



**NOTES
OF THE JOINT MEETING OF THE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GROUP
AND THE
PARTNERSHIP DELIVERY GROUP
TUESDAY 2 JULY 2013**

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

PRESENT:

Councillors Mrs D M Boote, S J Boote, N K Boughton-Smith, R L Butler, H A Chewings, T Combellack, L B Cooper, J E Greenwood, M G Hemsley, R Hetherington, E J Lungley, Mrs M M Males, G R Mallender, Mrs J A Smith, B Tansley (substitute for Councillor Mrs Stockwood), H Tipton (substitute for Councillor Purdue-Horan), T Vennett-Smith

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Councillors J A Cranswick and N C Lawrence

J Colquitt	Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire
J Kirkwood	Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire
J Molineaux	Rushcliffe Community & Voluntary Service
C Perry	Rushcliffe Community & Voluntary Service

OFFICERS PRESENT:

D Banks	Executive Manager - Neighbourhoods
D Hayden	Community Engagement Manager
K Marriott	Executive Manager - Transformation
D Mitchell	Executive Manager - Communities
V Nightingale	Senior Member Support Officer

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

Councillors F A Purdue-Horan and Mrs M Stockwood

1. Appointment of Chairman

Councillor R L Butler was appointed as Chairman for this joint meeting of the two groups.

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillors Combellack and Cooper declared a personal interest with regard to Item 4 – Service Level Agreement with RCVS and RCAN Year 1 Scrutiny.

3. Notes of the Previous Meetings

a) Community Development Group

The notes of the meeting held on Tuesday 9 April 2013 were accepted as a true record. Members noted the responses regarding the actions from that meeting.

Councillor S Boote queried why all businesses did not have to inform the Council of their existence, especially for Business Rates. The Executive Manager - Transformation explained that it was very difficult to collect information on all micro businesses as not everyone was liable for business rates. She stated that if someone worked from home and paid domestic rates then it was unlikely they would pay business rates although if part of their home had been converted solely for business use then business rates might be payable.

b) **Partnership Delivery Group**

The notes of the meeting held on Tuesday 19 March 2013 were accepted as a true record. Members noted the responses regarding the actions from that meeting.

In relation to CCTV officers explained that the Council did not own any fixed cameras and that they were not part of the Council's community safety arrangements. However, if it was felt that there was a demand for cameras then this would be initially assessed by the South Nottinghamshire Community Safety Partnership.

4. **Service Level Agreement with RCVS and RCAN Year 1 Scrutiny**

The Executive Manager - Communities presented a report which outlined the first year of the delivery of the Service Level Agreement with Rushcliffe Community & Voluntary Service and Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire. Previously the Council had an agreement with both organisations, however following scrutiny and Cabinet approval a single agreement had started in 2012. He informed the Group that the Agreement had five key themes and was very detailed. In respect of monitoring the Agreement there was quarterly monitoring by the Executive Manager - Communities and six monthly monitoring by the Cabinet Portfolio Holders for Resources and Community Services. At the annual review meeting with the Cabinet Portfolio Holders they had felt that the two organisations had substantially met all the targets in the Agreement but had requested that more responses were required to validate their surveys. Members had also recognised that parish plans were complex items that could take many months to complete, and that instead of expecting two to be finalised each year that six should be accomplished over the three years. The Group was also informed that as the market town initiative had not been requested from the community it had been agreed to amend this to incorporate additional support for neighbourhood plans. In addition Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire would now be leading on a rural diversification workshop during year two of the Agreement.

Carolyn Perry and Jenny Kirkwood gave a presentation outlining the work of the two organisations and the work undertaken to fulfil the Agreement. Members were informed that:

- Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire had been set up in 1924 to assist and support the rural communities and that it was a county wide organisation. Its main funding was from DEFRA (Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs), other funding comes from

fundraising, Nottinghamshire County Council, Rushcliffe Borough Council, Big Lottery and for undertaking projects and research on behalf of other organisations. They had 17 full time equivalent staff and 74 active volunteers, 11 in the Rushcliffe area. In relation to quality standards they had been accredited with ISO 9001 and achieved ACRE Level 3.

- Rushcliffe Community & Voluntary Service was a Borough wide organisation that had been set up in 1984 to support the establishment of new ideas and infrastructure for the voluntary sector. It was funded by Nottinghamshire County Council, Rushcliffe Borough Council, NHS/PCT, voluntary contributions and for undertaking projects, ie Boots, voluntary transport scheme, etc. Members were informed that for every £1 from Rushcliffe Borough Council an extra £5 was raised by the organisation. There were seven core staff which equated to 3.7 full time equivalents and 11 project staff which equated to 4.9 full time equivalents. In relation to quality standards they had achieved level 2 PQASSO. With regard to voluntary groups they give advice and support on setting up constitutions, health and safety, etc. They assured Members that they only work with groups that have good practices.

Although the two organisations had worked together for many years this Agreement had formalised the relationship. Members were informed of the many community groups, village hall committees and parish councils that had been supported, where help had been given in relation to community led and neighbourhood plans. A map was presented showing all the areas in the Borough where help and support had been given. Officers had recognised that there were gaps in their delivery and this was being addressed. Following a recent survey by the Rushcliffe Community & Voluntary Service it was apparent that there needed to be more promotion of the services available as many groups did not understand what support was on offer. Following a question Members were informed that Rushcliffe Community & Voluntary Service supported a large number of groups, some only short term and a few long term, whereas Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire dealt with fewer groups but mainly on larger, often in depth, projects.

Following a question Members were informed that each organisation monitored its finances carefully and that if the funding was removed then this would have an impact on the services that were available for Rushcliffe residents, however as project work was funded separately this would continue. At present £220,000 of funding was expected including money from the Nottinghamshire County Council's Olympic Legacy fund. It was noted that in these austere times not all funding applications would be successful.

Councillors were concerned that there could be areas of duplication and overlap between Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire and Rushcliffe Community & Voluntary Service and other groups ie Rushcliffe Advice Network. Officers stated that there were good communications between the organisations and signposted people to the most appropriate organisation. By working together it reduced the number of groups who went advice shopping.

Following a question, officers stated that they did not have any concerns regarding a shrinking pool of volunteers as many people were not aware of all the volunteering opportunities there were. Recently more unemployed people were coming forward to volunteer as they still wanted to work.

With regard to volunteers, both organisations used their websites, newsletter and noticeboards to advertise for volunteers however, they were pleased to say that there was not a large turnover in people. One of the most effective methods of recruitment was by word of mouth. Both organisations had a good working relationship with the volunteers, who in turn felt that they were listened to and could contribute.

In relation to the transformation funding officers replied that a part time co-ordinator had been appointed and a joint business plan had been proposed to cover three CVS areas. Groups had been surveyed to ascertain needs and discussions had been held with partners. Officers saw the service equating to a 'triage' for organisations. It was proposed that there would be greater collaboration to deliver more streamlined services. It had always been acknowledged that the funding was time limited, however the trustees could allocate money from the Development fund if they wished.

In respect of communications Members were informed that Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire had mapped all the village/local newsletters and had written an article for inclusion. It was also hoped that parish councils would also signpost people to the two organisations. If demand did increase significantly then resources would have to be considered. However, every request was reviewed to ascertain what resources were required, it was necessary that the group's expectations were managed.

Members queried the number of parish plans that could be undertaken. Officers stated that although there were two per year in the Agreement this was not indicative of the number of Neighbourhood or Community Led Plans that were in existence. Although it was recognised that Local Government was under a financial strain plans could set short, medium or long term goals. It was also recognised that there were more village halls in the area than had been shown on the map, however some did not need help, especially those with fairly new buildings. It was proposed that more information could be disseminated by working together with NAVACH (Nottinghamshire Association of Village and Community Halls).

Following questions regarding the Voluntary Transport Scheme Members were informed that this was carefully monitored. All volunteers were subject to DBS (Disclosure and Barring Service) checks, which had replaced CRB (Criminal Records Bureau) checks. All recipients were also checked for suitability, ie mobility problems and were from all areas of the Borough, although there was not a large need from more rural areas. Also the type of assistance was also monitored as hospital appointments were not allowed. As far as possible drivers were utilised from the same area as the clients.

The Group raised concerns about how the organisations protected the elderly from rogue volunteer groups. Ms Perry stated that any group who worked with

vulnerable members of society had to have enhanced DBS checks. Also if the Rushcliffe Community & Voluntary Service felt that the Group was not appropriate it would not work with them, advertise their services and would contact other colleagues across the County.

Members asked about the work undertaken at the Whatton Prison Visitor Centre and how this benefitted residents of Rushcliffe. Officers stated that funding for this project came from the Ministry of Justice. This funding helped towards the cost of the core services, also some inmates and visitors would be from the area.

With reference to the report Members were informed that three year's funding had been obtained for a befriending service for older people in the area. Nationally it was recognised that loneliness and social isolation in the country's aging population led to health and social care problems. To combat these a project co-ordinator had been appointed and it was envisaged that the project would become sustainable.

Officers recognised that they needed to improve the marketing of their services. Members suggested visiting local village shows, using Facebook and Twitter. It could be investigated if the Council's YouNG group could assist with electronic communications.

With regard to the outcomes for year one of the Agreement Members were informed that the year one targets had largely been met and some exceeded ie the target was to have one to one contact with at least 35 groups, in fact over 100 groups had been supported.

It was AGREED that Members endorsed the Year 1 delivery report of the Service Level Agreement between the Council and Rushcliffe Community Voluntary Service (RCVS) / Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire (RCAN). **(Attached as Appendix 2)**

5. **Annual Work Programme Review**

a) **Community Development Group**

Councillor Lawrence, as the previous Chairman of the Community Development Group, presented the Annual Report which would be forwarded to Council. He stated that this was a fair representation of the work undertaken by the Group.

In respect of the Draft Housing Policy it was felt that the third sentence should be expanded to read – One of the proposals was to reduce the number of people on the waiting list by restricting the eligibility criteria *to only those actually in need for housing.*

Following a discussion regarding the 'Governance of West Bridgford' it was agreed that there was not yet enough evidence that there was a demand for a local council. With regard to the petition for a parish council for Edwalton Village Ward Members were informed that this would be considered by a cross party Cabinet Member Group and not this Group. It was agreed to add the following sentence to the report –

The Group noted that there was not yet enough visible evidence of dissatisfaction with the current arrangement from the people of West Bridgford.

b) Partnership Delivery Group

Councillor Hetherington, as the previous Chairman of the Partnership Delivery Group, presented the Group's Annual Report. He gave a brief highlight of the work undertaken by the Group including the Call In of the Council's arrangements with Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club. Councillor S Boote said that he was pleased to see that there was more information on what would be delivered and how this could be measured. Councillor Butler stated that the Call In had been thoroughly debated and that issues had been highlighted to help the decision making process.

6. Work Programme

a) Community Development Group

The Group discussed the Work Programme. With regard to the Council's relationship with Town and Parish Councils it had been envisaged that parish clerks would be invited to give the Group their opinion on how the relationship could be developed. It was noted that the topic was part of the Group's agenda in March 2014 but this did not preclude the topic from being raised earlier.

Members felt that the Group should consider the delivery of broadband to rural areas as there were a number of concerns about the plan. The Group had received a presentation in January 2012 and it was felt it was appropriate to scrutinise this again.

In relation to the YouNG group officers agreed that this could be considered again. Members felt that there should be as much emphasis put on the arts as was put on sports. Officers stated that the YouNG group had links to sports but also considered other elements.

Following a discussion regarding housing and homelessness Members were informed that this Group had considered the policy of the Choice Based Lettings scheme but that this had now been passed to the Partnership Delivery Group to monitor.

In respect of Bridgford Hall the Group was informed that tenders had been received and that these were commercially sensitive. It was envisaged that a further report would be presented to Cabinet in September 2013.

b) Partnership Delivery Group

The Group considered its work programme. In respect of the South Nottinghamshire Community Safety Partnership Members noted that both the Police and Fire Service had been scrutinised and suggested the Ambulance Service. However, as the Borough would not be

receiving any funding, as none of its wards were in the 'worst 10' wards of the County it was felt that the Group should consider how this would affect service delivery.

Members were reminded that Metropolitan Housing Trust would be scrutinised at their next meeting and were asked to forward any questions to Member Services. It was acknowledged that this would not prevent Members from asking questions at the meeting but was an aide to ensure that partners covered the topics where Members had most concerns.

The meeting closed at 9.10 pm.

Action Sheet

JOINT SCRUTINY MEETINGS - TUESDAY 2 JULY 2013

Minute Number	Actions	Officer Responsible
4. Service Level Agreement with RCVS and RCAN Year 1 Scrutiny	Officers to consider how the YouNG group could help with electronic communication	Executive Manager - Communities
5. a) Annual Report – Community Development Group	The annual report to be amended as agreed by the Group	Member Services
6.a) Work Programme – Community Development Group	Future topics for the Community Development Group to be raised at the next Scrutiny Chairmen and Vice Chairmen's meeting	Member Services