

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

Our reference:
Your reference:
Date: 11 January 2013

To all Members of the Partnership Delivery Group

Dear Councillor

A meeting of the PARTNERSHIP DELIVERY GROUP will be held on Tuesday 22 January 2013 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 Meetings held on Tuesday 27 November 2012 and Thursday 20 December 2012 (pages 1 - 5 and 6 - 13).
4. Review of the South Nottinghamshire Community Safety Partnership

The report of the Head of Community Shaping is attached (pages 14 - 17).
5. Work Programme

The report of the Head of Partnerships and Performance is attached (pages 18 - 19).

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
TUESDAY 27 NOVEMBER 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, R L Butler,
H A Chewings, A M Dickinson, E J Lungley, F A Purdue-Horan and
Mrs M Stockwood

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Councillors S J Boote and J E Greenwood.
C McCurdy Project Co-ordinator, Rushcliffe Advice Network

OFFICERS PRESENT:

C Bullet Deputy Chief Executive (CB)
D Hayden Community Engagement Manager
D Mitchell Head of Partnerships and Performance
V Nightingale Senior Member Support Officer

APOLOGY FOR ABSENCE:

Councillor T Vennett-Smith

11. Declarations of Interest

There were none declared.

12. Notes of the Previous Meeting

The notes of the meeting held on Tuesday 18 September 2012 were accepted as a true record following an amendment by Councillor Purdue-Horan.

In note 9 a new paragraph to be inserted after paragraph 5 to read "Concern and disappointment was also expressed to Ms Danson at the lack of knowledge or initial apparent willingness to co-operate with local authority partners regarding flooding that was exacerbated by blocked surface drains in area that are the responsibility of Metropolitan Homes (Hill Drive, Bingham was one example). Forcing officers and Councillors to seek out legal documents to prove responsibility before action was decided upon, was not helpful to resident in such difficult circumstances."

With regard to the actions Members were informed that in respect of Metropolitan Members had been provided with contact details and information regarding resident's forums. Officers had taken on board the need to inform Members of any significant anti-social behaviour incidents and processes were in place. However, the Head of Community Shaping had not, as yet, received any requests for individual meetings with Ms Danson.

In respect of Waterloo Members had been provided with contact details and a link to the video. Members were informed that there were no regular tenant involvement groups and these were called as required, officers would ensure that Members were informed of these. Also when a site visit was applicable Members would be invited.

Members asked that the list of actions should be reproduced before the Group scrutinised the partnership again, officers agreed to provide this.

13. **Partnership Delivery – Review of Partnership with Rushcliffe Advice Network (RAN)**

The Community Engagement Manager presented the report outlining the Borough Council's partnership with the Rushcliffe Advice Network. He stated that it was an umbrella organisation funded by a Big Lottery grant of just under £500,000, which aimed to improve the delivery of advice and the sustainability of the advice centres within the Borough.

Ms McCurdy gave a presentation outlining the history of the organisation and its role. She stated that the Group had formed in 2009 to look at the impact of the recession on the existing advice centres. Following a successful bid a five year project was initiated, which involved improving the sustainability of the advice centres and ensuring that consistent advice was given by the volunteers. The Network had employed three people to assist in these aims and had also received some further funding from BT for computers and from the Rushcliffe Community Partnership for IT and training. A steering group was set up to oversee the project with membership from Rushcliffe Borough Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, Citizen's Advice Bureau, the Friary, Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe Community Voluntary Service and the British Legion. Members were informed that the BIG Lottery funding could not be used for any costs incurred by the advice centres.

The Group were informed that the advice centres delivered advice on a wide range of general topics, including finance, housing, health and disability. They mainly dealt with simple debt and tax problems, not bankruptcy or insolvency. Also they signposted people to other organisations that dealt with more complex issues or to other advice centres if the person did not wish to be seen locally.

Members were informed that the advice centres were volunteer led and based in Radcliffe on Trent, Cotgrave and West Bridgford. There had been a centre in Keyworth and it was hoped that this could be reinstated by Easter 2013. Ms McCurdy stated that it was envisaged to have a centre in Bingham soon. She explained that the centres were reliant on funding and donations, although as they received under £3,000 they could not obtain charitable status. Following a question Members were informed that the centres fiercely guarded their independence and did not wish to join together, nor was that the aim of the Network.

At present the number of enquiries for advice was increasing and this could become a challenge for the Network. Debt advice was becoming more complex and the volunteers were helping more people with appeals in regard to Employment and Support Allowance and Disability Living Allowance. There

had been changes to the Job Seekers Allowance and sanctions were now being implemented that were deemed harsher. Another change coming into effect soon was the Welfare Reform Act 2012 and the implementation of the Government's scheme for Universal Credit. It was recognised that the Network was assisted in this issue because of its close relationship with the Borough Council, which was a pilot. In relation to performance Members were informed that 1,100 people had been given advice in relation to benefits which equated to an estimated £914,765 for the year; 348 people had received debt advice with a recorded debt of £525,704 and 140 people had seen a consultant advisor for appeals and tribunals. Other advice was given in relation to tax, access to legal information, health and housing accommodation. Following a question it was confirmed that the 45 minutes of free legal advice did not cost the advice centres as it was pro bono work on behalf of the solicitor.

In respect of challenges facing the Network Ms McCurdy explained changes to the benefit system would affect the advice centres and as a Network they would need time to support and train the volunteers to provide the appropriate advice and support. Other challenges included promoting the services and raising awareness, although this could lead to more people applying for advice which itself could lead to capacity issues. One challenge the Network was considering was obtaining funding for the centres to make them sustainable.

Finally Ms McCurdy explained that the long term vision was to ensure that all centres were viable and sustainable; to increase the number of volunteers and to ensure they receive an induction and training; and to bring access to services to more people.

Following a question regarding debt Members were informed that data collection was one area that was being considered and improved. Information from the advice centres indicated that more people were being seen because of pay-day loans. The Citizen's Advice Bureau and the Credit Union were running campaigns regarding these types of loans.

Members queried how the funding was spent as the Network had received £500,000 for five years, equating to £100,000 per year. It was recognised that three people were employed but Members were unsure what else the funding was used for. Ms McCurdy explained that the funding was used for marketing, publicity and training, she agreed to provide the Group with further information. With regard to funding for advice centres it was recognised that centres had to raise their own funds but she was working towards producing a business model with them. In respect of measuring the value/worth of the partnership officers explained that it was difficult to quantify however, they were working towards establishing the benefits the centres brought to the community which would in turn help them towards bidding for funding. It was hoped that if the income could be increased then charitable status could be applied for.

With regard to the partner organisations it was recognised that some put into the partnership, for example the Borough Council provided accommodation, training room facilities, and an officer acted as Vice Chair of the partnership whereas others provided expertise, and other organisations took from the partnership.

The Group queried if the Network was in a better position to apply for Lottery funding. Ms McCurdy explained that at present they could not apply again and hopefully by the end of the five years the Network should be sustainable. However, if after the five years they required additional funding they would have a bank of case studies to help them with the application.

Officers explained to the Group that the Network was looking at the Council's Customer Service Centre model and hoping to have a centre in the six larger villages as well as West Bridgford. Councillor S Boote stated that at a recent meeting in Keyworth it had been felt that there should be synergy with the Council's outreach centres, it was hoped that the advice centre in Keyworth could be held at the same place and at the same time as the Customer Services. The Head of Partnerships and Performance explained that there had been a good collaboration between the Council and the advice centre at Radcliffe on Trent. Also the Customer Service advisors were all trained to a basic level and could signpost people who needed further help.

The Chairman asked what assistance the Borough Council could give the Network. Ms McCurdy explained that their accommodation was provided by the Council and that officers had helped to set up the Network. They had access to many officers, especially those in the Revenues and Benefits section and also were involved in the Universal Credit pilot scheme. The relationship was extremely good and it gave both sides confidence and trust in each other.

Finally the Head of Partnerships and Performance summarised the discussion; it was recognised that it was early days for the Network, that there were some good results from the three centres and it was hoped to have more centres in Keyworth and Bingham during 2013 and that approximately 2,000 residents had been helped.

It was AGREED that the work of the Rushcliffe Advice Network be endorsed.

14. **Work Programme**

The Group considered its work programme. It was acknowledged that the Group would be scrutinising the South Nottinghamshire Community Safety Partnership, concentrating on the Fire Service and the work of the Council. Members were asked to email their questions to Member Services. Following a question the Group was informed that all the questions would be consolidated before the meeting, which was now the process.

The meeting closed at 7.55 pm.

Action Sheet**PARTNERSHIP DELIVERY GROUP - TUESDAY 27 NOVEMBER 2012**

Minute Number	Actions	Officer Responsible
12. Notes of the Previous Meeting	List of actions regarding Metropolitan and Waterloo to be reproduced before the next scrutiny of Registered Social Providers (September 2013)	Head of Partnerships and Performance
13. Partnership Delivery – Review of Partnership with Rushcliffe Advice Network (RAN)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. The Network to provide a breakdown of how the funding is utilisedb. The Network to consider how it could be promoted and what added value the partnership bringsc. The Network to produce more details on the type of debts that are the advisors are dealing with	The Rushcliffe Advice Network and the Community Engagement Manager
14. Work Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Members to email their questions for the the scrutiny of the South Nottinghamshire Community Safety Partnershipb. Officers to compile a list of the questions for South Nottinghamshire Community Safety Partnership	Members Head of Partnerships and Performance



NOTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
PARTNERSHIP DELIVERY GROUP
THURSDAY 20 DECEMBER 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, R L Butler,
H A Chewings, A M Dickinson, E J Lungley, F A Purdue-Horan,
Mrs M Stockwood, T Vennett-Smith

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Councillors S J Boote and J A Cranswick and 3 members of the public.

OFFICERS PRESENT:

C Bullett	Deputy Chief Executive (CB)
D Mitchell	Head of Partnerships and Performance
V Nightingale	Senior Member Support Officer

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

There were no apologies for absence

15. Declarations of Interest

There were none declared.

16. Cabinet Call In – Support to Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club

The Chairman welcomed Councillor S Boote, the Lead Signatory and Councillor Cranswick, on behalf of the Cabinet, to the Group's meeting. He outlined the purpose of the meeting and explained the process that would be undertaken.

Councillor S Boote addressed the Group stating the overall context of the Call-In. He said that in 2007 Full Council voted to make a loan of £1.23 million to Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club towards a new stand. The terms of repayment and the rate of interest were agreed; the loan was secured on the Cricket Ground and made on commercial terms at market rates of interest. The Cricket Club had recently asked if they could keep £750,000. Cabinet had made the decision to allow them to keep £450,000 with an extra £90,000 per year for four years. This totalled £810,000, which was not felt to be reasoned, reasonable and proportionate.

He stated that they were not calling-in/challenging the Cabinet decision in principle to make an additional loan of up to £2 million towards a new stand. It was felt that the loan was to ensure that the Ashes Test, already secured in 2015, would be properly conducted at a fully equipped ground. The Test, would bring considerable economic benefits, bringing people into this area who would spend money, thus creating jobs. This loan would also be secured on the Cricket Ground and be on commercial terms at market rates of interest.

It would be a commercial arrangement which would be of benefit to both parties; the Club would be able to access finances to improve its ground and the Council would benefit from a higher interest rate than presently available from other low risk sources. Therefore this part of the decision was not part of the Call-In.

Councillor S Boote stated that the Call-In concerned the £810,000 grant/gift, money that would not be coming back to the Council. He said that this was equivalent to a gift of £20 from every household in Rushcliffe. This was a concern as it came at a time of unparalleled financial stringency, when the Council was having to make cuts, make staff redundant and reduce services to the public. He explained that the £450,000 was a retrospective payment to the Cricket Club in recognition of the Positive Futures project in Cotgrave over the last 5 years. It had been part of the terms of the previous loan that the Cricket Club would sponsor community activities that would have a spin off effect on reducing crime and anti-social behaviour. He said that the Club was now claiming that it had done so well that it deserved to keep some of the money.

In respect of crime and anti-social behaviour incidents had reduced in Cotgrave although it was difficult to measure if this could be directly attributed to the Positive Futures scheme. There had been a multi-agency approach in Cotgrave, including 'Weeks of Action' and the 'Making Cotgrave Smile' project, which had won national recognition on behalf of the community and the police. Also crime had fallen over the whole of the Borough. However, the worst hotspot for crime in the Borough was the Trent Bridge Ward, where the Cricket Club was located.

Cotgrave had a higher level of policing and received a huge amount of regeneration money. Although there was an academic study of the apparent financial savings from the reduction in crime, it did not say how much of this had been due to Positive Futures. Therefore the Council was proposing a large expenditure without any clear knowledge of the benefits. The £450,000 grant was equivalent to £11 per household in Rushcliffe or a subsidy of £213 for each household in Cotgrave.

In respect of the £360,000 to be spent over the next four years Councillor S Boote stated that this was for the continuation of the project. However, there were no details on where this would happen, when it would happen or what the expected benefits would be. Councillors were being told that the project must continue at its present standard, however the present standard could not be clearly defined. Members were also being informed that the geographical scope and nature of the project would be subjected to a review without being informed what the scope and nature were. Also no assurances had been given that the review would have any teeth. As the project was not dependent on a satisfactory outcome of the review the Cabinet had made an open-ended commitment to hand over the money without sufficiently firm assurances of any benefits to the Council or the community.

He reminded the Group that this was a gift of council taxpayers' money to a private company that existed to provide professional sport and to make a profit. He reiterated that it was a time of extreme stringency in Council finance and that the amount was disproportionate to the claimed benefits. He felt that it was unreasonable to expect all Council Tax payers to contribute a very large

amount of their money to a project in just one small part of the Borough, especially as not everyone followed sport or lived in Cotgrave. It was essential that the Council had firm assurances about what the money was for and what benefits it would bring to the whole Borough.

Councillor S Boote stated that there were better, fairer and more proportionate ways of using Council Tax payers' money and that there were other alternatives that could have been explored. Serious consideration could be taken if the Cricket Club needed more time to repay the original loan. If the Council wanted to involve more young people in sport then money could go to a range of local sports clubs that were committed to that purpose and worked in the local community. Or if the Council wanted to it could give money to art, drama, music, dance, literature and other cultural activities, without assuming that sport is the be-all and end-all.

In summary, Councillor S Boote stated that the signatories felt that the Cabinet decision was flawed because:

- The expenditure is not proportionate to the expected benefits
- There was not enough consultation and no scrutiny (by a scrutiny group) of the grant requested
- The aims and outcomes were unclear, because there had not been enough investigation of the grant request and what the expected outcomes would be, and no one knew how much of the benefit so far could be directly attributed to Positive Futures as opposed to other factors.
- No other options were considered and no alternatives were evaluated.

He therefore asked the Partnership Delivery Group to confirm that the decision breached the decision making principles and that it should be referred back to Cabinet for consideration at its next meeting.

Councillor Cranswick, as Cabinet portfolio holder, responded to Councillor Boote. He said that he regretted Councillor Boote's comments that the Council was giving the Cricket Club £810,000. He felt that this was misleading and he did not believe that anyone actually believed that. He reminded Members that the loan had been set up in 2007 and that it stood alongside similar loans from Nottinghamshire County Council, Nottingham City Council and the East Midlands Development Agency. These loans had enabled the Club to build a new stand and install floodlights which had been a requirement by the English Cricket Board for the Club to stage the Twenty/20 World Cup in 2009. This event alone had been independently estimated to have benefitted the local economy by £6.2million. Each organisation had agreed their own terms of repayment. Also, as part of Rushcliffe's agreement, a partnership had been entered into which would see several community benefits being provided within the Borough, benefits that were wider than just Positive Futures. These were estimated at approximately £116,500 per year and included:

- Social awareness project pilot (became positive futures) equating to £33,000

- Cricket Development officer to service schools and clubs across Rushcliffe equating to £27,500
- Coaching and backup support staff equating to £27,500
- Match tickets for RBC to distribute equating to £9,600
- Twenty20 match demonstrations by children of the Borough equating to £3,000
- Free use of meeting rooms equating to £2,400
- Supporting local charities, clubs and schools with fundraising equating to £11,700
- One roadshow in the Borough per annum equating to £1,000
- Tours of the ground by schools etc equating to £800

Councillor Cranswick stated that the Positive Futures project had needed to be developed and therefore it was not possible to fully evaluate the scheme in 2007. Quoting from the original report he reminded Members that there would be “A review after 5 years, to ascertain the success of the community benefits and take a further decision in respect of the community benefits. A decision to convert all or part to a grant or amend repayment terms could also be taken at this review.” This had been reflected in the Cabinet’s decision.

In respect of some of Councillor Boote’s comments Councillor Cranswick stated that the Council was not committing funds entirely to sport but to social benefits for the community; sport was only a conduit by which the community benefits could be achieved. Also this was a capital grant which had little or no effect on revenue and therefore the money could not be used to provide services. He reminded Members that the Council had not reduced the level of services it provided to residents and that it did not intend to do so. The effect of the arrangement was to obtain a revenue benefit from a capital resource. He stated that if the Council had done this work it would have cost the Council a significant amount of revenue money. Also Members should not ignore the fact that the 3% interest rate was far better than the market rate of 0.5%. This income would continue.

With regard to sports clubs receiving a subsidy he emphasised to Members that this was not a subsidy to the Cricket Club but that the Council was buying community benefits.

The benefits of this partnership had been demonstrated admirably, not only through scrutiny examination by the Partnership Delivery Group but it had also gained national awards and accolades, such as

- National recognition of excellence in winning an Local Government Chronicle and a Municipal Journal award
- Runners up in the national Tilley awards
- English Cricket Board Business of Cricket Awards, Best Community Programme in 2010, 2011 and 2012
- Sport and Recreation Alliance (2011) Professional Sports Club Community Programme of the Year 2011 Finalist
- Commendation of Nottinghamshire Constabulary (2010) Jean Varnam Award
- Young people from the Positive Futures Project **had been** involved in a Guinness World Record in 2010

- Nottinghamshire Business of the Year Award (2012)

Councillor Cranswick stated that there was a reported 76% reduction in crime and youth anti-social behaviour, which, according to the evaluation by the University of Central Lancashire, was an estimated saving to the public purse of between £310,000 and £573,000 during the period July 2009 to December 2010. He felt that these accolades showed that a number of external organisations had evaluated the scheme and that it had demonstrated a massive and proportionate benefit to the community.

In respect of insufficient examination or scrutiny he stated that the Partnership Delivery Group had scrutinised the benefits on an annual basis. The Group had also noted the significant outcomes achieved. Quoting from the notes of the meetings he reminded Members that the Group had said

- The support work as part of the Positive Futures work in Cotgrave had been inspirational and the teams and individuals should be congratulated for all the hard work
- There had been excellent outcomes in terms of reduction in anti-social behaviour and juvenile crime which can be measured, but the Group also felt that the more 'difficult to measure' outcomes in motivating children to develop themselves and gain employment had also been significant
- The funding for the scheme finished in November 2011 and whilst the programme is secure in the near future it was recognised that further financial support would be required to maintain the programme
- The Group felt this was a showcase scheme and wanted to support and promote the activities and results being achieved

With regard to spending money in Cotgrave and that there was no proof of how much crime reduction was due to Positive Futures Councillor Cranswick informed the Group that, in consultation with officers, it had been deemed that Cotgrave had a major problem and that this was where resources should be focussed. However, other communities across the Borough had benefitted from £37,000 being spent on Area Based Initiatives by the Community Safety Partnership over the three year period.

Councillor Cranswick informed the Group that in 2009/10 £10,000 had been spent on communications, signage, additional police patrols, events and promotional safety items for events, clean up and approximately £1,500 for projects for young people for example Friday night football and a project at Candleby Lane School. In 2010/11 £5,000 had been spent on similar items with a further £1,000 on projects for young people. In 2011/12 £22,000 had been spent on initiatives to design out crime. He felt that it was impossible to separate out the impacts of all of these initiatives. Cabinet had agreed with officers that it was impossible to quantify the impact on people's lives and attitudes or how many people had benefitted. The long term benefits were as yet unknown but it was a fact that crime was down by 64% and anti-social

behaviour had been reduced by 40%. Also many young people in Cotgrave now had aspirations that did not previously exist.

In relation to there being no attempt to explain where the project would be extended to and what it would involve Councillor Cranswick stated that this was correct. However, as the loan was due for review and it was time critical Cabinet had agreed a proposal that would allow the project to be developed in a bespoke manner in other areas. It was recognised that the Council now had a model which clearly worked. It was envisaged that the success and enthusiasm of the Cotgrave scheme would be transferred whilst each are evolved and developed its own scheme which was proportionate to its problems. Referring to his earlier comments Councillor Cranswick stated that the project was not just about Cotgrave and that it was Cabinet's clear objective that the other benefits across the Borough would continue.

It was obvious that the current standard was not in doubt, as evidenced by the various activities and awards. However, it was recognised that this had been achieved by also raising additional funding from external parties. It was also noted that this funding would need to be replaced to keep the current activities going.

With regard to the comment that no alternatives had been considered, such as rescheduling the loan the Cabinet had responded appropriately to the request from the Cricket Club, who was one of the Council's key partners, and in accordance with the intentions of the original loan. He felt that what had been agreed was a combination of a recognition of excellent partnership and an incentive to ensure the excellent work continued. It also made excellent use of a capital resource for a revenue purpose. The Council now had the opportunity to define what would be required over the next four years. If the Council was not satisfied with what the Club was offering then the £90,000 per annum would not be converted to grant. In response to Councillor Boote's calculations he stated that this was equivalent to £17 per household over the proposed nine years, which equated to £2 per household per year.

In summary Councillor Cranswick quoted from the notes of the Group's meeting on 3 July 2012. "It was AGREED that the Group would encourage Cabinet to look positively at the significant social and community benefits arising from the partnership and would encourage them to do all possible to facilitate the long term continuation of the partnership benefits when reviewing the loan arrangement". He believed that this was exactly what Cabinet had done.

The Group discussed the merits of the Call In and questioned Councillors S Boote and Cranswick. Following a question the Group was informed that it was not known if any other Councils had been approached or if so what their decision was.

The Group felt that because the benefits for, and the achievements by, Cotgrave had been widely publicised there was a perception that other areas had not been involved, whereas many other areas had received assistance.

Whilst discussing the amount of benefit that had been received by the residents the Group were divided upon whether the Positive Futures project

was accountable for the reduction in crime and anti-social behaviour, however it was recognised that there was a ripple effect and that cause and effect could not be seen in isolation. It was also recognised that the location of the Cricket Ground was a benefit to the Borough, as it was known internationally and therefore it gave Rushcliffe recognition and put it on the map. Members were aware of many of the other communities that had been helped via their local cricket clubs. Following a question the Group was informed that no Service Level Agreement had been entered into as it was difficult to quantify the majority of the outcomes, although there were additional items such as match tickets, coaching, availability of meeting rooms, etc that could be. It was recognised that the Cricket Club had delivered what had been expected and that the Positive Futures project was seen as an exemplar by other bodies. Councillor Cranswick agreed to take on board the comment that when considering future projects it would be easier to determine what the outcomes should be.

Some Members were disappointed that other information that Cabinet had been given, as evidenced by some of the responses, had not been included within the report that had been presented on 4 December 2012. Also the Group felt that the report should have included a short summary of the evaluation undertaken by the University of Central Lancashire and not just listed it as a background paper. Councillor Cranswick agreed that the Executive did receive further information and professional advice from officers. He stated that there was a balance between including the relevant points in a report and including everything which would make the document unwieldy. He also pointed out that a further report had been requested by Cabinet to outline the options for diversifying the Positive Futures initiative. He reminded the Group that if in the future it was felt that this project was no longer required then there would be no requirement for the Council to convert the £90,000 per annum.

Following a question the Group was reminded that the interest rate the Council had been, and would be receiving, was at a higher rate than the current standard rate. However, this was not being challenged as part of the Call-In.

In summing up Councillor Boote stressed that Members were discussing the conversion of a loan to a handout, or that is what the comments he had received from the public indicated. In these austere times should the Council be giving nearly a £1,000,000 to a private company, for outcomes that were not measured. In response to Councillor Cranswick the public do not see the difference between capital and revenue money. There are a lot of agencies doing a splendid job in Cotgrave including the Council, Sure Start, football clubs and association. The reduction in crime and anti-social behaviour was clear but this could not be attributed solely to Positive Futures. This arrangement had only come to light at the Cabinet meeting, there had been no consideration by any scrutiny group; there had been no request made when this Group considered the arrangement in July. This meeting was the first opportunity for the Group to consider the conversion of the loan. There was not enough information given on which areas the initiative will be rolled out to or how it will be delivered. It is a lot of money to spend for ill-defined outcomes, it is an act of faith. Members had been given very little facts, figures or confidence that the money was being spent in the right direction. He

wanted to assure the Group that he was not attacking the Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club, cricket, Cotgrave or the people of Cotgrave.

Councillor Cranswick, in summing up, stated that the situation was being misrepresented to people, the Council was not giving money to the Cricket Club but was paying for a service. If it was not bought from the Cricket Club then it would be from someone else. It was not possible to measure all the outcomes but the change in Cotgrave was noticeable. With regard to the grant being considered by the Partnership Delivery Group the request had not been submitted before July and, according to the Constitution, it did not have to be scrutinised first, it could be sent direct to Cabinet. The Positive Futures project was for four years and as yet it had not been clearly defined. It needed further development and consideration with regard to areas and what issues needed to be addressed. The Cabinet had decided that the money would not be spent if the project was not required, although he could not see that this was a possibility. He reminded Members that the Cabinet had requested a further report in order that they could consider future options. Finally he stated that the Cabinet had been criticised for not taking risks, that it should invest more into the Borough and now that it was taking this leap of faith it was still being criticised.

The Chairman reminded the Group of the three options available to them.

- To uphold the Cabinet's decision (the Cabinet decision can now be actioned)
- To agree that the decision breached the decision making principles but not sufficiently to warrant referral back to Cabinet (the Cabinet decision can now be actioned)
- To agree that the decision breached the decision making principles and recommend that the decision be referred back to the next Cabinet meeting. The Scrutiny Group should expressly outline the reasons why it believes the decision making principles have been breached. (Note Cabinet's decision cannot be actioned until Cabinet has reconsidered the decision.)

The Group considered each of the principles. Members felt that the Call-In process had been useful and that in future it could be amended to address the discontent between the Executive and Scrutiny. It was felt that it could have been beneficial for decisions of this nature if the Chairman of the appropriate scrutiny group had been involved in discussions prior to Cabinet's decision.

On being put to the vote the Group agreed that the decision had breached the decision making principle (vi), 'a record of what options were considered and giving the reasons for the decision', it was not sufficient to warrant referral back to Cabinet and therefore the Cabinet decision was upheld.

The meeting closed at 9.00 pm.



PARTNERSHIP DELIVERY GROUP

22 JANUARY 2013

REVIEW OF THE SOUTH NOTTINGHAMSHIRE COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP

4

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF COMMUNITY SHAPING

Summary

This report provides Members with an update on the performance of the Community Safety Partnership in 2012/13. At the meeting Sally Jackson, Partnership Analyst, will provide Members with a presentation on the Partnership's current performance, achievements against priorities, 2013/14 priorities and proposed changes. In addition, Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Group Manager South Joanne Wooler-Ward (representing the Community Safety Partnership) will provide a short presentation on Fire and Rescue service activity. Members will have the opportunity to scrutinise the work of the Partnership.

Recommendation

It is **RECOMMENDED** that the improvements in performance made by the South Nottinghamshire Community Safety Partnership over the past year in reductions in all crime, dwelling burglaries, vehicle crime, anti-social behaviour and robbery be acknowledged.

Details

Partnership Constitution

1. In 2008 the Rushcliffe Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP) merged with the Broxtowe and Gedling CDRPs to create the South Nottinghamshire Community Safety Partnership. The partnership includes Rushcliffe Borough Council, Nottinghamshire Police, Nottinghamshire Police Authority, Nottinghamshire County Council, Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service, the Probation Service, the Primary Care Trust and a number of other non-statutory and voluntary organisations.

Priority areas for 2011-2014

2. It was agreed at a County level that a geographical approach was a much more effective way of dealing with crime and associated/causal issues rather than a thematic approach and the 15 worst performing areas would be eligible for funding. Whilst this approach focussed on specific locations with increased levels of crime, all crime continues to be tackled proactively by the Partnership.
3. A methodology was used to highlight the problematic ward areas in South Nottinghamshire based on the following 7 themes:

- Serious Acquisitive Crime
 - Domestic Abuse
 - Hate Crime
 - Youth Issues
 - Alcohol & Drugs
 - Anti-social behaviour
 - Violence (excluding domestic)
4. The top two ward areas for crime were identified for each of the three local authorities. In Rushcliffe the wards were identified as **Trent Bridge** and **Cotgrave**. Both areas already have a sustained approach to tackling issues of Community Safety through the Area Based Initiatives.

Performance targets for Area Based Initiatives areas and Police Authority targets

5. For each Area Based Initiative (ABI) area (Trent Bridge and Cotgrave) an action plan is in place informed by a problem profile. The Rushcliffe Local Management Group delivers against these plans, monitoring progress, outputs and outcomes. The South Nottinghamshire Executive Group will continue to monitor overall progress.
6. In Trent Bridge the area has been subject to an ABI since April 2010. The ABI group is led by a project officer from Rushcliffe Borough Council. Mainstream activity takes place on the ward area and in addition there is extra policing etc around community and sporting events. The Fire Service have committed to delivering training to all frontline staff to encourage agency referrals of people vulnerable from fire. Work has been targeted towards the significant student population residing in the Trent Bridge Ward as this group is more likely to be a victim of burglary due to insecure properties and possession of high value items. The ABI group has established links with Nottingham Trent University to work with students to reduce the risk of being a victim of crime. Additionally the ABI group has undertaken sustained work with young people in the local area and local businesses to take a proactive approach to reducing the risk of crime.
7. In Cotgrave there has been a significant reduction in crime and anti-social behaviour. This has been achieved through a partnership approach working with young people through Positive Futures and targeting ex-offenders in the area. In addition Metropolitan has also played a role working within the Partnership to ensure that lettings are made sensitively in the area, wherever possible. The focus for the last nine months has been on the sustainability of the existing projects and support has been provided to both the Neighbourhood Watch Group and the newly established Community Speed Watch. Cotgrave came second in the national final of the prestigious Tilley awards, which recognise innovative crime fighting projects where police, community groups and the public successfully work together to identify and tackle local crime problems.
8. In relation to funding, Rushcliffe did not receive any funding via the Central Government Grant via Nottinghamshire County Council as it did not meet the threshold for the 15 worst performing wards across Nottinghamshire. However underspends from previous years have been used to support the priority areas and Locality Management Group as follows:

Table 1- Funding allocation for Rushcliffe

Rushcliffe Priority area funding 2012/13	Amount
Trent Bridge ABI area	£20,000
Cotgrave	£15,000
Rushcliffe Locality Group	£20,000
Domestic Violence Sanctuary Scheme	£6,000

Rushcliffe Performance

9. In addition to the ABI areas above the South Nottinghamshire Community Safety Partnership work with all partners across the Borough towards achieving the Nottinghamshire Police Authority targets for 2012/13 for Rushcliffe which are shown in Table 2 below.

Table 1- Targets set for Rushcliffe for 2012/13

Rushcliffe	2012/13 Volume Target	% Reduction required
All Crime	3,717	-8.0
Violent Crime	626	-8.0
Anti-social behaviour	2,326	-10.0
Reporting of Domestic Incidents	744	+8.0
Domestic Crime	254	-8.0

Table 2- Performance against Targets for Rushcliffe

Crime Group	Annual Target Reduction	End of Year target	Level required after 9 months	Actual after 9 months	% Difference from target	Volume difference from target	Actual change
1. All Crime	-8.0%	3,717	2,788	2,675	-4.0%	-113	-13.0%
2. Violent Crime	-8.0%	626	432	444	2.8%	12	-7.3%
3. Anti-social behaviour	-10.0%	2326	1,745	1,247	-28.5%	-498	-37.8%
4. Reporting of Domestic Incidents	8.0%	744	558	573	2.7%	15	9.1%
5. Domestic Crime	-8.0%	254	191	191	0.3%	1	-9.0%

10. Year to date the greatest reductions are across criminal damage, burglary other and fraud & forgery and year to date there are increases in violence with injury and drug offences. The target is currently in line to be achieved.

Presentation from Group Manager South Joanne Wooler-Ward

11. Joanne Wooler-Ward will be making a presentation to the Partnership Delivery Group on behalf of the Community Safety Partnership which will include:
 - An update on the Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue South Group Community Framework for their Risk Reduction Team.

Financial Comments

In 2012/13 Rushcliffe did not receive any central government area based grant due to no ward being within the top 15 worst performing wards in the County.

If the same methodology is used in Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe will not receive any area based grant funding for the financial year 2013/14. As per our strategic assessment our worst performing ward in Rushcliffe is Trent Bridge and this is currently number 30 of the 171 wards in Nottinghamshire.

Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act

Section 17 is incorporated into all aspects of the work of the Community Safety Partnership.

Diversity

Equality and diversity is incorporated into all aspects of the work of the Community Safety Partnership.

Background Papers Available for Inspection: Nil

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PARTNERSHIPS AND PERFORMANCE

Summary

This report sets out a rolling work programme for the Partnership Delivery Group for 2012/13 based on the areas proposed and supported by the Group during the previous municipal year.

Recommendation

It is **RECOMMENDED** that the Partnership Delivery Group agrees the proposed work programme for 2012/13.

1. The work programme for the Partnership Delivery Group is developed around the corporate priorities that fall within its remit and takes into account the timing of the Group's business in the previous municipal year and any emerging issues and key policy developments that may arise.
2. As part of this agenda item Members are invited to discuss and consider potential questions they would like to raise in relation to the consideration of the Review of Surestart and the Update of the Local Strategic Partnership.
3. The following table sets out the proposed rolling work programme.

Date of Meeting	Item
22 January 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Notts Community Safety Partnership - update (Concentrating on Fire Service and Council activity) • 2 year rolling work programme
19 March 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of Surestart • Update of the Local Strategic Partnership • Annual review of scrutiny • 2 year rolling work programme

Date of Meeting	Item
2 July 2013 Joint meeting with the Community Development Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of service level agreement with RCVS and RCAN • 2 year rolling work programme
1 October 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual review of partnership with Metropolitan Housing Partnership • 2 year rolling work programme
7 January 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual review of partnership with Waterloo Housing Group • Review of the Rushcliffe Action Network • 2 year rolling work programme, including capturing questions for the South Notts Community Safety Partnership
25 March 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Notts Community Safety Partnership - update • 2 year rolling work programme

Financial Comments

No direct financial implications arise from the proposed work programme

Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act

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

Diversity

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

Background Papers Available for Inspection: Nil