

MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
CORPORATE OVERVIEW GROUP
TUESDAY, 7 NOVEMBER 2023

Held at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road, West
Bridgford

and live streamed on [Rushcliffe Borough Council's YouTube channel](#)

PRESENT:

Councillors T Combellack (Chair), A Edyvean, P Gowland, L Plant, R Walker
and L Way

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

C Caven-Atack Service Manager - Corporate Services
E Richardson Democratic Services Officer

APOLOGIES:

Councillors G Williams

16 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of Interest.

17 Minutes of the meeting held on 5 September 2023

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 September 2023 were approved as a true record and were signed by the Chairman.

18 Financial and Performance Management

The Senior Business Partner presented the Q2 position for the Council's financial and performance monitoring for 2023/24.

The Senior Business Partner summarised the position and said that the projected outturn for revenue had worsened with the predicted budget efficiency of £0.55m now sitting at £0.287m for 2023/24. She said that this was mostly due to due to Rushcliffe Oaks Crematorium, with a half yearly review indicating that projected performance would be £310k less than budget. She said that there had also been a reduction in demand for planning services in relation to new developments which had led to a £259k under recovery of income.

The Senior Business Partner said that there was some offset against efficiency loss from utilities savings as the original budget had been set pessimistically at the height of uncertainty to allow tolerance in price volatility and the Council was now able to release £183k of that. She said that capital underspend had increased from £6.457m to £9.292m with the Council looking to rephase £7.068m of that, leaving £2.224m.

The Vice Chair of Governance Scrutiny Group referred to the reported reduction in usage in crematoria across the region and the Senior Business Partner said that whilst it was difficult to predict death rates, there was some seasonality with fewer deaths during the warmer months and that covid-19 may have led to some people dying earlier than predicted.

Members of the Group referred to grounds maintenance costs. The Senior Business Partner said that when originally considered as part of the budget setting it had been thought that the works could be provided within existing Streetwise resource, however now that Streetwise had been brought inhouse and the Crematorium had opened, the Council had more information about ongoing maintenance and it had been determined that increased staffing and equipment was required. She explained that some of the costs related to vehicle hire from contracts established prior to the Council bringing Streetwise inhouse and it was predicted that costs would reduce once those obligations had expired. The Crematorium Manager was looking at how costs could be reduced whilst continuing to deliver a high standard of service.

The Chair of Governance Scrutiny Group noted that much work had been done in raising awareness of the facility with funeral directors and suggested that this be replicated in the community. The Communications and Customer Services Manager confirmed that the Council was currently preparing communications to raise awareness and engage with residents, including a video on the Council's Youtube channel highlighting that the facility had a comfort dog called Maizie.

The Vice Chair of Governance Scrutiny Group noted the underspend for registered housing providers and the Senior Business Partner referred the Group to paragraph 4.10 of the Social Housing Models report which was presented to the Communities Scrutiny Group on 5 October 2023 which provided information in relation to the budget, housing needs and strategies.

The Vice Chair of Communities Scrutiny Group asked about total payments to the Development Corporation and The Senior Business Partner said that she would provide an update for the Group.

The Vice Chair of Communities Scrutiny Group noted that there were a number of acronyms in the reports, including BLC (Bingham Leisure Centre), HUG (Home Upgrade Grant) and LAD3 (Local Authority Delivery Grant). The Senior Business Partner said that she would provide information about how the HUG and LAD3 grant monies were used.

The Group referred to plans for a traveller site and it was noted that there was need for a permanent site within the Borough as not having this provision left the Council open to challenge.

The Vice Chair of Governance Scrutiny Group referred to special expenses and asked how these were decided and what the annuity charges were for West Bridgford. The Senior Business Partner said that there was a Special Expenses Group which made decisions about some special expenditure and that capital programmes, such as for the Abbey Road fencing, went through the budget setting process. She said that she would provide information in

writing about the annuity charges.

The Chairman asked whether the savings from staff vacancies would disappear when agency staff were employed and the Senior Business Partner confirmed that they were real savings arising from circumstances such as posts not being backfilled or from gaps between staff leaving and new recruits coming into post.

The Chairman asked about S106 monies and commitments not yet identified and the Senior Business Partner said that some of these were linked to rephasing of affordable housing and Bingham Leisure Centre which was delayed.

The Chair of Growth and Development Scrutiny Group referred to the percentage of household planning applications processed within target times and asked how many people comprised the delayed 29.2%. He asked for information on how long any delays were for and whether the Council had sufficient planning staff to meet the targets. The Communications and Customer Services Manager said that he would report back to the Group.

It was **RESOLVED** that The Corporate Overview Group considered:

- a) the expected revenue budget efficiency for the year of £0.287m and proposals to earmark this for cost pressures (para 4.1);
- b) the projected capital budget efficiencies of £9.292m including the re-profiling of provisions totalling £6.068m to 2024/25 and £1m to 2025/26 (para 4.7);
- c) the expected outturn position of £12.3k overspend for Special Expenses (para 4.5);
- d) identified exceptions to judge whether further information is required.

19 **Annual Customer Feedback Report 2022/23**

The Service Manager Corporate Services presented the Annual Customer Feedback Report for 2022/23 and explained that this provided information about complaints and compliments received by the Council about the services that it delivered.

The Service Manager Corporate Services summarised that there were no matters which caused alarm and that the overall picture was one of steadiness and stability. She noted that due to previous turnover of staff in the Planning Team the Council had had an issue with a number of complaints related to planning but that following training those issues appeared to have been addressed. She said that a complaint which had been referred to the Local Government Ombudsman had related to planning and the Council had been found to be at fault and as such had issued a letter of apology and paid £200 compensation.

The Chair of Growth and Development Scrutiny Group said the data showed

that performance was excellent and the Chairman echoed these sentiments and congratulated the Council.

It was **RESOLVED** that this report was scrutinised and, subject to any comment, was accepted as a true record of customer feedback in 2022/23.

20 **Corporate Strategy**

The Service Manager Corporate Services presented the Corporate Strategy Report and explained that a very draft form of the Strategy had been brought to the previous Corporate Overview Group meeting in September, including information from the public consultation, after which it had been opened up for consultation with Councillors. She said that the Corporate Strategy presented today was believed to be near final and following review this evening, was due to be presented to Cabinet next week before moving to Full Council in December.

The Vice Chair of Communities Scrutiny Group raised concern about the first recommendation of the report which asked the Group to consider the results of the Councillor's consultation as she did not think that that sufficient information had been included in the report for this to be approved. The Group asked that the Service Manager for Corporate Services feedback that it would have been helpful for the Group to have seen the responses from Councillors.

The Vice Chair of Communities Scrutiny Group referred to the fact that the papers for Cabinet, including this version of the Corporate Strategy, had already been published before the Group had had chance to comment on it, which did not create a positive perception. Members of the Group echoed these comments but suggested that it would still be possible for this Group to feedback and make recommendations for Cabinet to consider.

The Service Manager Corporate Services said that the publishing of the Cabinet papers had been a technicality and that the report to Cabinet was clear that the Strategy was being considered by Corporate Overview Group this evening and that any recommendations from the Group would be verbally presented to the Cabinet meeting. She confirmed that there was then a month between Cabinet and Council for any recommended changes to be made.

The Service Manager Corporate Services said that it would be possible to remove the first recommendation, 'A', from the report if the Group agreed for this to be done.

The Vice Chair of Growth and Development Scrutiny Group expressed surprise that only four responses to the consultation had been received from Councillors, one of which was from a political party. The Service Manager Corporate Services confirmed that Councillors had been notified about the consultation through emails, Councillors Connections and through discussion at this Group. She said that the matter of one response being from a political party had not skewed the results.

The Vice Chair of Governance Scrutiny Group asked about home and hybrid working practices at the Council and the Service Manager Corporate Services

said that this came under the remit of the Head of Paid Service and was an internal, operational, matter rather than an outward, corporate, practice and as such it wasn't included in the Strategy. She confirmed that the Council had facilitated for its staff to be able to work from any location and that working remotely did not impact on staff being able to complete all aspects of their job. She said that the Council had support systems in place for staff to communicate wherever they were working and that staff could communicate via live chat groups, even when taking a phone call, so that they could seek support at all times.

The Vice Chair of Growth and Development Scrutiny Group asked about the five Council Leisure Centres and the Service Manager Corporate Services confirmed that the Council had Rushcliffe Arena, Bingham Arena, Cotgrave Leisure Centre, Keyworth Leisure Centre and East Leake Leisure Centres. She said that East Leake Leisure Centre would come back under the Council's control in 2027 with a stipulation that it be returned to the Council in the same condition as it was given and as such the handover should not result in a significant financial implication for the Council.

The Chair of Growth and Development Scrutiny Group referred to terminology in the document in relation to delivery of some targets, such as 'to support' and 'be an active partner' and thought that more direct language, such as 'implementation' could be used. The Service Manager Corporate Services said that the wording for various tasks had been designed to differentiate between tasks within the control of the Council and those where it was an influencing partner. As a result, those which were outside of its control were more to ensure that the Council kept them in focus as they had a wider importance for the Borough. The Chair of Growth and Development Scrutiny Group asked that Cabinet reflect on the wording for the delivery and measurement of the various targets.

The Vice Chair of Governance Scrutiny Group referred to mention of benefits for the Council and suggested that this be reworded to reflect that the actions of Council had led to an increased benefit for residents, that through its interactions the Council had ensured that Rushcliffe residents benefited in some way in which they wouldn't otherwise have done so.

The Chairman confirmed that the Group agreed to remove recommendation A and suggested updated wording for the two recommendations, as recorded below. The Chairman asked that comments from the Group's discussion be put forward to Cabinet to provide background to the updates.

It was **RESOLVED** that that the Corporate Overview Group:

- b) considered the draft Corporate Strategy for 2024-2027 and;
- c) endorsed the design of the Corporate Strategy 2024-2027 and forwarded it to Cabinet for consideration and reflection upon the wording.

The Chairman fed back on behalf of the Chair of Communities Scrutiny Group who had commented that Officers were often regurgitating information from their reports. The Deputy Chair of Communities Scrutiny Group added that there was also occasion when Officers had not fully addressed the questions asked on the matrix.

The Chair of Growth and Development Scrutiny Group said that the degree of Officer introduction could depend on the complexity of information being reported with some information requiring longer presentation and he welcomed the addition of the matrices to reports to allow Councillors opportunity to assess points raised. He said that the Chair's briefings also gave opportunity to evaluate the reports and level of introduction required.

The Chairman said that it was often preferential for Officers to focus on expansion of key points in the report via verbal update.

The Chair of Governance Scrutiny Group said that it was possible for Committees to invite Cabinet members and external and expert bodies to attend meetings to provide information where relevant.

The Service Manager said that training was being provided for Officers in relation to writing reports for scrutiny.

The Chairman said that this discussion highlighted how scrutiny was an ever evolving process and encouraged Members to attend scrutiny training offered by East Midlands Councils. Information about the free, virtual, Scrutiny Skills sessions provided by East Midlands Councils would be circulated to Members after the meeting.

The Chair of Governance Scrutiny Group reported that the last meeting reviewed the Internal Audit and Risk Management reports and said that a Member Working Group looking at the Constitution had been set up. He noted that the Asset Management Plan would now report to Governance Scrutiny in February due to changes in EPC ratings linked to the type of energy used which required additional work in reviewing the Plan.

The Chair of Growth and Development Scrutiny Group reported that the last meeting had reviewed how the Council planned for infrastructure growth, noting that the process involved long period forward planning which meant that it was less adaptable to short term change, and had included discussion about elements of infrastructure not in place. He reported that the Group had also reviewed the Council's Growth Boards and had approved changing focus towards holding task and finish delivery boards as determined by the Strategic Growth Board rather than holding set geographical boards.

The Chairman said that Members submitting questions in advance of Group meetings where possible helped Officers to provide answers and information.

The Chairman noted that scrutiny matrices no longer provided Officer recommendation as to whether they proceed so as not to influence outcomes and enable better discussion.

22 **Feedback from Lead Officers**

There was no feedback to report.

23 **Consideration of Scrutiny Group Work Programmes**

The Chairman explained that due to the fulsome nature of the agenda and number of matrices submitted two minutes' presentation and five minutes' discussion was allowed to ensure that there was time for the Group to review them all.

The Vice Chair of Growth and Development Scrutiny Group presented the matrix for Retrospective Planning Applications. She explained that she had been involved in a number of retrospective planning applications recently where she had wondered whether they would have been allowed to go ahead if submitted before being built. She said that she had submitted the matrix to know more about how retrospective applications were accepted by the planning department and the process that they went through in reviewing and determining an application.

Members of the Group agreed with the sentiment behind the matrix but thought that this may be a question that could be answered through a briefing note in the first instance.

The Service Manager Corporate Services explained that Officers recommendation would be that as the scrutiny matrix was seeking information that wasn't currently known, it would be appropriate to put those questions to Officers. She said that if a matter related to something which a wider group of Councillors would benefit from knowing then training may be appropriate. She said that if something did not relate to a problem, perhaps in service delivery, or a matter where a tangible outcome could be achieved then it was not a matter for scrutiny.

The Vice Chair of Growth and Development Scrutiny Group said that it was a series of questions and thought that training would be required to enable a two-way dialogue.

Members of the Group said that there was some perception by residents that there were people who abused the system and said that there would be value in holding a training session to inform and better equip Councillors to challenge those perceptions.

The Vice Chair of Growth and Development Scrutiny Group expressed concern that a training session may not be well attended and said that it was also possible that training would identify aspects that may appear to not be working well, hence her final bullet point about improving the system.

The Service Manager Corporate Services informed the Group that if a matrix had been approved through the Corporate Overview Group and had been through the scrutiny process, then unless the recommendation of the Scrutiny Group was for it to return for further information the matter was considered to have been addressed and could not return within the two year period. She

said, however, that if the matter was referred for example to be answered through a briefing note or training session in the first instance and had not been through the scrutiny process then a matrix could be re-submitted within the two years.

The Group agreed for this item to be addressed through training.

Councillor Billin joined the meeting to present the matrix for Local Power Generation. He said that his question related to clean energy generation and how the Council could become the nucleus of an urban solar farm, such as on rooftops and carparks and unproductive spaces from an energy perspective. He said that he saw this as starting with assets that the Council controlled or had an influence and then widening to other stakeholders across the whole Borough. He said that to achieve net zero a significant increase in non-fossil fuel energy would be required and he wanted Rushcliffe to be an exemplar and join the many other Council's involved in this work.

The Chair of Growth and Development Scrutiny Group referred to the second bullet point of the matrix and Councillor Billin said that achieving a Rushcliffe wide solar farm would require many entities to participate and he wanted to look at how the Council could provide information and become the nucleus to generate wider involvement, to identify barriers to the Council facilitating a not-for profit enterprise. He clarified that he was not proposing that the Council become an energy seller.

Members of the Group noted that the Council did not as yet have policy in place relating to this matter and as such there was nothing to be scrutinised. The Chairman thought that the Council was reviewing its estate in relation to energy generation and noted that the Council's Carbon Management Plan was timetabled to come through scrutiny in March next year.

The Vice Chair of Governance Scrutiny Group asked whether the proposal could be brought forward as a motion and the Service Manager for Corporate Service said that careful wording be required along with consideration of what was within the role and remit of the Council to do.

The Group noted that the Council had agreed a supplementary planning document which although not mandatory provided advice and guidance and said that the Council could use its influence to encourage central government to put legislation in place and to persuade the public where possible.

The Service Manager Corporate Services said that the Council's Carbon Management Plan included reference to installing solar panels on car park canopies and the tops of buildings and said that the scrutiny review in March could look at how far the Plan addressed these proposals.

The Group agreed that this item would not move forward to scrutiny as there were other avenues to be pursued.

The Vice Chair of Communities Scrutiny Group presented the matrix for To clarify and review Rushcliffe's local offer for care leavers. She did not think that many Councillors knew that the Council had a local offer for care leavers and

said that while elements of the matrix could be addressed through training, it was crucial that Councillors had information about the services offered by the Council in dealing with this vulnerable group of people. She referred to the Council passing a motion that it supported treating care experience as a protected characteristic and said that scrutiny was required to assess whether Council policy established four years ago was working and what impact it was having.

The Service Manager Corporate Service said that feedback from Officers involved in this service area advised that scrutiny at the current time would detract from work involved in the delivery of the additional items put forward as part of the motion to Council. She said that the County Council were also in the process of scrutinising the delivery of the care leavers policy across the whole of Nottinghamshire and that Rushcliffe Borough Council was participating in that review. She said that Officer recommendation would be to provide information to Councillors at this point in time.

The Chair of Growth and Development Scrutiny Group asked whether it would be possible to agree it as a suitable item for scrutiny without agreeing when would be appropriate for it to come forward. The Service Manager Corporate Services said that Officers could make a note internally that Councillors would like to scrutinise this policy at the appropriate time, for example when it came up for renewal and pending the outcome of the County Council review.

The Group agreed that more information or training was required for Councillors in the first instance and agreed that while the policy was suitable for scrutiny, this was not the right time for it to take place.

Councillor Thomas joined the meeting to present the matrix for Housing density in new housing sites. She said that housing density determined how much land was required for a certain amount of housing, which was critical to the Council's calculations for planning allocations. She said that she had reviewed these calculations and had found that them to not be accurate in determining how many houses would actually be delivered on a site, which caused upset for residents when more were delivered than proposed at initial stages. She said that the Council did not have a policy for managing housing density.

The Service Manager Corporate Services explained that this item had been considered by Corporate Overview Group previously which had determined that it was appropriate for it to be addressed through a briefing note initially and that as the matrix had been expanded on, it was acceptable for it to be considered for scrutiny now.

The Service Manager Corporate Services said that Officer recommendation was that this was a planning matter rather than a matter for scrutiny and was something that would go through the Local Delivery Framework (LDF) Group.

The Chair of Governance Scrutiny Group said that the Council did have related policies for example on garden size and whilst this may not be a matter for scrutiny, answers to the questions raised were required.

Councillor Thomas said that when sites came up for housing they went into a

SHLAA which calculated how much housing was required for the Council to meet its housing provision targets. She said that it was highly inaccurate and inefficient and noted that some other Councils had policies in place which set out gross density allowed in various areas.

The Chairman informed the Group that there had been some discussion about this matter at a recent LDF Group as part of a Council design code or guide. Members of the Group agreed that it would be more appropriate for this item to be taken forward through the LDF Group.

Councillor Thomas questioned whether the LDF Group would cover this aspect of policy in this depth and expressed concern about it being subsumed and buried within the design code. She hoped for it to be included as a stand-alone part of the Core Strategy, specifying density across different sites in different parts of the Borough and how that related to land usage. She said that it underpinned housing delivery within the Borough.

The Vice Chair of Growth and Development Scrutiny Group said that this also related to the matter of open spaces management.

The Chairman said that she would write to the Chairman of the LDF Group setting out the points raised by Councillor Thomas and ask that he invite her to attend a meeting.

Councillor Thomas presented the matrix for Parking provision funded by Rushcliffe. She said that this arose from discussion about parking in Bingham which highlighted questions about the Council's process for parking across the Borough. Councillor Thomas said that it would be beneficial to look at parking holistically, including the Council's role in provision, external partners, gaps in provision and to assess equitability, charging and payments.

Members of the Group supported taking this proposal forward for scrutiny. The Vice Chair of Governance Scrutiny Group asked said that it would be good to include information about ticketing, pricing, enforcement and the decision making process of the Council.

The Service Manager for Corporate Services said that Officers would recommend that this was not a suitable item for scrutiny at this point in time. She said that the Council had an Offstreet Parking Strategy in place which covered most of the points raised by Councillor Thomas and which had been approved by Cabinet in March 2023. She highlighted that Strategy set out the Council's approach to parking across the Borough which was tailored to meet the different requirements of the different areas.

The Service Manager for Corporate Services referred the Group to paragraph 4.1 of the matrix and said that the Corporate Overview Group was tasked with setting the scrutiny work programmes based on the Cabinet Forward Plan. She said that the offstreet Car Parking Strategy would return to the Cabinet Forward Plan for review in the future and that it would be appropriate to consider it for scrutiny at that point. She said that scrutiny now would divert Council resources directed at resolving parking in Bingham.

The Group agreed that this item be placed on scrutiny work programme for two years' time.

Councillor Thomas presented the matrix for Sustainable Drainage Systems on New Estates. She said that there was general dissatisfaction that public infrastructure was paid for by estate charges and also concerns about the adequacy of some of the systems and whether they were designed and operated properly and how they would be maintained. She said that it was important to look at whether the Council was making sure they were performing as required and that their contribution the environment, safety and amenity was assessed.

The Vice Chair of Growth and Development Scrutiny Group said that this an issue raised frequently by newer estates as it became an issue when residents had to cover the financial burdens. She said that it was becoming increasingly pertinent as the estates in the Borough were often older than other newer estates. She said that information for residents about how they were designed to work would be helpful for people to understand when they were or were not working appropriately.

Members of the Group referred to some estates having neglected open spaces with a lack of consistency in ownership of these spaces across the various estates, being controlled either by the management company or the developer.

Councillor Thomas referred to Schedule 3 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 which would have provided for infrastructures to be adopted publicly and that the Government was currently looking at implementing Schedule 3 to bring them into public control.

Councillor Thomas said that it was important to look forward and scrutinise the powers of the Council, including what it did and did not own or manage and what it could and could not do.

The Service Manager for Corporate Services said that Officers thought that these questions could be answered directly and that the answers were very much influenced by how much control the Council had. She asked the Group what outcomes it would hope to achieve from the scrutiny process.

The Chair of Growth and Development Scrutiny Group said it may not be possible to identify outcomes without going through the scrutiny process. He suggested that Officer resource may not be best utilised in reviewing how Rushcliffe residents felt that the systems were performing given the difficulty in getting people to engage.

The Chairman suggested that the questions could be put to the relevant Director in the first instance.

In response to question about differences in resource required, the Service Manager for Corporate Services explained that preparation for scrutiny review required significantly more Officer time and input than responding to questions outside of a Group meeting.

Councillor Thomas said that she likely knew the answers to many of the points she had raised in the matrix and said that it was more a matter of raising knowledge and awareness for other Councillors to create a collective understanding as to what the Council could do to influence others or to undertake the responsibilities.

The Chairman confirmed that it was agreed that this item would not progress to scrutiny at this time and for Councillor Thomas ask the Director for Development and Economic Growth to respond.

The Chairman referred to the matrix for Infrastructure Delivery and the Service Manager for Corporate Services said that the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group had requested a follow up item regarding when infrastructure delivery programmes were delayed and how the Council engaged and communicated with Town and Parish Councils.

The Group agreed for this item to be taken forward in the scrutiny work programme.

The Chairman referred to the matrix for Rushcliffe Oaks Crematorium and asked whether this was an appropriate time for scrutiny.

The Chair of Growth and Development Scrutiny Group explained that the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group had scrutinised this item in July 2023 and had asked for it to return to the Group in 2024.

Members of the Group discussed when would be an appropriate time for it to come forward for review. The Vice Chair of Growth and Development Scrutiny Group said that reviewing performance in a year's time would be an appropriate opportunity for Officers to provide an update. The Service Manager for Corporate Services confirmed that performance indicators for the Crematorium would start to be monitored from April 2024 and report around June/July 2024, which would fit with it coming forward in July 2024.

The Group agreed for this item to be taken forward to the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group meeting in July 2024.

The Chairman presented the matrix for Connectivity and communications. She said that it was vital for people to be able to communicate and whilst the Council did not deliver services, it did have a responsibility to its residents for communication. She recommended that someone from the County Council be invited to present, with the aim of influencing delivery. She said that it related to both 4G and broadband, particularly given that Rushcliffe was a rural borough.

The Chair of Governance Scrutiny Group highlighted that for telephone numbers with an 01509 and 01664 prefix provision came from Leicestershire County Council and the Chairman said that they should be invited to present to the Scrutiny Group also.

The Service Manager for Corporate Services said that Officer recommendation, on the basis that the Chairman had approached and worked with Officers to create this matrix, would be for this item to be taken forward to scrutiny. She

confirmed that an Officer from Nottinghamshire County Council had agreed to attend and that an invitation would also be extended to Leicestershire County Council. She suggested inviting the relevant Nottinghamshire County Council Ward Member to attend also.

The Group agreed for this item to be taken forward in the scrutiny work programme.

In relation to the Scrutiny Group Work Programmes, the Service Manager for Corporate Services proposed that an Annual Update on the Strategic Tasks be brought to Corporate Overview Group in June 2024.

The Service Manager for Corporate Services confirmed that the Asset Management Plan had moved to go Governance Scrutiny Group in February 2024.

In relation to Growth and Development Scrutiny Group, the Service Manager for Corporate Services said that Connectivity and Communications was programmed to go to the March 2024 meeting, the Rushcliffe Oaks Crematorium review to go to the July 2024 meeting and the Infrastructure Deliver to go the meeting in October 2024.

It was **RESOLVED** that the Corporate Overview Group:

- a) consider any additional items for scrutiny from the current Cabinet Forward Plan, Corporate Strategy, Medium Term Financial Strategy, Capital and Investment Strategy and Transformation Plan (Appendix One)
- b) determine any additional topics to be included in a scrutiny group work programme for 2023/24 for each of the scrutiny groups as presented on newly submitted scrutiny matrices (Appendix Two)
- c) review the current work programme for each of the scrutiny groups (Appendix Three).

Work Programme 2023-24 – Corporate Overview Group

7 November 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Standing Items<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Feedback from Scrutiny Group Chairmen○ Feedback from Lead Officer○ Consideration of Scrutiny Group Work Programmes○ Financial and Performance Management
-----------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rolling Items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Customer Feedback Annual Report ○ Corporate Strategy
20 February 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standing Items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Feedback from Scrutiny Group Chairmen ○ Feedback from Lead Officer ○ Consideration of Scrutiny Group Work Programmes ○ Financial and Performance Management • Rolling Items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○
xx June 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standing Items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Feedback from Scrutiny Group Chairmen ○ Feedback from Lead Officer ○ Consideration of Scrutiny Group Work Programmes ○ Financial and Performance Management • Rolling Items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Diversity Annual Report and update on the Equality and Diversity Strategy ○ Annual update on Strategic Tasks
xx September 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standing Items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Feedback from Scrutiny Group Chairmen ○ Feedback from Lead Officer ○ Consideration of Scrutiny Group Work Programmes ○ Financial and Performance Management • Rolling Items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Health and Safety Annual Report

Work Programme 2023-24 – Governance Scrutiny Group

23 November 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal Audit Progress Report • Annual Audit Completion Report 2022/23 • Statement of Accounts • Capital and Investment Strategy Update • RIPA Review • Recommendations from the Planning Committee Working Group
22 February 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal Audit Progress Report • Internal Audit Strategy • Risk Management – Update • Capital and Investment Strategy Update • External Annual Audit Plan • Annual Audit Letter and Value for Money Conclusion • Capital and Investment Strategy 2024/25 • Asset Management Plan
xx June 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal Audit Progress Report • Internal Audit Annual Report • Annual Fraud Report

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Governance Statement (AGS) • Capital and Investment Strategy Outturn • Constitution Update • Code of Conduct
xx September 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk Management Update • Going Concern • Capital and Investment Strategy Update • Internal Audit Progress Report

Work Programme 2023-24 – Growth and Development Scrutiny Group

	Items / Reports
3 January 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sewerage Infrastructure and Discharge within Rushcliffe • Management of Open Spaces
6 March 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connectivity and Communications
xx July 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of the Crematorium
xx October 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure Delivery

Work Programme 2023-24 – Communities Scrutiny Group

	Items / Reports
18 January 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flight Paths
21 March 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Streetwise In-Sourcing • Carbon Management Plan Update
xx July 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of Community Facilities
xx October 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • •

Actions – 7 November 2023

Min No	Action	Officer Responsible
18.	The Vice Chair of Communities Scrutiny Group asked for information about total payments to the Development Corporation	£400k to date and nothing further as yet
18.	The Vice Chair of	HUG: Home Upgrade Grants fully

	<p>Communities Scrutiny Group asked for information about how the HUG (Home Upgrade Grant) and LAD3 (Local Authority Delivery Grant) monies were used</p>	<p>funded by the government. We were awarded funding for HUG1 and HUG 2 rounds. The grants provide for energy efficiency upgrades and low carbon heating to eligible households in England – households on low income and/or are off the gas grid. HUG1 closed 31.05.23 and HUG2 is currently being commissioned. The HUG schemes are aimed at people across the whole borough who are off mains gas, and it is a more generous grant than the LAD. Such works include full insulation for the house followed by the installation of low/zero carbon technologies such as air source heat pumps along with solar electric to lower the running costs. These larger interventions take vulnerable/fuel poor residents off expensive fossil fuel systems such as LPG/oil whilst also vastly improving the insulation and carbon emissions.</p> <p>LAD: Local Area Delivery again fully funded by Government Grant. We were awarded funding for LAD2 and LAD3. LAD2 closed in 22/23 and LAD3 closed 30.09.23. As with HUG, the grants provide for energy efficiency upgrades to eligible households in England. The LAD 3 works (now completed) have been fitting BISF (British Iron and Steel Federation) houses in East Leake with external wall insulation, loft insulation and where applicable solar electricity systems. This could save a vulnerable resident at risk of fuel poverty around 50%-60% in their overall carbon emissions as without such measures, they are wasting heat through the uninsulated walls/roofs. The cherry on top, is the solar electric systems that can save around 20%-30% on their electricity through generating onsite and not putting it through the meter.</p> <p>Both schemes cover installation of green energy measures into Eligible Households i.e., those with a low Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) rating E, F, or G including those living in the worst quality off-gas grid homes. The schemes are delivering progress</p>
--	---	--

		towards reducing fuel poverty and phasing out the installation of high carbon fossil fuel heating. The households should be subject to a low-income verification which is indicative at £30,000 but can be higher in certain circumstances. Green energy measures include Solar Photovoltaic Panels, External Wall Insulation, Loft Insulation, and production of EPCs.
18.	The Vice Chair of Governance Scrutiny Group asked what the annuity charges were for West Bridgford and for information to be provided in writing	Where annuity charges exist, this is due to historical works completed at a cost to the council and is then charged to special expenses budget annually.
18.	The Chair of Growth and Development Scrutiny Group referred to the percentage of household planning applications processed within target times and asked how many people comprised the delayed 29.2%. He asked for information on how long any delays were for and whether the Council had sufficient planning staff to meet the targets.	<p>44 out of the 137 householder applications between 1 July and 30 September took longer than 56 days to determine.</p> <p>The average timescale for a decision on those applications was 94 days.</p> <p>So the 10% who missed out on the quarter two target waited on average an extra 38 days for their planning decision.</p>

The meeting closed at 9.50 pm.

CHAIR