

# Rushcliffe Borough Council – Scrutiny Matrix

<b>Councillor Request for Scrutiny</b>			
Councillor L Way			
<b>Proposed topic of scrutiny ...</b>	<b>Retrospective Planning Applications</b>		
<b>I would like to understand ... (key lines of enquiry)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How such applications are dealt with when they arrive with planning officers</li> <li>• What policies/regulations are applied to these applications</li> <li>• How frequent they are and if there is any trend in frequency of occurrence</li> <li>• How many are refused</li> <li>• What action is taken following refusal</li> <li>• What proportion go to appeal and the proportion upheld/dismissed</li> <li>• If there are options available in order to prevent building work starting before permission is granted</li> <li>• Is there scope for improving the system to make it more efficient and effective</li> </ul>		
<b>I think this topic should be scrutinised because ... (please tick)</b>		Poor Performance Identified	
		Change in Legislation or Local Policy	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Resident Concern or Interest	
		Cabinet Recommendation	
		Links to the Corporate Strategy	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other (please state reason)	
		I have been asked to comment as a consultee on several of these recently and would like to better understand the processes involved	
<b>Officer Consideration of Councillor Request for Scrutiny</b>			
<b>Officer Feedback (please tick)</b>			
- Issue already being addressed	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue of a complaint investigation	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Issue has already been considered in the last 2 years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue is a staffing matter	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Appendix Two

- Issue is a legal matter		There is an alternative way of dealing with the issue	
<b>Is there sufficient capacity ...</b>			
- Scrutiny Work Programme?			
- Officer Resources?			
<b>Recommendation</b>			
<b>Consideration of Request for Scrutiny at COG</b>			
<b>Public Involvement / engagement?</b>			
<b>Expert witnesses?</b>			
<b>Portfolio holder?</b>			
<b>Lead Officer?</b>			
<b>Proposed Timescale for Scrutiny and Scrutiny Group</b>			

DRAFT

# Rushcliffe Borough Council – Scrutiny Matrix

<b>Councillor Request for Scrutiny</b>		
Councillor J Billin		
<b>Proposed topic of scrutiny ...</b>	<b>Local Power Generation</b>	
<b>I would like to understand ... (key lines of enquiry)</b>	<p>How Rushcliffe Borough Council can become the Nucleus of a borough-wide Urban Solar Farm – consisting of thousands mid and small-scale installations, starting with RBC assets, reaching out to include schools, leisure facilities, car parks (also providing shade from sun), businesses (especially Big Box warehouses and stores) and domestic/residential properties?</p> <p>What are the barriers to a not-for-profit Social Enterprise entity becoming a Power Generator?</p>	
<b>I think this topic should be scrutinised because ... (please tick)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Poor Performance Identified
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Change in Legislation or Local Policy
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Resident Concern or Interest
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cabinet Recommendation
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Links to the Corporate Strategy
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other (please state reason)
	<p>The move to Net Zero requires a massive increase of non fossil-fuel power generation.</p> <p>The decommissioning of Ratcliffe on Trent power station will leave a gap in generation capacity.</p> <p>Decarbonising power generation is essential to meet National, Regional and Local CO2 targets.</p> <p>Simply doing nothing because the alternative may be 'difficult' or require effort is not good enough.</p>	
<b>Officer Consideration of Councillor Request for Scrutiny</b>		

## Appendix Two

<b>Officer Feedback (please tick)</b>			
- Issue already being addressed	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue of a complaint investigation	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Issue has already been considered in the last 2 years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue is a staffing matter	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Issue is a legal matter	<input type="checkbox"/>	There is an alternative way of dealing with the issue	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Is there sufficient capacity ...</b>			
- Scrutiny Work Programme?	<input type="checkbox"/>		
- Officer Resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>		
<b>Recommendation</b>			
<b>Consideration of Request for Scrutiny at COG</b>			
<b>Public Involvement / engagement?</b>			
<b>Expert witnesses?</b>			
<b>Portfolio holder?</b>			
<b>Lead Officer?</b>			
<b>Proposed Timescale for Scrutiny and Scrutiny Group</b>			

DRAFT

# Rushcliffe Borough Council – Scrutiny Matrix

<b>Councillor Request for Scrutiny</b>	
Councillor L Plant	
<b>Proposed topic of scrutiny ...</b>	<b>To clarify and review Rushcliffe's local offer for care leavers</b>
<b>I would like to understand ... (key lines of enquiry)</b>	<p>Rushcliffe's local offer for care leavers is part of the County Councils joint local offer, which included all district and borough councils in Nottinghamshire. Cabinet agreed the Rushcliffe local offer in March 2019. Cabinet agreed to look at supporting/ implementing elements of the County Council's offer that are of particular relevance to borough and district councils.</p> <p>Leaving care is a very challenging experience for young people. Many are only too often totally unprepared for the transition to independent living, and have no family support for this crucial stage of their lives. Care leavers make up one quarter of the homeless population, are far less likely to be in education, employment or training, and are over represented in the criminal justice system.</p> <p>The Children and Social Work Act 2017 extended Corporate Parenting responsibilities to include district and borough councils. Are members of Rushcliffe Council aware of this and how it impacts on services provided by the council?</p> <p>What does Rushcliffe's Local Offer consist of – what services does it cover?</p> <p>How is the offer communicated to care leavers and partner organisations?</p>

## Appendix Two

	<p>Is the present Rushcliffe offer appropriate to the needs of care leavers, or could a more supportive and responsive offer be provided? What is the impact on the lives of care leavers? Is there any opportunities for care leavers to have their voices heard and listened to?</p> <p>At the last full council meeting a motion to treat people with care experience as if they have a protected characteristic was passed. How will this impact on services Rushcliffe provides going forward?</p>		
<p><b>I think this topic should be scrutinised because ...</b> <b>(please tick)</b></p>			Poor Performance Identified
	x		Change in Legislation or Local Policy
	x		Resident Concern or Interest
			Cabinet Recommendation
	x		Links to the Corporate Strategy
	x		Members need clarity and training on this issue
<b>Officer Consideration of Councillor Request for Scrutiny</b>			
<b>Officer Feedback (please tick)</b>			
- Issue already being addressed			Issue of a complaint investigation
- Issue has already been considered in the last 2 years?			Issue is a staffing matter
- Issue is a legal matter			There is an alternative way of dealing with the issue
<b>Is there sufficient capacity ...</b>			
- Scrutiny Work Programme?			
- Officer Resources?			
<b>Recommendation</b>			
<b>Consideration of Request for Scrutiny at COG</b>			
<b>Public Involvement / engagement?</b>			
<b>Expert witnesses?</b>			
<b>Portfolio holder?</b>			
<b>Lead Officer?</b>			
<b>Proposed Timescale for Scrutiny and Scrutiny Group</b>			

DRAFT

# Rushcliffe Borough Council – Scrutiny Matrix

Councillor Request for Scrutiny		
Councillor C Thomas		
Proposed topic of scrutiny ...	Housing density in new housing sites	
<p><b>Following the briefing note circulated on 8 August 2023, I would like to challenge and debate</b></p> <p>...</p>	<p>The way the number of homes a site will provide is estimated in the SHLAA methodology and the assumptions made about housing density to do this</p> <p>The level of analysis undertaken when estimating the number of homes, as this often increases during the course of the application which leads to inaccurate planning of infrastructure requirements and upsets neighbouring residents.</p> <p>The use of gross rather than net density in the above process</p> <p>The starting points used for calculating housing densities on different sized sites.</p> <p>Assumptions made about desirability of communal open space provision v larger gardens</p> <p>How density relates to the housing mix proposed, expected and required. (The statement in the briefing note that “housing mix is generally independent of density” contradicts what developers have told us.)</p> <p>The fact that Rushcliffe currently provides no policies to control density</p> <p>Potential impact of emerging government policy that housing density on new builds should reflect the existing density in that area</p>	
	Y	Poor Performance Identified
	Y	Change in Legislation or Local Policy

## Appendix Two

<b>I think this topic should be scrutinised because ...</b> <b>(please tick)</b>	Y	Resident Concern or Interest
		Cabinet Recommendation
		Links to the Corporate Strategy
		Other (please state reason)
<b>Officer Consideration of Councillor Request for Scrutiny</b>		
<b>Officer Feedback (please tick)</b>		
- Issue already being addressed		Issue of a complaint investigation
- Issue has already been considered in the last 2 years?		Issue is a staffing matter
- Issue is a legal matter		There is an alternative way of dealing with the issue
<b>Is there sufficient capacity ...</b>		
- Scrutiny Work Programme?		
- Officer Resources?		
<b>Recommendation</b>		
<b>Consideration of Request for Scrutiny at COG</b>		
<b>Public Involvement / engagement?</b>		
<b>Expert witnesses?</b>		
<b>Portfolio holder?</b>		
<b>Lead Officer?</b>		
<b>Proposed Timescale for Scrutiny and Scrutiny Group</b>		

# Rushcliffe Borough Council – Scrutiny Matrix

<b>Councillor Request for Scrutiny</b>	
Councillor C Thomas	
<b>Proposed topic of scrutiny ...</b>	<b>Parking provision funded by Rushcliffe</b>
<b>I would like to understand ... (key lines of enquiry)</b>	<p>Rushcliffe owns and operates car park spaces in settlements across the Borough as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>West Bridgford 276</li> <li>Cotgrave 112</li> <li>Radcliffe on Trent 69</li> <li>Keyworth 89</li> <li>Bingham 165</li> </ul> <p>(Source: Agenda item 8 Sept 2023 Cabinet para 4.2)</p> <p>What has been the capital cost of providing and upgrading these facilities?</p> <p>What is the overall annual cost of this operation, taking into account charges, fines, operation and enforcement costs? How is this split between the settlements?</p> <p>What are the policies about length of stay, charging and enforcement and how are these policies determined and reviewed?</p> <p>How do charging levels affect retail businesses etc?</p> <p>Why does Rushcliffe own and operate no parking in Ruddington or East Leake? (Does RCP count?)</p> <p>This is only some of the parking available for centres. Car parks are also provided by Parish Councils, private operators, supermarkets, leisure centres etc and on-street parking is available. What is the overall situation at each of the centres, and where are the pressure points?</p>

## Appendix Two

	<p>Should Rushcliffe be increasing (or reducing) number of spaces it operates in some centres? Is there a planned programme or just reactive responses?</p> <p>To what extent do centres serve surrounding areas?</p> <p>How much do households in each settlement pay for parking funded through their Rushcliffe and Town/Parish council tax and is this equitable across Rushcliffe?</p>		
<p><b>I think this topic should be scrutinised because ... (please tick)</b></p>	X	Poor Performance Identified	
		Change in Legislation or Local Policy	
	X	Resident Concern or Interest	
		Cabinet Recommendation	
		Links to the Corporate Strategy	
		Other (please state reason)	
<b>Officer Consideration of Councillor Request for Scrutiny</b>			
<b>Officer Feedback (please tick)</b>			
- Issue already being addressed		Issue of a complaint investigation	
- Issue has already been considered in the last 2 years?		Issue is a staffing matter	
- Issue is a legal matter		There is an alternative way of dealing with the issue	
<b>Is there sufficient capacity ...</b>			
- Scrutiny Work Programme?			
- Officer Resources?			
<b>Recommendation</b>			
<b>Consideration of Request for Scrutiny at COG</b>			
<b>Public Involvement / engagement?</b>			
<b>Expert witnesses?</b>			
<b>Portfolio holder?</b>			
<b>Lead Officer?</b>			
<b>Proposed Timescale for Scrutiny and Scrutiny Group</b>			

## Rushcliffe Borough Council – Scrutiny Matrix

<b>Councillor Request for Scrutiny</b>	
Councillor C Thomas	
<b>Proposed topic of scrutiny ...</b>	<b>Sustainable Drainage Systems on New Estates</b>
<b>I would like to scrutinize ... (key lines of enquiry)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design of SuDS on new estates - whose responsibility this is, and which policies govern this?</li> <li>• Responsibility for technically approving the designs and how Rushcliffe's Planning Officers check this has happened?</li> <li>• Who ensures they are built as designed, and how does Rushcliffe sign this off for each planning application?</li> <li>• How monitoring and maintenance regimes are specified via S106 agreements and who signs these off?</li> <li>• Who checks that monitoring and maintenance takes place as required</li> <li>• What the cost is to residents for the monitoring and maintenance of these systems (where these are included in management charges)?</li> <li>• Whether any are known to have failed in Rushcliffe to date, and if so what the impacts were in terms of flooding etc and what was the cost of repair?</li> <li>• How Rushcliffe's residents feel they are performing at present?</li> <li>• How their contribution to environmental objectives is designed and how well this is working?</li> <li>• How their safety and amenity value is assessed at the design stage and in operation?</li> <li>• What the implication for Rushcliffe will/would be for government future</li> </ul>

## Appendix Two

	implementation of Schedule 3 to the Flood and Water Management Act 2010?		
<b>I think this topic should be scrutinised because ...</b> <b>(please tick)</b>	X	Poor Performance Identified	
	X	Change in Legislation or Local Policy	
	X	Resident Concern or Interest	
		Cabinet Recommendation	
	X	Links to the Corporate Strategy	
	Other (please state reason)		
<b>Officer Consideration of Councillor Request for Scrutiny</b>			
<b>Officer Feedback (please tick)</b>			
- Issue already being addressed		Issue of a complaint investigation	
- Issue has already been considered in the last 2 years?		Issue is a staffing matter	
- Issue is a legal matter		There is an alternative way of dealing with the issue	
<b>Is there sufficient capacity ...</b>			
- Scrutiny Work Programme?			
- Officer Resources?			
<b>Recommendation</b>			
<b>Consideration of Request for Scrutiny at COG</b>			
<b>Public Involvement / engagement?</b>			
<b>Expert witnesses?</b>			
<b>Portfolio holder?</b>			
<b>Lead Officer?</b>			
<b>Proposed Timescale for Scrutiny and Scrutiny Group</b>			

# Rushcliffe Borough Council – Scrutiny Matrix

<b>Councillor Request for Scrutiny</b>		
<b>Request from Growth and Development Scrutiny Committee</b>		
<b>Proposed topic of scrutiny ...</b>	<b>Infrastructure delivery</b>	
<b>I would like to understand ... (key lines of enquiry)</b>	<p>Councillors at Growth and Development Scrutiny Group heard how the Council works with partners to plan for the infrastructure required to support housing growth in the borough.</p> <p>The Group requested a follow up item regarding when infrastructure delivery programmes are delayed and how it engages and communicates with Town and Parish Councils.</p> <p>To review how, when and why changes are made and the role of the Borough Council in this process – what powers does it have to influence the changes and when are they used.</p> <p>To review how the Borough Council engages and communicates with local stakeholders, including Town and Parish Councils and consider what improvements could be made.</p> <p>Reflecting on lessons learned through delivery of existing infrastructure in the Borough as a result of housing growth and changes that could be applied to future housing developments.</p>	
<b>I think this topic should be scrutinised because ... (please tick)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Poor Performance Identified</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Change in Legislation or Local Policy</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Resident Concern or Interest</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Cabinet Recommendation</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Links to the Corporate Strategy</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Other (please state reason)</b> Request from scrutiny
<b>Officer Consideration of Councillor Request for Scrutiny</b>		

## Appendix Two

<b>Officer Feedback (please tick)</b>			
- Issue already being addressed		Issue of a complaint investigation	
- Issue has already been considered in the last 2 years?		Issue is a staffing matter	
- Issue is a legal matter		There is an alternative way of dealing with the issue	
<b>Is there sufficient capacity ...</b>			
- Scrutiny Work Programme?			
- Officer Resources?			
<b>Recommendation</b>			
<b>Consideration of Request for Scrutiny at COG</b>			
<b>Public Involvement / engagement?</b>			
<b>Expert witnesses?</b>			
<b>Portfolio holder?</b>			
<b>Lead Officer?</b>		Helen Knott, Service Manager – Planning and Growth	
<b>Proposed Timescale for Scrutiny and Scrutiny Group</b>		Growth and Development Scrutiny Group – November 2024	

# Rushcliffe Borough Council – Scrutiny Matrix

<b>Councillor Request for Scrutiny</b>			
<b>Request from Growth and Development Scrutiny Committee</b>			
<b>Proposed topic of scrutiny ...</b>	<b>Rushcliffe Oaks Crematorium</b>		
<b>I would like to understand ... (key lines of enquiry)</b>	<p>At the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group in July 2023 a further update the Rushcliffe Oaks Crematorium was requested for June/July 2024.</p> <p>Areas for the report to cover include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further marketing and engagement activity undertaken to raise profile of facility as per discussions at the meeting including with FD's outside of the area</li> <li>• Performance – number of cremations carried out (trend across the year) and income received</li> <li>• Further breakdown of data – number of Rushcliffe residents and those from outside the area</li> <li>• Memorialisation options – any new ones and sales.</li> </ul>		
<b>I think this topic should be scrutinised because ... (please tick)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Poor Performance Identified</b>		
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Change in Legislation or Local Policy</b>		
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Resident Concern or Interest</b>		
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Cabinet Recommendation</b>		
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Links to the Corporate Strategy</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other (please state reason)</b>			
<b>Officer Consideration of Councillor Request for Scrutiny</b>			
<b>Officer Feedback (please tick)</b>			
- Issue already being addressed	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue of a complaint investigation	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Issue has already been considered in the last 2 years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue is a staffing matter	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Issue is a legal matter	<input type="checkbox"/>	There is an alternative way of dealing with the issue	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Is there sufficient capacity ...</b>			
- Scrutiny Work Programme?	<input type="checkbox"/>		

- Officer Resources?		
<b>Recommendation</b>		
<b>Consideration of Request for Scrutiny at COG</b>		
<b>Public Involvement / engagement?</b>		
<b>Expert witnesses?</b>		
<b>Portfolio holder?</b>		
<b>Lead Officer?</b>		
<b>Proposed Timescale for Scrutiny and Scrutiny Group</b>		

DRAFT

# Rushcliffe Borough Council – Scrutiny Matrix

Councillor Request for Scrutiny											
Councillor T Combellack											
<b>Proposed topic of scrutiny ...</b>	<b>Connectivity and communications</b>										
<b>I would like to understand ... (key lines of enquiry)</b>	<p>In this day and age our residents should have 100% mobile and broadband coverage and I think we need to ensure those working on their behalf are delivering. We still do not have 100% connectivity and as more and more use is made of the service with apps, zoom and streaming, and film download what was considered good speeds are slowly being degraded.</p> <p>Members would like to understand what NCC are doing to support digital connectivity across Rushcliffe, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full fibre broadband and the latest upgrades</li> <li>• BDUK roll out – where are the gaps in Rushcliffe and what can we do about them</li> <li>• An update on Gigahubs</li> <li>• An update on project Gigabit</li> <li>• Broadband voucher scheme</li> <li>• Land line disconnection scheduled by 2025 leaves many reliant on VOIP which needs a good Broadband connection. This is a health and safety issue.</li> <li>• Mobile mast connectivity and opportunities for improvement. There are companies already looking for mast sites – could we be engaging with these companies to ensure our residents are well served.</li> </ul>										
<b>I think this topic should be scrutinised because ... (please tick)</b>	<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>*</td> <td>Poor Performance Identified</td> </tr> <tr> <td>*</td> <td>Change in Legislation or Local Policy</td> </tr> <tr> <td>*</td> <td>Resident Concern or Interest</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Cabinet Recommendation</td> </tr> <tr> <td>*</td> <td>Links to the Corporate Strategy</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	*	Poor Performance Identified	*	Change in Legislation or Local Policy	*	Resident Concern or Interest		Cabinet Recommendation	*	Links to the Corporate Strategy
*	Poor Performance Identified										
*	Change in Legislation or Local Policy										
*	Resident Concern or Interest										
	Cabinet Recommendation										
*	Links to the Corporate Strategy										

## Appendix Two

	Other (please state reason)
<b>Officer Consideration of Councillor Request for Scrutiny</b>	
<b>Officer Feedback (please tick)</b>	
- Issue already being addressed	Issue of a complaint investigation
- Issue has already been considered in the last 2 years?	Issue is a staffing matter
- Issue is a legal matter	There is an alternative way of dealing with the issue
<b>Is there sufficient capacity ...</b>	
- Scrutiny Work Programme?	
- Officer Resources?	
<b>Recommendation</b>	
<b>Consideration of Request for Scrutiny at COG</b>	
<b>Public Involvement / engagement?</b>	
<b>Expert witnesses?</b>	
<b>Portfolio holder?</b>	
<b>Lead Officer?</b>	
<b>Proposed Timescale for Scrutiny and Scrutiny Group</b>	