



**MINUTES  
OF THE MEETING OF THE  
CORPORATE OVERVIEW GROUP  
TUESDAY, 3 MAY 2022**

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

**PRESENT:**

Councillors T Combellack (Chairman), R Butler, N Clarke, B Gray, D Viridi and  
J Wheeler

**OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:**

C Caven-Atack  
C Evans

Service Manager Corporate Services  
Service Manager Economic Growth  
and Property  
Finance Business Partner  
Democratic Services Officer  
Service Manager Finance

A Oxley  
A Poole  
S Whittaker

**20 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillor B Bansal.

**21 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**22 Minutes of the Meeting held on 1 February 2022**

The minutes of the meeting held on 1 February 2022 were approved as a true  
record of the meeting and signed by the Chairman.

**23 The Impact of Covid-19 on Rushcliffe Borough Council - External Focus**

The Service Manager Corporate Services delivered a presentation to support  
the report of the Director – Neighbourhoods concerning the specific work  
undertaken by the Council to support communities and businesses during the  
Covid-19 pandemic. It was explained that the report focused on the external  
impact of Covid-19 on the Council's delivery of services and it complimented  
the previous report presented to the Group which focused on the internal  
impacts.

The presentation to the Group covered:

- Impact of Covid-19 on communities and businesses, sports clubs,  
voluntary and community groups, contracted services
- Community Support Hub
- Business support
- Covid Compliance
- Contracts Management

- Communication
- Critical Success Factors

The Service Manager Corporate Services explained that the Community Support Hub, hosted by Nottinghamshire County Council, had received 133 requests from individuals for support with medication collection, emergency food parcels, access to food supply, telephone befriending, physical wellbeing checks and dog walking. The Borough Council responded to these requests, by redeploying staff where required, to support Rushcliffe residents.

In Rushcliffe, the level of requests for such support was lower than in other districts in the Local Resilience Forum (LRF) area due to the strong response received from volunteers in local communities, which was supported by local Councillors who, in many cases, took a leading role in facilitating and bringing together networks.

Examples of the support provided to and by communities were highlighted to the Group and included:

- Radcliffe to the Rescue, which generated 150 volunteers to support the whole community
- Over 100 activity packs (including physical activity packs, recipe packs, Active Minds packs and bespoke Family Packs) developed and issued under the Reach Rushcliffe Initiative to homes/families and those who were socially isolated and lonely
- Radcooks Community Kitchen which provided meals and social interaction to vulnerable Rushcliffe residents
- Cotgrave Community Kitchen, which offered food delivery to residents
- Holiday Activities and Food Programme, funded by Nottinghamshire County Council via the Department for Education, to provide children in receipt of free school meals with physical activity, nutritional education and a healthy meal during school holidays
- Summer and Christmas programmes delivered in 2021 provided a total of 786 HAF funded places for 298 children, which will be funded for the further three years with additional provision of 1,524 places in Cotgrave, Bingham, West Bridgford, Edwalton, Radcliffe-on-Trent, Kinoulton and East Leake.

The Group was informed that the Council had also supported those who could not work as they were self-isolating or were on low incomes with payments of £500 provided from Government funding. 1,158 applications had been received and 531 payments made, amounting to £265,500. Currently, there were three applications awaiting further information. The Group was assured that the funding would be processed by the deadline (June) as monies unspent had to be repaid to the Government

The Council's Communities Team had supported community groups, voluntary organisations, and charities across the Borough to apply for Social Recovery Funding and Community Food funding again allocated by central government through Nottinghamshire County Council. A total of £220,732 was awarded to support social recovery projects and £103,662 for Community Food based projects across Rushcliffe.

Regarding the Councillors Community Support Grants Scheme, the Group was informed that the process had been streamlined to enable more efficient access to funding for community causes. This enabled Councillors to spend around £9,000 between May 2020 and August 2021 on projects such as PPE, food parcels, craft activities to beat social isolation, and materials for the creation of medical scrubs, face masks and laundry bags.

The Group was informed that, during the pandemic, sports clubs ceased training and competition. Several funding streams were made available to support clubs through the pandemic and during re-opening. In May 2020, Sport England's Emergency Fund allocated £22,305 to sports clubs in Rushcliffe; 60% of applications received were allocated funding. Officers supported sports clubs in their return as the pandemic eased, with provision of templates for Covid documentation and guidance on implementing Covid measures and creating risk assessments. Funding and resources were still available for those financially impacted by the pandemic.

The Service Manager Corporate Services explained that the Council had put in place a number of measures to support the Rushcliffe business community. A dedicated Covid-19 business support webpage had received 41,000 views, and regular posts were put on the Council's and Rushcliffe Business Partnership's social media pages. In addition, the Council was allocated £212,000 of Welcome Back Funding by the European Regional Development Fund to support the safe re-opening of town centres, which in Rushcliffe included:

- Allocation of £10,000 to each of the larger town/parish councils
- 10 business support webinars held with expert consultants providing advice and support
- 24 businesses received one-to-one business support from retail and PR consultants
- 30 market traders attended a webinar on the basics of social media and establishing a digital presence
- Shop local shop safe communications campaign
- Appointment of High Street Ambassadors to support the reopening of high streets and be a visible presence to provide reassurance
- Enhanced summer events programme in West Bridgford to encourage people back into the town centre
- Improvements to the appearance of town centres including; new planters in Bridgford Park, lighting at Eaton Place in Bingham and improvements to seating areas on Gordon Square
- The appointment of a temporary Town Centre Manager who has supported the delivery of a number of events and markets, the establishment of retail forums/meetings and one-to-one business support
- Development of a new strategy for West Bridgford Way to enhance what it offers, support local businesses and increase footfall
- The appointment of a contractor to address and reduce ASB/littering in parks
- The simplification of the process for applying for pavement licenses, to enable businesses to use pavements for seating to ensure social distancing measures were adhered to.

The Group was informed that occupation levels in Council-owned commercial property remained high at around 97%. Current tenants had been offered rent holidays during the pandemic which totalled £134,000 for 24 tenants, of which £75,000 had been repaid. 19 tenants had cleared their debts, four remained with payment plans, with just under £60,000 outstanding. Tenants had been very grateful for the support provided by the Council during such a challenging time.

Regarding Covid compliance, the Environmental Health Team had worked to ensure that businesses complied with the Government's Covid guidance. In total, 23 fixed penalty notices had been served on businesses that had breached Covid regulations and the closure of a business in West Bridgford which had repeated breaches had been sought. 800 additional Covid-related enforcement/advisory visits had been completed by the Team, which was in addition to usual business.

The Group was informed that the Council had supported leisure centres throughout the pandemic by providing advice and guidance to support the safe re-opening and ensure that Government guidance was followed. £224,000 was secured from the National Local Recovery Fund managed on behalf of DCMS by Sports England to support Lex Leisure, the Council's leisure centre provider. Leisure centre usage was now at 80% of pre-pandemic levels, with requests for swimming lessons higher than pre-pandemic, for children in particular. Additionally, the Council had refurbished the indoor bowls hall at the Arena to enable the provision of group exercise classes in a socially distanced manner.

Community facilities throughout Rushcliffe had been used as vaccination and testing sites. For example, from Gamston Community Hall, which had been refurbished since the pandemic, 180,000 vaccinations had been delivered. Testing had been carried out at sites across the Borough.

The Service Manager Corporate Services highlighted the amazing uprising from communities across the Borough which showed that people were very engaged in their communities and were keen to support delivery by the Council. The existing strong links between Council teams and communities were built on to enable a rapid response to communities' needs.

The Group commended the report adding that an emergency action plan covering the lessons learned should be developed in the event that something similar should reoccur and that this should address other emergencies, as well as the pandemic. The Service Manager Corporate Services responded that the LRF had emergency plans in place for such an eventuality and caution should be taken to avoid duplication. This was acknowledged by the Chairman.

The Group suggested that the successes highlighted be promoted to communities, encompassing information from the presentation given, to detail what had been achieved and also thanking residents for their enthusiasm and support, as well as seeking their input to the process.

The Group commended the support available to businesses, which it highlighted was highly valued by the business community for the speed of response and support provided by the Council. Rushcliffe had a good

reputation for responding well to the pandemic. The Group asked that an additional recommendation be included in the report to recognise the work undertaken by staff and to congratulate them for this success in supporting Rushcliffe communities.

It was moved by Councillor N Clarke and seconded by Councillor J Wheeler that Corporate Overview Group:

“Welcomes the information provided by officers which highlighted the support provided to Rushcliffe communities during the pandemic and its congratulations be relayed to all staff for their efforts and support with this”.

The Chairman added that the Borough Council had a strong relationship with parish councils throughout Rushcliffe which had enabled the rapid provision of support to communities during the pandemic. She added that there had been a fantastic hygiene regime in place during the pandemic, and she was disappointed that this would not be continued nationally; she was keen for this to continue locally.

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

- a) Welcomes the information provided by officers which highlighted the support provided to Rushcliffe communities during the pandemic and its congratulations be relayed to all staff for their efforts and support with this
- b) Considers the information provided by officers, both in the report and verbally at the meeting in response to the Group’s questions
- c) Considers whether there are any additional lessons to be learnt from the Council’s response to the pandemic
- d) Considers whether any actions are necessary at this stage in light of the increased knowledge and understanding the Group now has about the Council’s response to the pandemic.

## 24 **Diversity Annual Report**

The Service Manager Corporate Services delivered a presentation to support the report of the Chief Executive which provided an update on delivery of the action plan for the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Scheme and included the annual diversity report update.

The Group was informed that the data included in the report was from the Census 2011 as the data from the Census 2021 would not be available until October 2022. The data detailed in the report for Rushcliffe was not significantly different to that included in the previous report to the Group.

The Group was informed that 94% of the Council’s workforce was in the white British or white other ethnic group which reflected data for the Borough. The figure for the Borough was higher than that for the East Midlands (89%) and nationally (85%).

The Service Manager Corporate Services added that the age profile of Rushcliffe indicated that the Borough had a larger proportion of residents who were over 60 years of age (25%) than the East Midlands (23.5%) and national average (22%). There was also a larger proportion of residents aged 45-59 within Rushcliffe (21%) than nationally (19%). Conversely, there were fewer younger residents aged 18-24 (7.8%) than the East Midlands (9.53%) and nationally (9.37%). In addition, there was a disparity in the 25-29 age groups between Rushcliffe (4.7%), East Midlands (6.1%) and nationally (6.8%). The age profile of the Council showed that there was a peak at 45-54, this was the same as was reported in 2019/20. 20% of the workforce was aged between 18-34, and 59% were aged between 35-54. The authority continued to support employees who wished to continue working, keeping knowledge within the organisation as well as working towards ensuring effective succession planning by improving the age diversity of the workforce.

Regarding health, data from the 2011 Census showed that 7,540 people (6.7% of the population) in Rushcliffe had a long-term health problem or disability which limited their daily activities to a greater extent. A further 9,939 (8.9%) were limited to a lesser extent – all lower than the percentages for the East Midlands which were 8.6% (greater extent), and 11.9% (a lesser extent).

The Group was informed that the number of employees who declared they had a disability was the same as the previous year at 5%. The Council continued to support employees who were either disabled when they joined the authority or became disabled during their employment. The Group was informed that the Council was a Disability Confident Employer and had reached the required criteria to be reaccredited this year.

The gender profile showed that there were slightly more females (51%) than males (49%) currently residing in the Borough. The gender split at the Council showed fewer female employees than males (42% compared to 58%) which was, in some part, due to the Council's manual workforce containing roles that were traditionally male dominated. The Council had worked to encourage female employees into this environment and would continue to promote fair recruitment practices and positive action to encourage a diverse workforce.

The Service Manager Corporate Services informed the Group that the Council had made positive improvements to the gender pay gap and reporting now showed that the gap had narrowed from 8.9% (in 2017) between the mean £per hour of male and female pay to now a difference of less than 1%. The Group was informed that the change was due to an improved gender balance in senior positions.

The Group was informed that the Council's current HR system only recorded male and female as this is how it is recorded and reported to HMRC. Officers would explore whether additional options could be added with the supplier of the payroll system. The recruitment system included options for the full range of gender identity as this was a form developed internally by the Council.

Regarding the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Scheme, the Group was informed that

- EDI actions were embedded in service plans.
- The Council's website was now accessible to all people with sight impairment who used an e-reader and officers were working through all documents included on the website to ensure that they also complied with the Accessibility Regulations.
- The Council's action plan also identified the need to engage more young people in democracy and an event had been held at Rushcliffe Arena for 30 Year 10 students from Toothill School which saw four candidates from the group stand for election.
- Training in British Sign Language was being explored for customer services staff, supported by East Midlands Councils, which could possibly be extended to the summer events programme in the Park.
- Customer Services web and email enquiries had doubled in 2021 compared to the volume pre-pandemic in 2019. A review would be undertaken to identify the best ways to meet customer needs.
- Work had been undertaken to tackle inactivity through GP surgeries in Rushcliffe through 'Active Practice Accreditation', whereby GPs would encourage staff and patients to be more active.
- A Recruiting Talent event would be held in June 2022 to encourage employers to be inclusive in their recruitment practices and the support available to them.
- A mentoring scheme was being developed under YouNG which would see officers at the Council mentoring young people from September 2022. If successful, further roll-out with Rushcliffe businesses involved would be explored.
- The Council had also employed one Kick Start placement and two supported interns, with identified disabilities.
- Council recruitment practices had been amended to improve accessibility, as a CV only was required when applying for vacancies. The Council was also working with the Careers Transition Partnership to attract veterans to vacancies.
- Over the last year, 281 applicants had applied for jobs at the Council; data on gender, ethnicity etc had been recorded and other Councils had been approached so that comparisons and benchmarking could be carried out. Unfortunately, data was not available at this time.

The Group commended the report and asked how the Council was spending the Apprenticeship Levy and whether the full Levy was accessed. The Service Manager Corporate Services agreed to provide an answer following the meeting.

The Group supported the approach of the Council, for example the use of BSL at the Theatre in the Park events and suggested that the UK Cinema Association could advise on the use of audio headsets. They suggested that, to support healthy eating, the food offered by Lex Leisure be reviewed, particularly in the coffee shop at Rushcliffe Arena.

The Group questioned whether the data regarding demographics (age 30-44 and 44-59) provided in the report in Appendix A2, was accurate as it did not appear to reflect the presentation given. The Service Manager agreed to investigate and report back to the Group.

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

- a) considered and endorsed the report information provided for the diversity annual report; and
- b) reviewed the action taken so far as a part of the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Scheme action plan and made suggestions for future action or areas of focus.

## 25 **Finance and Performance Management**

The Senior Finance Business Partner presented the report of the Director of Finance and Corporate Services which detailed the quarter three position in terms of financial and performance monitoring for 2021/22. The report also highlighted the Covid-19 variances.

The Senior Finance Business Partner explained that the budgets for quarter one were set prudently in anticipation of an adverse impact of Covid but the largest of which had recovered more quickly than anticipated namely - car parks, leisure, planning and community facilities.

The Senior Finance Business Partner referred to Table 1 at paragraph 4.2 of the report which summarised the position at Quarter 3, including lost income and costs due to Covid-19 which showed a net Covid pressure of £0.118m, offset by other in-year efficiency savings of £1.187m, leaving a net revenue efficiency of £1.069m. The Group was informed that Table 1 also showed additional non-ringfenced grant funding of £0.167m (new burdens funding). It was noted that there was a Business Rates surplus of £2.958m, £2.4m of which would be transferred to reserves to cover the anticipated deficit that would arise next year and in 2023/24.

Regarding further commitments from in-year efficiencies, detailed in Appendix A, this included £0.3m to Streetwise and £50k for feasibility in Central Avenue, West Bridgford and £5k for the Bingham Improvement Board.

The Group was informed that the Special Expenses budget had also been impacted by Covid restrictions. However, some activity was covered by Government Sales Fees and Charges funding for Quarter 1 leaving a total Special Expense budget forecast deficit of £15.7k.

It was explained that the Capital Programme forecast an underspend of £5.1m, which mainly related to Bingham Hub, Rushcliffe Oaks Crematorium and LAD funding for green energy grants. Due to current projections, it was unlikely that there would be a need to borrow funding.

The Senior Finance Business Partner referred to Table 2 at paragraph 4.11 and explained that it detailed the grants received and no further grants were anticipated. The projected position was positive with a net £54k efficiency. However, uncertainties over funding, increased cost of goods and services along with government policy reviews, meant that a healthy reserves position was vital to ensure the Council remained financially resilient. It was noted that there was no room for complacency as there remained a great deal of



uncertainty such as Business Rates, Comprehensive Spending review, Fair Funding and Brexit not to mention opportunities in the Freeport and Development Corporation. The Council's financial position would need to be closely monitored.

The Service Manager Corporate Services informed the Group that two strategic tasks still showed as 0% - these related to new legislation expected for Planning and Waste services - due to delays with the introduction of the new legislation.

The Group was informed that of the 13 Performance Indicators (PI), 12 had previously been reported to the Group, which had been made clear in the appendices to the report. There was one new exception - Choice Based Lettings – which was linked to previously raised exceptions. The delay to the PI - LINS32 Average waiting time of applicants rehoused by Choice Based Lettings – was covid related, which had caused a backlog of residents waiting to be rehoused by Metropolitan Housing as tenants had not moved during the pandemic which had paused the turnover of properties. Some people, however, were prepared to wait a long time for the 'right' property.

Regarding the slippage of £5.1m in the Capital programme, the Group asked whether this was due to cash flow or the need to change the year in which it would be spent. They were informed that there was slippage on the Crematorium and the Bingham Hub into next year. They were assured that the money would be spent but not within the timeframe originally intended.

The Group asked whether the percentage of calls answered by the Customer Services Centre within the 40 second target was impacted by the type of call received. The Service Manager Corporate Services responded that the enquiries received during Covid were more detailed and complex, mainly as a result of face-to-face services being closed during the early part of the pandemic. These naturally took longer to address and therefore led to the delay in answering calls within 40 seconds. The target, set in 2005, was unachievable and unrealistic considering the current and changing demands to the service. Following a benchmarking exercise with similar service providers, the target would, therefore, be extended to 60 seconds. The Group was informed that currently 80% of calls received this year had been answered within this timeframe.

The Group asked whether there had been an increased level of investment to utilise the underspend. The Service Manager Finance explained there had been increased investments as a result of capital and revenue underspends shown through increased interest and investment income figures in the report. Officers assess the level of reserves available and make an informed assessment when setting the Medium-Term Financial Strategy in March 2023.

The Chairman asked whether the staffing difficulties experienced by Metropolitan Housing had been resolved. The Service Manager - Corporate Services agreed to clarify the position and inform the Group.

Regarding appeals related to planning applications, the Chairman asked how much such appeals had cost the Borough Council. The Service Manager –

Corporate Services explained that the two planning applications currently with the Planning Inspectorate for non-determination were being processed at the lowest possible level, with low cost to the Council. It was noted that there would be a nominal cost to staffing resources in pulling together the required documentation for the appeal, but that this was not added to the appeal itself.

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

- a) the expected revenue budget efficiency for the year of £0.054m inclusive of committed reserves;
- b) the planned use of reserves totalling £4.140m (detailed in Appendix A);
- c) the capital underspend of £5.1m;
- d) the expected outturn position for Special Expenses of £15.7k deficit;
- e) the progress to date of Strategic Tasks– Appendix F; and
- f) the comments for performance exceptions and considered whether additional scrutiny was required – Appendix G

## 26 **Feedback from Scrutiny Group Chairmen**

The Chairman reported that the Scrutiny Training for Councillors had been well received. She added that she had attended the East Midlands Councils Networking Group, the last of which concerned the invitation of witnesses to scrutiny meetings. She suggested that Councillors who had submitted a Scrutiny Matrix to the Corporate Overview Group, should be invited to attend the meeting – at the discretion of the Chairman – to present their case. The Chairman of the Communities Scrutiny Group added that such attendance should be to the Corporate Overview Group only as it was this Group that made decisions about the work programmes for all Scrutiny Groups

The Chairman of the Communities Scrutiny Group explained that there had been one substantive item at the last meeting – the Carbon Management Plan which had generated a healthy discussion. Progress had been made against targets (despite the level of officer turnover due to personal circumstances and was not a reflection on the Council), but achievements against target was currently on track although an Action Plan still needed to be developed. He informed the Group that the installation of electric vehicle charging points throughout the Borough was going well, although there had been issues in accessing LAD funding for an EV point at West Bridgford car park due to issues with the electricity supply. Officers were liaising with Western Power to resolve this. The use of EVs for waste collection was not possible in Rushcliffe due to the rurality and size of the Borough. However, the use of bio-oil to power current vehicles had been piloted and there was a desire for this to be rolled-out further in the future. The updating of Leisure Centres, for example Keyworth, would be costly. The potential to purchase land for tree planting to offset emissions had been discussed but there were concerns about the cost of land. He added that the report on the Waste Strategy had been delayed as the White Paper was awaited.

The Chairman of the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group explained that the last meeting had considered only one item – which was planning communications. The Scrutiny Matrix received was very detailed, and the report answered many of the questions raised within it. It was noted that the Planning Team had been under pressure due to staff shortages, reflecting the national position, and long-term illness with the Planning Team. He added that it had been valuable to the scrutiny process for the Councillor who had submitted the Scrutiny Matrix to be involved in the discussion with the Group, and he had also invited the Cabinet Portfolio Holder, although he had been unable to attend, and the Chairman of the Planning Committee as he expected them to have valuable insight into the process. Regarding planning communications, he highlighted that the Council went above and beyond what was expected within the requirements. Although included in the report, conservation areas had not been discussed at length as it would be the subject of a future report to the Group. Following discussion, the Group agreed to add a third recommendation, concerning a further review once the staffing situation was settled.

The Chairman of the Governance Scrutiny Group stated that the agenda for last meeting, held in February, had included internal audit, capital and investment and risk management. He informed the Group that Internal Audit was on track, despite delays due to Covid-19. There had been a discussion around the material impact of ratings and whether they should be medium or substantial. The auditors would consider this along with the Director – Finance. There had been a good discussion about the Capital Investment Strategy and changes that were required to property investments due to the updated requirements in the CIPFA Codes. The Group was comfortable with the assurance received around the levels of investment income and that investment income thresholds had not been reached. The Group had also discussed the Council's Treasury Management advisors, Link, and the close distinction between advice and decision and the Council's ability to ensure that such investment decisions were made independently. The Group had also had a deep dive into the risk management process and the Corporate Risk Register.

## **27 Feedback from Lead Officers**

The Service Manager Corporate Services updated the Group on East Midlands Scrutiny Network Meeting, held on 11 March, which focused on public involvement in scrutiny and the different approaches in place. The discussion included the development of a 'witness guide' to enable visitors attending meetings to know what was expected and consideration of public involvement when the topic was discussed at Corporate Overview Group. It was noted that the next meeting was on 24 June at Erewash District Council in person and the topic of discussion was budget setting scrutiny.

The Group was informed that very positive feedback had been received on the Scrutiny Training Session held at the end of February. The Service Manager – Corporate Services asked for feedback from Chairmen on whether they had noticed a difference in their last scrutiny group meetings.

It was noted that a 45-minute drop-in virtual session about the process for submitting the scrutiny matrix was scheduled for Thursday 5 May at 5.15pm. The matrix would be updated to include consideration of public engagement / portfolio holder and the new template would be launched after the training. The Group was asked to encourage other Councillors to attend.

The Service Manager Corporate Services explained that a Scrutiny Witness Charter / Protocol was being developed – as discussed at the last East Midlands Scrutiny Network Meeting – which would outline what witnesses could expect at the scrutiny meeting but also make clear the provisions contained within the Council's Constitution with regard to how witnesses could address the meeting and the limitations placed on their ongoing involvement for the rest of the meeting. Witnesses included the councillor submitting the topic for scrutiny, the portfolio holder, any officers in attendance to present to the Group, external expert witnesses or members of community interest groups brought in to provide particular insight into the topic under consideration.

**28 Consideration of Scrutiny Group Work Programmes**

The Group considered requests for scrutiny items submitted by either Councillors or officers using the scrutiny matrix. In respect of the Biodiversity Net Gain, the Group was informed that a detailed response to the questions raised had been provided to the Councillor by officers. It was noted that further training and awareness was needed as some questions could be addressed directly with officers rather than through the scrutiny process. The Group acknowledged that it would be beneficial to have contact details for officers and their responsibilities. The Service Manager – Corporate Services advised that the initial contact should be at Director or Service Manager level and agreed to provide details to Councillors.

The Group then discussed the scrutiny matrix concerning the online and print communication put out by the Borough and felt that the questions raised were political so were not suitable for scrutiny. It was noted that the Communities Scrutiny Group would consider the wider issue of communications at its meeting in October following customer survey feedback received and the issues raised linked in with this. The Service Manager – Corporate Services agreed to feedback to Councillor Walker who had submitted the matrix.

Regarding Electric Vehicle Charging points and it was noted that this had already been discussed by the Communities Scrutiny Group at its meeting last week.

It was **RESOLVED** that the work programmes outlined below be agreed.

**Work Programme 2021-22 / 2022-23 – Corporate Overview Group**

<p>3 May 2022</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standing Items             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Feedback from Scrutiny Group Chairmen</li> <li>○ Feedback from Lead Officer</li> <li>○ Consideration of Scrutiny Group Work Programmes</li> <li>○ Financial and Performance Management</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rolling Items             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Diversity Annual Report</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
-------------------	--

OFFICIAL

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The Impact of Covid-19 on Rushcliffe Borough Council – External Focus</li> </ul>
7 June 2022 (provisional date)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Consideration of Scrutiny Group Work Programmes</li> </ul>
6 September 2022 (provisional date)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Standing Items               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Feedback from Scrutiny Group Chairmen</li> <li>○ Feedback from Lead Officer</li> <li>○ Consideration of Scrutiny Group Work Programmes</li> <li>○ Financial and Performance Management</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Rolling Items               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Health and Safety Annual Report</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
15 November 2022 (provisional date)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Standing Items               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Feedback from Scrutiny Group Chairmen</li> <li>○ Feedback from Lead Officer</li> <li>○ Consideration of Scrutiny Group Work Programmes</li> <li>○ Financial and Performance Management</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Rolling Items               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Customer Feedback Annual Report</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
21 February 2023 (provisional date)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Standing Items               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Feedback from Scrutiny Group Chairmen</li> <li>○ Feedback from Lead Officer</li> <li>○ Consideration of Scrutiny Group Work Programmes</li> <li>○ Financial and Performance Management</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Rolling Items</li> </ul>

**Work Programme 2021-22 / 2022-23 – Governance Scrutiny Group**

30 June 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Internal Audit Progress Report</li> <li>● Internal Audit Annual Report</li> <li>● Annual Governance Statement (AGS)</li> <li>● Treasury Management Update</li> <li>● Constitution Update</li> <li>● Code of Conduct</li> <li>● External Audit Annual Plan</li> <li>● Annual Audit Letter and Value for Money Conclusion</li> </ul>
15 September 2022 (provisional date)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Risk Management</li> <li>● Going Concern</li> <li>● Asset and Investment Outturn 2021/22</li> <li>● Treasury Management Update</li> </ul>
24 November 2022 (provisional date)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Internal Audit Progress Report</li> <li>● Annual Audit Report 2021/22</li> <li>● Statement of Accounts</li> <li>● Streetwise Annual Report</li> <li>● Treasury and Asset Investments – 6 monthly update</li> <li>● Asset Management Plan</li> </ul>
23 February 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Internal Audit Progress Report</li> </ul>

OFFICIAL

(provisional date)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internal Audit Strategy</li> <li>• Risk Management – Update</li> <li>• Treasury and Asset Investments Strategy 2023/24</li> </ul>
--------------------	--

**Work Programme 2021-22 / 2022-23 – Growth and Development Scrutiny Group**

	Items / Reports
20 April 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning Communications</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
27 July 2022 (provisional date)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation Areas – Part Two</li> <li>• Policies relating to Alternative Energy Sources</li> </ul>
21 September 2022 (provisional date)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covid-19 Business Recovery Update</li> <li>• Sewerage infrastructure and discharge within Rushcliffe</li> </ul>
4 January 2023 (provisional date)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
8 March 2023 (provisional date)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

**Work Programme 2021-22 / 2022-23 – Communities Scrutiny Group**

	Items / Reports
28 April 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Carbon Management Plan</li> </ul>
21 July 2022 (provisional date)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sports Development in Rushcliffe</li> <li>• Access Agreement – Canals and Rivers Trust</li> </ul>
6 October 2022 (provisional date)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishment of a Youth Council</li> <li>• Council's External Communications Strategy</li> </ul>
19 January 2023 (provisional date)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
16 March 2023 (provisional date)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

**ACTION SHEET**

Minute Item	Action	Officer responsible
4	The successes highlighted in the report and presentation be promoted to communities, encompassing information from the presentation given, to detail what had been achieved and also thanking residents for their enthusiasm and support, as well as seeking their input to	Service Manager Corporate Services

OFFICIAL

	the process	
5	Further data to be provided on how the Council is spending the Apprenticeship Levy.	Service Manager Corporate Services
5	Feedback from the Group about the need to offer healthy options at the Rushcliffe Arena coffee shop to be provided to Lex Leisure.	Service Manager Economic Growth and Property
5	To investigate whether the data regarding demographics (age 30-44 and 44-59) provided in the report in Appendix A2, was accurate as it did not appear to reflect the presentation given.	Service Manager Economic Growth and Property
5	Whether the staffing difficulties experienced by Metropolitan Housing had been resolved.	Service Manager Corporate Services
9	Contact details of Directors and Service Managers and their responsibilities to be provided to all Councillors.	Service Manager Corporate Services
9	To discuss the scrutiny matrix submitted to COG concerning the online and print communication put out by the borough and the Group's decision with Councillor Walker	Service Manager Corporate Services

The meeting closed at 9.25 pm.

CHAIRMAN