

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
Dog Fouling Councillor C Thomas, Independent Councillor for East Leake	Suitable for scrutiny at the Communities Scrutiny Group – Combine with littering – both forms of litter	See Matrix
Management of new developments Cllr L Way, Independent Councillor for East Leake	Rename – Management of open spaces – suitable for scrutiny at the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group	See Matrix
Fly Tipping Cllr R Walker, Conservative Councillor for Gotham	Suitable for scrutiny at the Communities Scrutiny Group – provisionally pencilled in for March 2020	See Matrix
Flooding assessment and drainage Cllr T Combellack, Chairman of the Corporate Overview Group	Suitable for scrutiny at the Communities Scrutiny Group – Nottinghamshire County Council, the Drainage Board, Severn Trent Water and the Council's Emergency Planning Officer to be invited to attend	See Matrix
Littering on main routes into the Borough Cllr T Combellack, Chairman of the Corporate Overview Group	See above – Dog Fouling	
How are the six strategic employment sites being developed, and how is the Council engaged with the stakeholders Cllr N Clarke, Chairman of the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group	Not considered suitable for scrutiny at the present time as this topic is considered in other ways (such as the Strategic Growth Board) – greater understanding of the concerns of Councillors and resulting key lines of enquiry for the scrutiny investigation sought	

<p>Supporting Town Centres – to bring this item back at a later date with an update and progress report</p> <p>Cllr N Clarke, Chairman of the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group</p>	<p>Not suitable for scrutiny at this time – recently considered and purpose of further scrutiny not clear at this point – greater understanding of the concerns of Councillors and resulting key lines of enquiry for the scrutiny investigation, and timing of the scrutiny, is sought</p>	
<p>The availability of banks and cashpoints declining significantly across the Borough</p> <p>Cllr N Clarke, Chairman of the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group</p>	<p>To be explored at the next Town and Parish Councils Forum to understand scale of issue – potential future topic for consideration</p>	
<p>Engagement with the D2N2 LEP to outline their support within Rushcliffe</p> <p>Cllr N Clarke, Chairman of the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group</p>	<p>Not considered suitable for scrutiny at this stage – officers suggest a briefing note to update Councillors. D2N2 regularly present to the Strategic Growth Board. A Local Industries report is expected soon and this may provide scope for scrutiny involvement.</p>	
<p>Planning Enforcement Policy</p> <p>David Mitchell, Executive Manager – Communities</p>	<p>Suitable for scrutiny at the Communities Scrutiny Group before being considered for adoption at Council</p>	<p>See Matrix</p>

Scrutiny Matrices Submitted By Councillors For Consideration

Topic: Dog Fouling
Review of policies and level of fine. Review of resources allocated to enforcement and campaigns, and their effectiveness. Consideration of measures taken elsewhere, including requirement for dog walkers to carry bags (see Blaby District Council ¹) and enforcement

Initial questions to ask	
Why would we do this?	High public interest Health risk Dog fouling order dates back to 1998 Changing public opinion and new options available
How does it link to the Council's Corporate Strategy?	"Our residents' quality of life is our first priority" "create great, safe and clean communities to live and work in" "Protecting our residents' health" "create vibrant town centres which are attractive and accessible to all"
What tangible benefits could result for the	Cleaner public places, better engagement with dog owners, shift of behaviour
What evidence is there to support the need for a review?	Examples can be given from East Leake – this topic has been raised frequently with me as a new councillor. Officers monitor this information on a monthly basis and no significant issues have been identified within the Borough though there are pockets of concern.
What would we wish to achieve and why?	Improved policies, better communicated to the public, more effective enforcement
Are resources available to undertake a scrutiny exercise accommodate it?	Yes, this can be undertaken by our contracts team

Reasons to reject the topic	
Is it covered by the terms of reference for a scrutiny group?	Communities Scrutiny Group – "Identifying areas of community concern" "Considering concerns ... in terms of health and wellbeing"
Is it already being addressed?	Yes, it is regularly monitored and we have on going campaigns
Is it part of a legal process?	No
Does it fall within the Council's complaints procedure?	Complaints can be made about dog fouling issues but these will be treated as service requests and dealt with.

¹ <https://w3.blaby.gov.uk/decision-making/documents/s38716/Appendix%20A%20The%20Public%20Spaces%20Protection%20Order%20-%20Blaby%20District%20Council%202019.pdf>

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?	No
Is there sufficient capacity to support such a review?	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			★	
	2				
	1				
		1	2	3	4
	Impact				

Topic: Management of new developments – Rename to Management of Open Spaces

To examine the management of new developments after the developers hand over to management companies. Who has which responsibilities, for example, but not exclusively, grass cutting, litter bins and maintenance of play equipment? Does this mean that the residents on a particular development have sole rights to using the space and are entitled to ask other residents to leave? Look at how future costs will impact residents when management companies are in control.

Initial questions to ask	
Why would we do this?	This is increasing and multiple issues are arising from the views of the management companies and residents. In some areas it is causing conflict between residents and could lead to enclaves within communities.
How does it link to the Council's Corporate Strategy?	Bullet point 1 and 4 under Quality of Life on /Corporate Strategy 2019-2023
What tangible benefits could result for the community or our customers?	A more cohesive community and clarity in responsibilities of different agencies.
What evidence is there to support the need for a review?	Evidence can be provided using recent new developments in East Leake
What would we wish to achieve and why?	Give the residents of new developments and the wider community some influence in how resources are managed.
Are resources available to undertake a scrutiny exercise and will the work programme accommodate it?	Possibly, although it would depend on a further scoping exercise to identify firmer key lines of enquiry and the timing of a review.

Reasons to reject the topic	
Is it covered by the terms of reference for a scrutiny group?	An argument could be made for both the Communities and Growth and Development Scrutiny Groups
Is it already being addressed?	No
Is it part of a legal process?	No, though there are legal elements to the transfer of management
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?	No
Is there sufficient capacity to support such a review?	Will depend on timing and scope of enquiry

Score	Importance	Impact
0	No evidence of links to Aims and Priorities	No potential benefits
1	No evidence of links to Aims and	Minor potential benefits affecting only

	Priorities, but a subject of high public concern	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	★			
	1				
		1	2	3	4
		Impact			

Appendix

Topic: Fly Tipping

The purpose of this group is to positively and proactively contribute to the ongoing success and good management of Rushcliffe Borough Council. The Group will achieve this by (emphasis added by Chairman of Communities Scrutiny Group):

- Reviewing the Council's partnerships to ensure that **community needs are being met** and the partnership is providing good value for money
- **Identifying areas of community concern, exploring how this can be met and making recommendations to that effect**
- Considering concerns specific to the local area in terms of health and wellbeing and making recommendations to improve the health and wellbeing of local residents
- **Considering projects and initiatives to further the Council's efforts to protect the environment** of the Borough and promote environmental sustainability to our residents

I have been prompted to raise this as an issue for scrutiny because:

* I witness an increased number of fly tipping incidents in my Ward. I don't have to hand more recent data than that mentioned below as reported to PMB. However, from personal experience, the incidents are increasing in both frequency and seriousness (I'm sure more current data on reported fly-tips is held/accessible).

* This has therefore become an area of community concern. It has detrimental impact on the environment and residents' quality of life (I assume you don't need me to explain how/why?! – I can do if necessary).

*Fly tipping is, by its nature, a difficult crime to detect. However I believe that as a Council we should review our current approach to detection/prevention; consider alternative/innovative approaches to reducing fly-tips; test such new approaches; then review effectiveness following.

*I feel scrutiny is needed because it represents an opportunity to reflect on current practice; would be an impetus to consider alternative approaches (in the face of increased instances); and would be a means by which to communicate to residents what the Council is doing to address their concerns.

*The goals of scrutinising this topic would be:

Significantly reducing fly-tipping in the Borough

Identifying and celebrating areas in which current prevention methods are working.

Identifying and actioning areas in which new prevention methods could be used.

Identifying opportunities to provide better value for money by reducing costs of removing fly-tips to both Streetwise and private land owners.

Improving residents' quality of life and the local environment via reduced fly-tips.

Initial questions to ask


Why would we do this?	Fly tipping reports have been rising year on year both locally and nationally, with 858 made in Rushcliffe the first 9 months of 2018 (as reported to PMB) Matter of significant interest/alarm to local communities.
How does it link to the Council's Corporate Strategy?	Quality of life: reducing fly tipping would have positive impact on how our residents feel about the Borough and its environment. Help towards

	<p>creating “great, safe and clean communities to live and work in”.</p> <p>Efficient services: addressing efficiency of streetwise by tackling prevention rather than speed of cleaning up once incidents occurred.</p> <p>The environment: Means to provide action rather than just aspiration in how we treat our environment. Means to “maximise our community leadership role to influence the behaviours of...our residents.” To improve how we “deliver a high-quality waste and recycling collection service.” Opportunity to “support environmental initiatives”.</p>
What tangible benefits could result for the community or our customers?	Reduce number of fly tipping incidents. Increase detection rate/prosecutions. Increase residents’ attitudes towards their environment.
What evidence is there to support the need for a review?	As per above, data provided via Streetwise on the increased volume of reported fly tips. Although prosecutions have been secured, this has not resulted in instances of tips reducing.
What would we wish to achieve and why?	A review of the approach towards fly tipping and measures in place to deter. Investigation of new, innovative and creative ideas to tackle the problem. Whilst detection is always going to be difficult, this does not mean we should not try to find fresh solutions.
Are resources available to undertake a scrutiny exercise and will the work programme accommodate it?	Yes

Reasons to reject the topic	
Is it covered by the terms of reference for a scrutiny group?	Yes, Communities Scrutiny Group
Is it already being addressed?	A significant amount of work has taken place in the last twelve months related to fly-tipping resulting in a number of high profile prosecutions
Is it part of a legal process?	Yes
Does it fall within the Council’s complaints procedure?	Yes
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?	No
Is there sufficient capacity to support such a review?	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				
	2				
	1				
		1	2	3	4
		Impact			

Appendix

Topic: Flooding assessment and drainage


Due to recent flooding in October 2019 and February 2020, there are high levels of public concern in specific areas of the Borough. Councillors would like a greater level of understanding of who does what, when and how; and would welcome the opportunity to communicate residents concerns to the relevant authority.

Initial questions to ask	
Why would we do this?	Given recent flooding problems in the Borough this is now an urgent area for scrutiny. We have representation on drainage boards but feedback is limited. Councillors understanding of who does what and how they can best help is limited. The public are understandably concerned.
How does it link to the Council's Corporate Strategy?	Clear links to the 'Environment' theme, particularly given our commitment to address climate change issues and therefore links to the Council's corporate strategy
What tangible benefits could result for the community or our customers?	Confidence in safety of themselves and their homes. To understand the drainage issues and address underlying problems would result in a benefit to residents and inform planning.
What evidence is there to support the need for a review?	There would be substantial community wide benefits and given the recent flooding events there has been a high level of public concern.
What would we wish to achieve and why?	The flooding problems have highlighted a need to address drainage and make provision for relieving flood waters. We need to work with the drainage boards and local land owners to ensure all water courses are regularly inspected and maintained.
Are resources available to undertake a scrutiny exercise and will the work programme accommodate it?	This area of scrutiny, if pursued, will require the coordination of external partners to give Councillors a complete picture of all involved in flooding issues.

Reasons to reject the topic	
Is it covered by the terms of reference for a scrutiny group?	Communities Scrutiny Group – "Identifying areas of community concern" "Considering concerns ... in terms of health and wellbeing"
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?	No

Is there sufficient capacity to support such a review?	Yes, although those resources are currently dealing with the recent operational issues of response and recovery so it will depend on the timing of the investigation
--	--

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				
	1				
			1	2	3
		Impact			

Topic: Littering on main routes into the Borough – to be combined with Dog Fouling


Reason to scrutinise – in the best possible interest of the public, given our commitments to recycling and the environment. The main arteries into the Borough are our advertisement for attracting inward investment from businesses and public. There is a need to raise greater awareness of the hazards of littering and the need to encourage the public to be more responsible for their own litter – look at the Japanese model. A litter free Borough should apply everywhere, not just the main roads, but streets, parks, public buildings and schools. We need a programme of public education – perhaps the schools can help. We would hope to produce a litter free Borough where residents were proud to live, businesses wanted to invest and the environment was healthy. All feeding into our Corporate Strategy.

Initial questions to ask	
Why would we do this?	High levels of usage; advertising the Borough; aim to keep other areas very highly cleansed but these routes are where people will make judgements.
How does it link to the Council's Corporate Strategy?	Clear links to the 'Environment' theme.
What tangible benefits could result for the community or our customers?	Cleaner streets, less litter blowing onto residential streets; higher levels of satisfaction with the Borough as a good place to live and work
What evidence is there to support the need for a review?	Being addressed as a key task in internal work programmes for investigation this year based on performance information monitored by the team
What would we wish to achieve and why?	New safe working practices to address cleanliness on main arterial routes and address central reservation cleansing
Are resources available to undertake a scrutiny exercise and will the work programme accommodate it?	Yes

Reasons to reject the topic	
Is it covered by the terms of reference for a scrutiny group?	Communities Scrutiny Group – "Identifying areas of community concern" "Considering concerns ... in terms of health and wellbeing"
Is it already being addressed?	Key task identified in internal work programmes for investigation this year
Is it part of a legal process?	No
Does it fall within the Council's complaints procedure?	Complaints can be made about littering issues but these will be treated as service requests and dealt with.

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?	No
Is there sufficient capacity to support such a review?	Would need to work with Streetwise Environmental Ltd as it is their contractual responsibility to deliver this service – support can be provided from the contracts team

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				
	1				
		1	2	3	4
		Impact			

Topic: How are the six strategic employment sites being developed, and how is the Council engaged with the stakeholders.


Scrutiny necessary to ensure appropriate provision of a variety of business/industrial space/flexible units etc. Are business taking up the space? If not, why not? If so, is there more demand that could be provided by public intervention? Create more and good quality jobs for local residents, and test if business rates is encouraging successful businesses.

Initial questions to ask	
Why would we do this?	To ensure the right facilities are being planned, provided and utilised in the Council's new strategic sites
How does it link to the Council's Corporate Strategy?	Direct links to the Council's priority to support businesses
What tangible benefits could result for the community or our customers?	More and expanded/growing businesses in the Borough. To maintain business rate contributions. Provide new jobs/high quality jobs. Ensure development of space is encouraged and strategic, and fulfils local demand.
What evidence is there to support the need for a review?	Developing area of Borough provision – need to ensure that what is being planned and built meets the current and future demand.
What would we wish to achieve and why?	To ascertain if we have appropriate types and the right amount of employment space to fulfil local needs and to understand which partners are involved in which sites, and what plans there are for the future. Is there room for business to grow and expand? To identify new sites if necessary. Would want understanding of the available premises and types of premise across the Borough, e.g. industrial/light industrial/hi-tech/office/start-up/growing on space.
Are resources available to undertake a scrutiny exercise and will the work programme accommodate it?	Yes, but the scrutiny investigation will need to be planned around existing workloads

Reasons to reject the topic	
Is it covered by the terms of reference for a scrutiny group?	Covered by the terms of reference for the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group
Is it already being addressed?	Covered by the strategic planning function and influenced / monitored by the Economic Growth team.
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?	No
Is there sufficient capacity to support such a review?	Dependant on timing of investigation

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				
	1				
		1	2	3	4
		Impact			

Appendix A

Topic: Supporting Town Centres – to bring this item back at a later date with an update and progress report.

Having just scrutinised this, we know it links to the Corporate Strategy to support local businesses. To ensure that we guard against complacency, and that we are monitoring the success of our Town Centres supporting vibrant local economies, local services and successful rural communities.

It is not currently an identifiable issue, but is something we must keep a careful watch on to ensure vibrancy is maintained, hence the need to keep under review.

Initial questions to ask	
Why would we do this?	
How does it link to the Council's Corporate Strategy?	
What tangible benefits could result for the community or our customers?	
What evidence is there to support the need for a review?	Presented at January scrutiny meeting – unclear what further scrutiny can be undertaken at this stage
What would we wish to achieve and why?	
Are resources available to undertake a scrutiny exercise and will the work programme accommodate it?	

Reasons to reject the topic	
Is it covered by the terms of reference for a scrutiny group?	Covered by the Terms of Reference for the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group
Is it already being addressed?	Was addressed in January 2020
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?	Yes
Is there sufficient capacity to support such a review?	No

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				
	1				
		1	2	3	4
	Impact				

Topic: The availability of banks and cashpoints declining significantly across the Borough.

The Borough has seen a considerable reduction in the number of cash points and banks in our towns and villages. This may make it very difficult for our residents who are not yet comfortable with digital financial transactions to conduct their business. It may also have an impact on local businesses who wish to bank takings or cannot afford digital transaction costs.

Initial questions to ask	
Why would we do this?	The trajectory is towards an ongoing reduction of cashpoints as both banks and people move to a cashless society and digital finance. The issue is that reduction of cashpoints is marginalising, still further, local residents who still prefer cash (e.g. mainly the elderly, given Rushcliffe's demographics). Also, many local retailers still rely on cash as card machines fees are expensive, and many small independent retailers operate on small margins and prefer cash where possible, especially small cafes, restaurants, newsagents, market stalls etc.
How does it link to the Council's Corporate Strategy?	Under Sustainable Growth, Protecting the most vulnerable in our communities.
What tangible benefits could result for the community or our customers?	Very few settlements, even large villages, now have any banking facilities and some "vulnerable/elderly" residents may not have access to, or the expertise for, a computer or feel comfortable or capable of using Smart phones for financial transactions, or even at all.
What evidence is there to support the need for a review?	We can't stop this trend but could consider/explore innovative local solutions, such as Community Cashpoints or maybe even attached to local central charging points (leading changes in future lifestyle) or maybe a Community digital hub in a local pub or shop.
What would we wish to achieve and why?	To reduce the impact of "cash marginalisation" of residents, particularly in smaller rural areas.
Are resources available to undertake a scrutiny exercise and will the work programme accommodate it?	Dependent on timing of scrutiny

Reasons to reject the topic	
Is it covered by the terms of reference for a scrutiny group?	Covered in the terms of reference for the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group.

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?	No
Is there sufficient capacity to support such a review?	Need not yet substantiated

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				
	1				
		1	2	3	4
Impact					


Topic: Engagement with the D2N2 LEP to outline their support within Rushcliffe

There is a desire to better understand the work of D2N2 and appreciate how they can contribute our corporate goal of maintaining a healthy and vibrant economy within the Borough.

Initial questions to ask	
Why would we do this?	The Council's intention is to maintain a healthy and vibrant economy. This is in order to understand what is available to local business and whether this support is an appropriate and effective engagement. To understand the D2N2 offer as it plays out in the Borough and is there anything more or different they should be doing to support the particular business demographic of Rushcliffe
How does it link to the Council's Corporate Strategy?	Directly to the Council's key priority to support business
What tangible benefits could result for the community or our customers?	Better directed business support services
What evidence is there to support the need for a review?	Uncertainty regarding D2N2 available programme of support and how this meets the needs of our Borough
What would we wish to achieve and why?	Ongoing business success and productivity in the Borough. Encouraging and supporting creation of jobs/quality jobs for the local workforce and encouraging inward investment and high quality jobs in the area
Are resources available to undertake a scrutiny exercise and will the work programme accommodate it?	D2N2 is monitored and reviewed by the Rushcliffe Strategic Growth Board – need for additional work not yet clear

Reasons to reject the topic	
Is it covered by the terms of reference for a scrutiny group?	No
Is it already being addressed?	Yes, by the Strategic Growth Board
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?	Yes
Is there sufficient capacity to support such a review?	No

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				
	1				
		1	2	3	4
		Impact			

Appendix


Topic: The Borough Council's Planning Enforcement Policy

The Borough Council is in the process of preparing a Planning Enforcement Policy. In addition, the Planning Enforcement Code of Practice is due for review and renewal in March 2021. Scrutinising the emerging Policy, and its effectiveness, as well as changes in legislation and operational practice will enable Councillors to influence changes to be made to the Policy before adoption at Council by March 2021.

Initial questions to ask	
Why would we do this?	Planning Enforcement is a discretionary service. However, ineffective enforcement can impact on the confidence in the planning process and the reputation of the service and the Council.
How does it link to the Council's Corporate Strategy?	<p>Quality of life: Development amounting to a breach of planning has the potential to impact on residents' quality of life.</p> <p>Efficient services: An efficient and effective enforcement service has the potential to maintain confidence in the planning process and avoid adverse impact on reputation of the service.</p> <p>Sustainable Growth: Compliance with planning permissions granted is important to ensure that development and growth within the Borough takes place in a sustainable manner.</p> <p>The Environment: Compliance with planning permissions granted is important to ensure that development takes place in an acceptable way and to ensure that any potential adverse impacts on the environment are avoided or appropriately mitigated.</p>
What tangible benefits could result for the community or our customers?	Reduction in number and significance of planning breaches and resultant impact on residents and the amenity of their property.
What evidence is there to support the need for a review?	The Planning Enforcement Code of Practice is due to be reviewed and there needs to be consistency between this and the emerging Enforcement Policy to ensure the delivery of an effective Enforcement service.
What would we wish to achieve and why?	Continued operation of an effective and efficient enforcement service and deterrent to potential future breaches of planning control.
Are resources available to undertake a scrutiny exercise accommodate it?	Resources are currently limited and consideration may need to be given to addressing any shortfall in capacity.

Reasons to reject the topic	
Is it covered by the terms of reference for a scrutiny group?	The scrutiny of the Planning Enforcement Code of Practice and emerging Planning Enforcement Policy could be deemed to fall within the terms of reference for both the Communities Scrutiny Group or the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group.
Is it already being addressed?	Policy is currently being prepared and would need to be referred to Cabinet and Council prior to adoption
Is it part of a legal process?	Yes
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?	No
Is there sufficient capacity to support such a review?	See above comment

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				
	1				
		1	2	3	4
		Impact			