to the Partnership Delivery Group on the delivery of the 'community benefits programme' during 2011/12, the key achievements and the priorities for 2012/13.

#### Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that the Partnership Delivery Group comment on the delivery of the programme of community benefits over the last year and the value for money of the partnership.

#### Background

1. In 2008 Rushcliffe Borough Council, in partnership with Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottingham City Council, provided Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club with a loan of £1.23M to enable the club to develop a new stand and safeguard the test match status of the ground. The other two Councils each contributed a similar sum. In return, the Cricket Club's contribution to the partnership was the provision of community benefits and the repayment of interest only until December 2012, after which the arrangements would be reviewed. The funding agreement outlined the main areas of a community benefits package that the Cricket Club would be required to deliver within the Borough during the period 2008-2023.
2. The nature and content of the community benefits package may be varied by agreement between the parties, but were initially identified as follows:-
  - o Social awareness project - Positive Futures
  - o Schools cricket coaching and competitions
  - o Club Development support
  - o Provision of match tickets and mascot opportunities for children
  - o Free use of meeting and conference rooms at Trent Bridge
  - o Support to local groups and charities with fundraising
  - o One cricket road-show to be held per year

These benefits were estimated to be valued at £116,500.

3. One of the major successes of the community project to date has been the establishment of the Positive Futures project in Cotgrave. The Community Sports Trust managed to secure £175,000 of funding through the Home Office

and Football Foundation to deliver this social inclusion project from November 2008 to November 2012.

4. Positive Futures has gone from strength to strength winning the Best Community Programme award at the English Cricket Board Business of Cricket Awards. Whilst the Project Co-ordinator and Youth Worker employed by the Cricket Club both received commendations from the Chief Constable for their contribution to a reduction of anti-social behaviour and juvenile crime within Cotgrave.
5. Young people involved in the project have benefitted from a wide range of opportunities to expand their skills and knowledge. Positive Futures focuses on developing skills that will aid the young people in future employment including providing training on canapé making and silver service which has been utilised at civic occasions and the setting up of a social enterprise business to sell jewellery.

### **Financial and Community Safety Outcomes**

6. The Positive Futures project was initially estimated as an investment into the Borough of £33,000 per year, but has actually resulted in a greater investment both by the club and the grant. Tracey Francis will provide an update at scrutiny as to the level of investment in the current year and the total value received to date.
7. Since the Positive Futures project began in Cotgrave there has been a 64% reduction in offences committed by young people. This is more than double the reduction that has been seen across Rushcliffe as a whole (-29%). There has also been a 40% reduction in reported anti-social behaviour in Cotgrave over the same period, which compares to 32% across Rushcliffe. (Source Nottinghamshire Police).
8. Over the same period there had been a 55% reduction in all crime, which compares to a 34% reduction in the Borough as a whole
  - 80% reduction in burglary
  - 55% reduction in criminal damage
  - 50% reduction in theft
  - 29% reduction in violence
9. The Partnership contract requires Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club to pay interest on the full amount of the loan at a rate of 4% per annum until 31 December 2012 after which time a new rate will be established. This provides a higher rate of return than many other investments given that the current Bank of England base rate is 0.5%

### **Future working**

10. The current partnership and loan arrangement with the Cricket Club is due to be reviewed by Cabinet by December 2012.

**Financial Comments**

In 2008 Rushcliffe Borough Council provided Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club with a loan of £1.23M to enable the Club to develop a new stand and safeguard the test match status of the ground.

**Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act**

The Positive Futures project directly contributes to the reduction of anti-social behaviour and criminal activity.

**Diversity**

The programme of cricket development delivered by Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club is available to all ages and specifically focuses on women and girls, and disability cricket.

**Background Papers Available for Inspection: Nil**



## **PARTNERSHIP DELIVERY GROUP**

**3 JULY 2012**

### **REQUEST FOR SCRUTINY OF SURESTART IN RUSHCLIFFE**

# **5**

## **REPORT OF HEAD OF COMMUNITY SHAPING**

### **Introduction**

At the last meeting of Partnership Delivery, held on 19<sup>th</sup> March 2012, Members made a request for Surestart in Rushcliffe to be scrutinised. It is now for this group to determine whether the topic should be included on the work programme. Furthermore, if the topic is accepted, the Group is requested to determine the scope and desired outcomes of the review.

### **Recommendation**

It is RECOMMENDED that

- a) Members consider whether Surestart in Rushcliffe should be a substantive scrutiny item for inclusion on the work programme and if so,
- b) The scope and focus of the review.

### **Detail**

As Members will recall, there is a process for determining whether a suggested topic should be included on the work programme of a scrutiny group. This involves answering some initial questions and then, if appropriate, completing a prioritising matrix.

### **Initial questions to ask**

#### **A. Why would we do this?**

Members raised it as a potential topic at the last meeting of this Group. At present there are five Surestart centres located within Rushcliffe at Abbey Road, in West Bridgford, Keyworth, Cotgrave, Bingham and xxx Surestart delivers services to families with young children targeting areas with higher levels of need. At present the co-ordination of these services is undergoing some change and the Surestart Co-ordinator has recently been made redundant. If Members do decide to scrutinise this partnership it may be appropriate to schedule this scrutiny for later on in the year when a new appointment has been made.

**B. How does this link to the Council's Corporate Strategy?**

This is not a strategic task in the Corporate Strategy. It could however contribute to our priority of 'Maintaining and enhancing our residents' quality of life' and the Strategic Task to 'Facilitate activities for Children and Young People to enable them to reach their potential.'

**C. What tangible benefits could result for the community or our customers?**

Improved Surestart services and opportunity for Members to signpost to these services more appropriately.

**D. What evidence is there to support the need for a review?**

There is no know evidence other than it was raised by Members at the lat Partnership Delivery Group meeting.

**E. What would we wish to achieve and why?**

We would wish to achieve an improved understanding of the Surestart services available to our residents in Rushcliffe and to make recommendations, where appropriate, to improve existing partnerships.

**F. Are resources available to undertake a scrutiny exercise and will the work programme accommodate it?**

The work programme could accommodate it, however please have regard to paragraph A.

**Are there any reasons to reject the topic?**

**G. Is it in the Scrutiny Group's terms of reference?**

Yes.

**H. Is it already being addressed?**

No.

**I. Is it part of a legal process/ complaint/ grievance procedure?**

No.

**J. Is it unlikely to result in real or tangible benefits?**

No.

**K. If a detailed scrutiny exercise was needed is there sufficient capacity to support such a review?**

Yes providing it was scheduled into the work programme to allow officers to prepare for it.

## **Summary**

A request has been made for a scrutiny of Surestart in Rushcliffe. Members are asked to consider whether the request should be supported and if so, what particular aspects of the current arrangements should be the focus for the review.

### **Financial Comments**

There are no financial implications

### **Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act**

There are no crime and disorder implications

### **Diversity**

There are no diversity implications

**Background Papers Available for Inspection: Nil**



## **PARTNERSHIP DELIVERY GROUP**

**3 JULY 2012**

### **REQUEST FOR SCRUTINY OF ADVICE NETWORKS**

# **6**

## **REPORT OF HEAD OF COMMUNITY SHAPING**

### **Introduction**

At the last meeting of Partnership Delivery, held on 19<sup>th</sup> March 2012, Members made a request for advice networks in Rushcliffe to be scrutinised. It is now for this group to determine whether the topic should be included on the work programme. Furthermore, if the topic is accepted, the Group is requested to determine the scope and desired outcomes of the review.

### **Recommendation**

It is RECOMMENDED that

- a) Members consider whether Advice Networks in Rushcliffe should be a substantive scrutiny item for inclusion on the work programme and if so,
- b) The scope and focus of the review.

### **Detail**

As Members will recall, there is a process for determining whether a suggested topic should be included on the work programme of a scrutiny group. This involves answering some initial questions and then, if appropriate, completing a prioritising matrix.

### **Initial questions to ask**

#### **A. Why would we do this?**

Members raised it as a potential topic at the last meeting of this group. At present the Council is a partner in the delivery of Rushcliffe Advice Network (RAN) which has received significant lottery funding to improve the skills of advisors across the Borough. There are a number of advice services both within Rushcliffe and those accessed by our residents in Nottingham city. Members may wish to scrutinise this area to gain an improved understanding of the services available and to make recommendations as to how we may improve these services in the future and to ensure value for money.

**B. How does this link to the Council's Corporate Strategy?**

This is not a strategic task in the Corporate Strategy. It could however contribute to our priority of 'Maintaining and enhancing our residents' quality of life.'

**C. What tangible benefits could result for the community or our customers?**

Improved advice services.

**D. What evidence is there to support the need for a review?**

The advice services in Rushcliffe are heavily utilised in the current economic climate. The scrutiny would enable Members to have an improved understanding of what services are being provided for our residents and what gaps exist. Members may wish to propose additional evidence to require a scrutiny.

**E. What would we wish to achieve and why?**

Ensure that lottery funding is being spent appropriately and that quality advice is being provided.

**F. Are resources available to undertake a scrutiny exercise and will the work programme accommodate it?**

The work programme could accommodate it, providing there is not a requirement to undertake significant research or public opinion surveys, it should be possible to undertake the review using existing resources.

**Are there any reasons to reject the topic?**

**G. Is it in the Scrutiny Group's terms of reference?**

Yes.

**H. Is it already being addressed?**

No.

**I. Is it part of a legal process/ complaint/ grievance procedure?**

No.

**J. Is it unlikely to result in real or tangible benefits?**

No.

**K. If a detailed scrutiny exercise was needed is there sufficient capacity to support such a review?**

Yes providing it was scheduled into the work programme to allow officers to prepare for it.



**Summary**

A request has been made for a scrutiny of the Advice Network in Rushcliffe. Members are asked to consider whether the request should be supported and if so, what particular aspects of the current arrangements should be the focus for the review.

**Financial Comments**

There are no financial implications

**Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act**

There are no crime and disorder implications

**Diversity**

There are no diversity implications

**Background Papers Available for Inspection: Nil**