

Potential Items to be considered by Scrutiny, Reasons for Rejection and Matrices for those that Could be Added to Scrutiny Work Programmes

Area of Work / Proposed by	Reason for Rejection / Comment	To be considered – see Matrix or No
<p>Section 106 and CIL</p> <p>Councillor N Clarke, Chairman of the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group</p>	<p>CIL already considered by Growth and Development Scrutiny Group this year. Unclear what the focus/objective is for proposed s106 scrutiny. In addition, RBC has limited control over the formulae which are set by NCC and it is unlikely they would participate in any review.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Proposals for Fairham</p> <p>Councillor T Combellack, Chairman of the Corporate Overview Group</p>	<p>Separate Growth Board for Fairham has been set up and will feed into the Strategic Growth Board. Housing and employment project reported via LDF and Local Plan progress. If councillors would like to be more informed about the new development, then a presentation from the developer could be sought.</p>	<p>Yes, included for consideration</p>
<p>Bingham Growth Agenda</p> <p>Councillor T Combellack, Chairman of the Corporate Overview Group</p>	<p>Separate Growth Board for Bingham to oversee growth and development of the area; also there is a separate Bingham Leisure Centre Member Working Group to oversee the development of the Chapel Lane site with proportionate member representation. A report to Cabinet is planned for January.</p>	<p>No. Await Cabinet report and any issues that may arise.</p>
<p>Borough Wide Community Facilities</p> <p>Councillor J Wheeler, Chairman of the</p>	<p>The majority of facilities outside of West Bridgford are the responsibility of Parish Councils and not in Council control which are currently being reviewed. As</p>	<p>Yes – included for consideration as part of the WB</p>

<p>Communities Scrutiny Group</p>	<p>part of the WB review the scope will include wider facilities across the Borough.</p>	<p>review scheduled for January 2020</p>
<p>Planning Performance Councillor T Combellack, Chairman of the Corporate Overview Group</p>	<p>Planning has been subject to a separate Peer Review and this has been reported upon and a follow-up report taken to Cabinet 18 months ago. Whilst performance against some operational planning service indicators is below target the reasons for this has been explained by officers. Importantly, strategic indicators show positive performance. For areas like enforcement, specific training sessions have been provided. And planning enforcement has been scrutinised.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Community Events Programme Councillor F Purdue-Horan, Chairman of the Governance Scrutiny Group</p>	<p>Most community events are held by Parish Councils, West Bridgford does not have a parish council and therefore specific events are held in West Bridgford. Some events have been held in Cotgrave, Ruddington and Bingham where there are larger communities to add vibrancy to the areas.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Pensions Investment Councillor J Walker, Vice Chairman of the Governance Scrutiny Group</p>	<p>The Council is part of the Nottinghamshire Pensions Scheme which is administered by the County Council. As the Council does not control this service, there is a limit to what can be influenced or changed at this stage.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Edwalton Golf Courses</p>	<p>A report considering the future of Edwalton Golf Course is being drafted for Cabinet in December.</p>	<p>Await outcome from Cabinet</p>

<p>Councillor T Combellack, Chairman of the Corporate Overview Group</p>	<p>Scrutiny may be appropriate following this.</p>	
<p>Public engagement in scrutiny</p> <p>Councillor J Walker, Vice Chairman of the Governance Scrutiny Group</p>	<p>Public engagement in both the identification of topics of concern to the community and as expert witnesses brought into participate in scrutiny is considered where it is already done to add value to the process. Councillors are keen to consider ways in which this could be achieved at Rushcliffe.</p>	<p>Yes, included for consideration</p>

Appendix

Topic: Proposals for Fairham

The Council has ambitious plans for a new community within the Borough at Fairham. Outline planning permission was granted in July 2014 for up to 3,000 homes, employment developments up to 100,000sqm, retail development up to 2,500sqm, a primary school, community facilities such as parks, playing pitches and a community hall, and a village centre including shops and amenities. The Section 106 agreement was signed in May 2019. The site is complex and split across a number of landowners who are working together as a consortium to bring the development forward. The Council has been awarded external funding to support the infrastructure development allowing the site development to be brought forward. This significant project links directly to the Council's Sustainable Development corporate priority.

The purpose of this scrutiny investigation is to:

- Understand the current proposals for residential and commercial development on the Fairham site.
- Identify any gaps in provision / vision and suggest ways of engaging with and complimenting existing communities.
- Recommend any notable ideas or changes to Cabinet.

Initial questions to ask	
Why would we do this?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is an issue of public concern• Is a key element of our new Corporate Strategy• It is considered essential to create a new community that compliments its surroundings and becomes an integral part of the Borough
How does it link to the Council's Corporate Strategy?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Expressly mentioned in the Sustainable Development priority
What tangible benefits could result for the community or our customers?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Greater oversight at the early stages of development will ensure that the Council's ambitions are realised
What evidence is there to support the need for a review?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Community concern
What would we wish to achieve and why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Better understanding of the proposed development
Are resources available to undertake a scrutiny exercise and will the work programme accommodate it?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Yes, if it follows, rather than running concurrently with, other scrutiny activities, resources can be found to support this review

Reasons to reject the topic	

Is it covered by the terms of reference for a scrutiny group?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group
Is it already being addressed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No
Is it part of a legal process?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No
Does it fall within the Council's complaints procedure?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No
Is it a staffing matter that would fall within the jurisdiction of the Head of Paid Service?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No
Is it unlikely to result in real or tangible improvements for local people?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No
Is there sufficient capacity to support such a review?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes

Score	Importance	Impact
0	No evidence of links to Aims and Priorities	No potential benefits
1	No evidence of links to Aims and Priorities, but a subject of high public concern	Minor potential benefits affecting only one ward/ customer / client group
2	Some evidence of links, but indirect	Minor benefits to two groups / moderate benefits to one
3	Good evidence linking both Aims and Priorities	Moderate benefits to more than one group / substantial benefits to one
4	Strong evidence linking both, and has a high level of public concern	Substantial community-wide benefits

Importance	4				
	3	X			
	2				
	1				
		1	2	3	4
		Impact			

Outcome:

Topic: Public engagement in scrutiny

Scrutiny will be most effective if it is open, transparent and embraces public involvement. In its present form, the public are rarely seen at the council's scrutiny meetings and there are no formal mechanisms for them to speak, unlike other forums within the Borough.

Actively seeking out the views and concerns of the public to influence will make real the work we do in scrutiny as well as ensuring we remain current and fit for purpose. We can't assume that we will pick up on all issues that may arise within the Borough and need help from our residents in providing a valuable extra layer of scrutiny.

As we are embarking on a new format for scrutiny is an excellent opportunity for us to try new ideas and approaches, unbridled from the prescriptive and formal methodology necessary in other areas of the Council.

Initial questions to ask	
Why would we do this?	To make scrutiny more democratic, transparent and fit for purpose. To show that our borough is actively trying to show we are progressive and thinking of new and inventive ways of increasing engagement.
How does it link to the Council's Corporate Strategy?	"Operating in an ever more transparent manner, ensuring residents feel fully informed and involved in decision making." Corporate Strategy 2019-2023
What tangible benefits could result for the community or our customers?	Involving the community in our scrutiny process will help make it fit for purpose and help us to serve the residents we are there to serve.
What evidence is there to support the need for a review?	It was very much encouraged as an example of best practise at our latest East Midlands Council gathering.
What would we wish to achieve and why?	Increased ownership and involvement in local government but people who may not be immediately drawn into politics. We could look to engage members of the public that wouldn't normally come to meetings.
Are resources available to undertake a scrutiny exercise and will the work programme accommodate it?	"The Good Scrutiny Guide" and https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/overview-and-scrutiny-statutory-guidance-for-councils-and-combined-authorities

Reasons to reject the topic	
Is it covered by the terms of reference for a scrutiny group?	Not yet
Is it already being addressed?	No
Is it part of a legal process?	No
Does it fall within the Council's complaints procedure?	No
Is it a staffing matter that would fall within the jurisdiction of the Head of Paid Service?	No
Is it unlikely to result in real or tangible improvements for local people?	Increased transparency and community involvement.
Is there sufficient capacity to support such a review?	Dependant on timing of review.

Score	Importance	Impact
0	No evidence of links to Aims and Priorities	No potential benefits
1	No evidence of links to Aims and Priorities, but a subject of high public concern	Minor potential benefits affecting only one ward/ customer / client group
2	Some evidence of links, but indirect	Minor benefits to two groups / moderate benefits to one
3	Good evidence linking both Aims and Priorities	Moderate benefits to more than one group / substantial benefits to one
4	Strong evidence linking both, and has a high level of public concern	Substantial community-wide benefits

Importance	4			
	3			
	2		X	
	1			
		1	2	3
Impact				

Outcome: