

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

**Our reference:**  
**Your reference:**  
**Date:** 21 June 2013

To all Members of the Partnership Delivery Group

Dear Councillor

A meeting of the PARTNERSHIP DELIVERY GROUP will be held on Thursday 3 October 2013 at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Pavilion Road, West Bridgford to consider the following items of business.

Yours sincerely

Executive Manager Operations and Corporate Governance

### ***AGENDA***

1. Apologies for absence.
2. Declarations of Interest.
3. Notes of the Joint Meeting held on 2 July 2013 (pages 1 – 8).
4. Review of Partnership with Metropolitan Housing

The report of the Executive Manager - Neighbourhoods is attached (pages 9 - 10).

5. Updated List of Partnerships

The report of the Executive Manager - Transformation is attached (pages 11 - 22).

6. Work Programme

The report of the Executive Manager - Operations and Corporate Governance is attached (pages 23 - 24).

### **Membership**

Chairman: Councillor Mrs J A Smith  
Vice-Chairman: Councillor F A Purdue-Horan  
Councillors Mrs D M Boote, H A Chewings, L B Cooper, R Hetherington,  
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 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

## Action Update from the JOINT SCRUTINY MEETING - TUESDAY 2 JULY 2013

Minute Number	Action	Officer Responsible	Response
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	The new cohort of YouNG started in September. Opportunities to include support within the programme is being considered
5. a) Annual Report – Community Development Group	The annual report to be amended as agreed by the Group	Member Services	The report was amended before being presented to Council
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	This was raised by the Democratic Services Manager at the Scrutiny Chairmen and Vice Chairmen's meeting on 15 July 2013

## Report of the Executive Manager - Neighbourhoods

### Summary

Members have requested an annual review of the partnership with Metropolitan the main housing provider in Rushcliffe. The Council has worked closely with Metropolitan in enabling the development of new affordable homes, meeting local housing need through participation in the Choice Based Lettings Scheme and attendance at joint partnership meetings to tackle issues such as anti-social behaviour. Richard Walker (Regional Director) will provide a presentation to Members on performance across key services on behalf of Metropolitan and outline their future plans.

### Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that the Partnership Delivery Group consider and make comments on the presentation made by Metropolitan and endorse the work of the partnership.

### Details

#### Metropolitan

1. Metropolitan is the main provider of social housing within the Rushcliffe area, with around 4,000 properties and are an important partner to the Council. The partnership has strengthened over the last 12 months with the continued development of affordable housing (Cabinet 9/7/13 Agenda Item 5), the adoption of the new Housing Allocations Policy, participation in the Choice Based Lettings Scheme and the innovative work on going on the Cotgrave Masterplan.
2. However the partnership has gone through a recent period of evolution and extensive leadership changes including a new Executive Team and Board which should enable Metropolitan to grow and support its customers. Officers now welcome the new Regional Director and look forward to a more settled period to further develop the partnership.
3. Metropolitan will provide Members with a presentation covering the following areas:
  - Partnership Working and Key Services- including the development of affordable housing, managing voids and allocations (Choice Based Lettings), improving the local housing stock, responsive repairs, the estate inspection programme, customer services and tackling anti-social behaviour

- Income recovery
  - Asset Management
  - Performance on complaints and customer care
  - Sheltered and Supported Housing
  - Communications and resident involvement and recent initiatives to involve residents
  - Customer Services and points of contact for customers and members.
4. In preparation for the Scrutiny Group members were asked to submit questions for discussion with Metropolitan, which have been provided to Metropolitan for their information. These focused on the following topics:
- Under Occupancy (social sector size criteria)
  - Complaints Procedure
5. In addition to their presentation to Members, Metropolitan representatives will take questions on the above and other matters as requested.

#### **Financial Comments**

There are no financial implications to this report

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

Metropolitan are a member of the Community Safety Partnership and work closely with the police and Rushcliffe Borough Council to ensure that S17 is considered within their daily activities.

#### **Diversity**

Metropolitan are committed to the equality and diversity agenda and consider this in all aspects of their work.

**Background Papers Available for Inspection: Nil**

## Report of the Executive Manager - Transformation

### Summary

At the meeting of the Partnership Delivery Group on 19 March 2013, Members agreed that it would be beneficial for the Group to consider the details of all the partnerships that the Council is involved in. It will also assist Members in developing their two year rolling work programme.

### Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Members consider the attached list to assist the development of a prioritised work programme for future meetings.

### Details

1. The attached list contains details of what are considered to be the most significant partnerships. Many of the partnerships listed will be familiar to Members but further information and clarification can be provided at the meeting.
2. Members will note that there are a number of different types of partnership that the Council is involved in: statutory, quasi statutory and voluntary. A number involve the private sector in a contractual relationship but others also include several public sector partners. The Council's role in these partnerships varies according to the terms of reference.
3. At the meeting of the Scrutiny Chairmen and Vice Chairmen on 27 May 2011 Members were of the view that non contractual partnerships where the Council has more of an influencing role and immature contractual partnerships should be scrutinised by Partnership Delivery Group; whereas partnerships of a contractual nature, where the focus should be on performance issues should be considered by the Performance Management Board. This can vary according to the position in the life cycle of the partnership. An example would be the Council's partnership with Glendale Golf which was considered by the Partnership Delivery Group in 2011 to be well established and therefore appropriately scrutinised by Performance Management Board. When this partnership nears the end of its contractual term, then the development of the new partnership will be scrutinised by the Partnership Delivery Group.
4. The role of the Partnership Delivery Group is to scrutinise the development of partnerships and where there are any concerns, regarding the way partnerships are working and the quality of the relationships.

**Financial Comments**

The financial input to the partnership from the Council, where applicable, is referenced in the table below.

**Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act**

The Council has a statutory requirement to be part of a community safety partnership and this is one of the partnerships that is scrutinised on an annual basis.

**Diversity**

The partnership that the Council has with Rushcliffe Community and Voluntary Service (RCVS) supports the Council in its equality commitments. RCVS co-ordinates a network of equality and diversity related groups, now called "Rushcliffe Together" (formerly Rushcliffe Community Cohesion Network). Rushcliffe Together meet several times a year and can act as consultation group for the Council when required as well as a conduit to hard to reach community groups.

**Background Papers Available for Inspection: Nil**

## Significant Partnership Arrangements – October 2013

Item	Service	Partners	Partnership coverage	Rushcliffe BC financial input £	Financial monitoring and governance arrangements	Performance monitoring arrangements	Type of partnership
1.	Recycling2go	Nottinghamshire County Council and other Nottinghamshire districts	Waste collection and disposal arrangements	No direct funding	Waste Partnership Board with Cabinet Portfolio representation	Waste Partnership Board with Cabinet Portfolio representation	Voluntary Partnership
2.	Waste and Fleet	Nottinghamshire County Council and other Nottinghamshire districts and the City Council	Nottinghamshire vehicle consortium	No direct funding	Quarterly meetings of Nottinghamshire Transport Managers with a signed partnership agreement agreed by Chief Executives	Through Nottinghamshire Waste Officers	Voluntary Partnership
3.	Strategic Housing	Metropolitan	Affordable homes capital development programme	Rushcliffe Borough Council provided £691,729 from 2009/10 to 2011/12. Investment from the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) and Metropolitan in the same period was £2.95m	Monitored by Executive Manager and through quarterly strategic development meetings	Monitored through performance indicators (LINS24).	Contractual Partnership as part of Large Scale Voluntary Transfer

Item	Service	Partners	Partnership coverage	Rushcliffe BC financial input £	Financial monitoring and governance arrangements	Performance monitoring arrangements	Type of partnership
4.	Strategic Housing	Midlands Rural Housing, Waterloo Housing Group	Trent Valley Partnership – affordable housing development in rural villages	Roughly £10k per unit in grant. Matched by funding from Waterloo and HCA. 55 Homes completed to date in six villages. Pay £1k per annum. towards costs of Rural Housing Enabler.	Trent Valley Partnership meets quarterly, and Midlands Rural Housing run an annual steering group (covering larger area than Rushcliffe)	Rural affordable housing developments contribute to LINS24	Voluntary
5.	Strategic Housing	Gedling and Broxtowe Borough Councils, housing associations	Choice Based Lettings, housing register and homelessness software	The budget for 2013/14 is £26.7k with a contribution of £12k from the partnership (Net £14.7k) however some variation in project costs	Budget held by Broxtowe Borough Council. Monthly steering group meetings.	Monitored through individual Local Authority local performance indicators	Voluntary Partnership



Item	Service	Partners	Partnership coverage	Rushcliffe BC financial input £	Financial monitoring and governance arrangements	Performance monitoring arrangements	Type of partnership
6.	Community Safety	Nottinghamshire County Council, Gedling, Broxtowe, Police, Fire, Primary Care Trust	South Notts Community Safety Partnership  Brings together the former Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships of Rushcliffe, Gedling and Broxtowe	£11,200 in 2013/14 main stream council funding	Broxtowe Borough Council manages partnership finance. Governance arrangements are via the Partnership Business Support Group (for the South Notts Community Safety Partnership).  NB In 2012/13 and in 2013/14 Rushcliffe will receive no Partnership funding	Through Community Safety Partnership Group  Scrutinised by the Partnership Delivery Group	Statutory Partnership
7.	Parking and car park management	Nottinghamshire County Council and private sector contractor NSL	Decriminalised Parking Enforcement	Anticipated to be broadly cost neutral. Deficit of £12k for 2008-12 (Paid in 2012/13). With a nil deficit for 2012/13.	Through legal agreement with Nottinghamshire County Council	Regular Board meetings and through monitoring the contract  Annual performance reported to the Performance Management Board	Contractual Partnership

Item	Service	Partners	Partnership coverage	Rushcliffe BC financial input £	Financial monitoring and governance arrangements	Performance monitoring arrangements	Type of partnership
8.	Rushcliffe sustainable communities strategy	Community Safety Partnership, Rushcliffe Community and Voluntary Service (RCVS), Public Health Nottinghamshire, Central College local business representatives, Nottinghamshire Police, Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue.	Rushcliffe Communities Strategy	£8,800 in 2013/14  Plus revenue contribution from Public Health Nottinghamshire of £9K per annum	Financial management is carried out using the Council's usual monitoring and recording systems. All expenditure is separately identified. Other than staff wages, there is only a small operating budget. The Reward Grant will be managed through the Community Development Team in line with spending approval by the Strategic Partnership	The Board and Executive Group have closed this year.  Four themes groups supported by the Community Development and Neighbourhoods teams, which are Health, Business, Children and Young People and Community Safety.  Scrutinised by the Partnership Delivery Group	Statutory Strategy  Voluntary Partnership

Item	Service	Partners	Partnership coverage	Rushcliffe BC financial input £	Financial monitoring and governance arrangements	Performance monitoring arrangements	Type of partnership
9.	Community Development with emphasis on young people	Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club, Nottingham Rugby Club	Positive Futures, Childhood Obesity Health project and schools, community coaching and club support	Cricket Club loan/grant to help fund new stand linked to item 10. Contribution to Nottingham Rugby of £10,000 in 2013/14, £5,000 in 2014/15	Service Level Agreements in place to cover service delivery	Written annual reports produced. Programme delivery meetings held. Scrutiny through the Partnership Delivery Group	Contractual Partnership
10.	Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club	Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club	Funding support for continuation of Test Match status to provide local economic benefits	Loan 1&2 £214,500 Further £1.23m loaned in 2007 of which £450k converted to grant 2012/13	Repayment of principal and Interest managed by Finance	Conversion of a loan to grant linked to achievement of performance outcomes by Positive Futures	Contractual
11.	Seamless customer services	Nottinghamshire Police, Bingham Town Council. Contact centre to move to Bingham Health Centre in November 2013	Central West Bridgford customer service centre and rural customer contact points	Capital Budget funded new Rushcliffe Community Contact Centre within West Bridgford Police Station.	Projects teams and Boards established at Rushcliffe and with Nottinghamshire Police	A Cabinet Member Group oversaw the development of customer services	Quasi Contractual Partnership

Item	Service	Partners	Partnership coverage	Rushcliffe BC financial input £	Financial monitoring and governance arrangements	Performance monitoring arrangements	Type of partnership
12.	Seamless customer services	Metropolitan Housing	Central West Bridgford customer service centre and rural customer contact points	Metropolitan Housing contributes one FTE salary (£22,100 for 2013/14) to deliver their face to face service.	Contract in place to cover service delivery	Ad hoc	Contractual
13.	Communities	Nottingham City Council Nottinghamshire County Council Ashfield District Council, Broxtowe, Gedling and Erewash Borough Council, Home And Communities Agency	Development of aligned Local Development Frameworks for the Greater Nottingham Housing Market area. Growth Point activity.	Officer time  Rushcliffe Borough Council benefits from economy of scale and shared expertise	Officer steering group and Joint Planning Advisory Board with Cabinet Portfolio representatives	Joint Planning Advisory Board with Cabinet Portfolio representatives. Local Development Framework group.	Voluntary (but strongly advised) Sub regional
14.	Safeguarding Children	Nottinghamshire County Council and other Nottinghamshire districts	Nottinghamshire Local Authority Safeguarding Children Partnership	Officer time	Partnership reports to Nottinghamshire Safeguarding Children Board. All partners have a duty to co-operate. External review by Ofsted	Organised by Nottinghamshire County Council – completion of S11 compliance report	Quasi Statutory Partnership

Item	Service	Partners	Partnership coverage	Rushcliffe BC financial input £	Financial monitoring and governance arrangements	Performance monitoring arrangements	Type of partnership
15.	Leisure Facilities	Parkwood Leisure	Management of Leisure Centres in Rushcliffe	Management Fee £383,892 2012/13 Actual. £451,600 2013/14 Budget	Written contract with Parkwood. Financial monitoring is through the Borough's normal budget procedures. Monthly contract and quarterly partnership board meetings	Annual report to the Performance Management Board	Contractual
16.	East Leake Leisure Centre	Carillon, Nottinghamshire County Council, East Leake Schools Ltd	Leisure Centre and School Private Finance Initiative (PFI)	Annual support cost including all building costs £440,113 Actual £460,600 Budget (2012/13). 2013/14 budget £460,600	General contract management including monthly contract and quarterly partnership board meetings	Annual report to the Performance Management Board	Contractual
17.	Edwalton Golf Course	Glendale Golf	Management of Golf course and associated social functions	Income received from Glendale £91,892 Actual £93,350 Budget (2012/13). 2013/14 budget £99,900.	General contract management including monthly contract meetings	Annual report to the Performance Management Board	Contractual
18.	Payroll	Gedling Borough Council	Provision of payroll services	£46,300 in 2013/14  RBC benefits from improved efficiency and resilience	Service Level Agreement in place to cover service delivery.	Regular monthly meetings with operational staff	Contractual

Item	Service	Partners	Partnership coverage	Rushcliffe BC financial input £	Financial monitoring and governance arrangements	Performance monitoring arrangements	Type of partnership
19.	Emergency Planning	Nottinghamshire County Council	Provision of emergency planning support	£27,000 for 2013/14  Rushcliffe Borough Council benefits from improved efficiency and resilience	Service Level Agreement in place to cover service delivery	Quarterly review of arrangements with Nottinghamshire County Council	Contractual
20.	Emergency Planning	Newark & Sherwood District Council (N&SDC)	Local Resilience Forum – N&SDC Chief executive acts as the local authority representative on the forum.	£600 per annum	Service Level Agreement in place to cover service delivery	Annual review	Contractual
21.	Business Rate Pooling	Nottinghamshire County Council and other Nottinghamshire districts	Joint treatment of business rate income collection	All Business Rate income is processed through the Pool.	Agreement in place	Via monthly meetings of the Notts Finance Officers Group (normal attendee Executive Manager – Finance and Commercial)	Statutory Pool agreed by Department for Communities and Local Government. Membership to be reconfirmed on an annual basis.

Item	Service	Partners	Partnership coverage	Rushcliffe BC financial input £	Financial monitoring and governance arrangements	Performance monitoring arrangements	Type of partnership
22.	East Midlands LawShare	5 law firms – Browne Jacobson, Anthony Collins, DLA Piper, Freeth Cartwright and Weightmans plus 59 other authorities	Provision of legal services	No fee for membership; discounted hourly rates for legal services purchased (without obligation).	Administered by Nottinghamshire County Council and Steering Group	Steering Group (no Rushcliffe Borough Council member)	Contractual/consortium.
23.	Neighbourhoods	Nottinghamshire County Council and other Nottinghamshire districts	Provision of Preventative Adaptation and Handy Persons services (HPAS)	£8.8k Actual 2012/13 - can vary due to number of referrals	Memorandum of understanding in place to cover service delivery arrangements	Steering Group meets quarterly	Contractual
24.	ICT	Broxtowe Borough Council, Newark and Sherwood District Council, Rushcliffe Borough Council	ICT service – Shared Chief Information Officer (CIO)	£20,000/year	Monthly meeting with Chief Executives	Monthly meeting with Chief Executives	Contractual
25.	ICT	Broxtowe Borough Council, Newark and Sherwood District Council, Rushcliffe Borough Council	Shared ICT service delivery manager	Income of £21,900	ICT service delivery manager reports to CIO who meets with Chief Executives monthly	ICT service delivery manager reports to CIO who meets with Chief Executives monthly	Contractual
26.	ICT – Transformational government group	Nottinghamshire County Council, Nottingham City Council, all 7 Nottinghamshire district councils	Wider ICT agenda – making ICT ready so ICT is not a barrier to working together	No financial commitment	Reports to the Chief Executives' Group	Reports to the Chief Executives' Group	Contractual

Item	Service	Partners	Partnership coverage	Rushcliffe BC financial input £	Financial monitoring and governance arrangements	Performance monitoring arrangements	Type of partnership
27.	Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club	Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club	Funding support for continuation of Test Match status to provide local economic benefits	Loan 1&2 £214,500 Further £1.23m loaned in 2007 of which £450k converted to grant 2012/13	Repayment of principal and Interest managed by Finance	Conversion of a loan to grant linked to achievement of performance outcomes by Positive Futures	Contractual
28.	Communities Nature Conservation	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Provision of Wildlife Conservation services within Rushcliffe	£15,750 in 2013/14	Service Level Agreement in place to cover service delivery	Regular meetings via the Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group and annual report	Contractual
29.	Community Development	Rushcliffe Community Voluntary Service, Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire	Deliver infrastructure services to voluntary and community groups, support town and parish councils and assist the Council in implementing its Equality scheme	Three annual payments of £78,741 between 2012 and 2015.	Service Level Agreements (SLA) in place to cover service delivery	Quarterly reporting of SLA delivery, with a six month performance review attended by all parties and the Cabinet portfolio holder for Resources.  Annual scrutiny of the partnership by the Partnership Delivery Group.	Contractual



**Report of the Executive Manager - Operations and Corporate Governance**

**Summary**

This report sets out a rolling work programme for the Partnership Delivery Group for 2013/14 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 review of the Waterloo Housing Group.
3. The following table sets out the proposed rolling work programme.

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<b>Item</b>
3 October 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual review of partnership with Metropolitan Housing Partnership</li> <li>• Review of Partnerships</li> <li>• 2 year rolling work programme, including capturing questions for the Waterloo Housing Group</li> </ul>
7 January 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual review of partnership with Waterloo Housing Group</li> <li>• Review of the Rushcliffe Advice Network</li> <li>• 2 year rolling work programme, including capturing questions for the South Notts Community Safety Partnership</li> </ul>
25 March 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Notts Community Safety Partnership - update</li> <li>• 2 year rolling work programme</li> </ul>

**Financial Comments**

No direct financial implications arise from the proposed work programme

**Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act**

In the delivery of its work programme the Group supports delivery of the Council's Section 17 responsibilities 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 commitment to meet the diverse needs of the community.

**Background Papers Available for Inspection: Nil**