OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD – 16 JUNE 2014

A meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board will be held at 5.30pm on Monday 16 June 2014 in Committee Room 1, Town Hall, Rugby.

Councillor Mahoney
Chairman of Overview & Scrutiny Management Board

AGENDA

PART 1 – PUBLIC BUSINESS

1. Minutes.

To confirm the minutes of the meetings held on 17 March 2014 and 5 June 2014.

2. Apologies.

To receive apologies for absence from the meeting.

3. Declarations of Interest.

To receive declarations of –

(a) non-pecuniary interests as defined by the Council’s Code of Conduct for Councillors;

(b) pecuniary interests as defined by the Council’s Code of Conduct for Councillors; and

(c) notice under Section 106 Local Government Finance Act 1992 – non-payment of Community Charge or Council Tax.

Note: Members are reminded that they should declare the existence and nature of their non-pecuniary interests at the commencement of the meeting (or as soon as the interest becomes apparent). If that interest is a pecuniary interest the Member must withdraw from the room unless one of the exceptions applies.
Membership of Warwickshire County Council or any Parish Council is classed as a personal interest under the Code of Conduct. A Member does not need to declare this interest unless the Member chooses to speak on a matter relating to their membership. If the Member does not wish to speak on the matter, the Member may still vote on the matter without making a declaration.

4. Call-Ins and Motions.

To receive any Call-Ins from Cabinet and any Motions referred by Council.

5. Minutes of Crime and Disorder Committee on 13 March 2014, Customer and Partnerships Committee on 3 April 2014 and Corporate Performance Committee on 10 April 2014 – for noting only.


7. Review of Fixed Term Tenancies.

8. Disestablishment of Crime and Disorder Committee.


PART 2 – EXEMPT INFORMATION

There is no business involving exempt information to be transacted.

Any additional papers or relevant documents for this meeting can be accessed here via the website.

The Reports of Officers (Ref. OSMB 2014/15-02) are attached.

Membership of the Board: -

Councillors Mahoney (Chairman), G Francis, Mrs Garcia, Keeling, Miss Lawrence, Roodhouse, Dr Shera, Stokes and Helen Walton.

If you have any general queries with regard to this agenda please contact Linn Ashmore, Democratic and Scrutiny Services Officer (01788 533523 or e-mail Linn.Ashmore @rugby.gov.uk). Any specific queries concerning reports should be directed to the listed contact officer.

If you wish to attend the meeting and have any special requirements for access please contact the Democratic and Scrutiny Services Officer named above.
MINUTES OF CRIME AND DISORDER COMMITTEE
13 MARCH 2014

PRESENT:

Members of the Committee:
Councillors Stokes (Chairman), Mrs Kaur, Mrs Parker, Dr Shera and Helen Walton

Officers:
Sean Lawson (Head of Environmental Services), Paul Ansell (Scrutiny and Policy Officer) and Linn Ashmore (Democratic and Scrutiny Services Officer)

Also in attendance:
Chris Cade (Chairman of Rugby Borough Neighbourhood Watch)

27. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 November 2013 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

28. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence from the meeting were received from Councillors M Francis and Keeling and also Keith Newell (Community Safety Partnership Manager).

29. QUESTION TIME

There were no questions.

30. CALL-INS

There were no call-ins.

31. COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP PERFORMANCE REPORT

The committee considered a report (Part 1 –agenda item 6) concerning CSP performance.

Copies of an updated performance report covering the period to the end of February 2014 were circulated to members of the Committee. A copy is attached at Annex 1 to the minutes.

The Head of Environmental Services briefed the committee on the following points:

The Community Safety Manager was unable to attend this meeting because he was currently involved in a joint national working party connected to the work of the Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC). This was in recognition of
Rugby’s achievements and how its performance management supports the CSP Board in the way it is delivering community rehabilitation.

Compared to the same period in 2012/13 performance for Rugby in the following areas was:

Most serious violence – down 12%
Serious violence – down 4%
Domestic burglary – down 3%

On average crime figures were down by 30 per cent compared to the previous year.

One particular area of partnership working success was domestic burglary.

The figures produced in the reoffending table were on a rolling five year basis from 2005 to 2011 and did not represent the current picture.

The data for Warwickshire was not within the control of the local CSP.

The figure for Warwickshire in relation to deliberate small fires was high compared to 2012/13 but this was probably as a result of the dry summer last year.

RESOLVED THAT – the report be noted.

32. PRIORITIES AND FUNDING BIDS FOR 2014/15.

The committee considered a report (Part 1 – agenda item 7) concerning funding for CSP Board priorities and action plans.

During discussion of the item the following points were made:

The Partnership has applied for £47,020 from the Police and Crime Commissioner Community Safety Grant for 2014/15 to fund the implementation of a set of multi-agency action plans produced to meet the priorities and targets set by the CSP Board.

It was argued that the core grant awarded to Rugby from the PCC’s budget meant Rugby was underfunded when its growing population and level of recorded crime was compared to the rest of Warwickshire. The PCC, however, did not accept this argument.

A number of programmes that would benefit from successful bids for Innovation Fund grants involved Hill Street Community Centre.

The original bid for the Futures Unlocked project was based on an Alliance-wide scheme but discussions held since then meant the scale of the plans has been reduced to a Warwickshire-wide scheme with 55-60 mentors.

Futures Unlocked has 25 current cases but it was anticipated there would be around 180 new cases as the move away from the National Probation Service takes effect.

Members asked about the relocation of DVR recording equipment in Brownsover and were informed the equipment will be relocated and upgraded to enable the camera to be linked to the monitoring station operated by Rugby First. The recordings will be stored in a secure area to be used as evidence if needed. This would be a reliable robust solution.
The Committee thanked Keith Newell, Community Safety Manager, and Paul Collett, Community Safety Project Manager (WCC) for their hard work.

RESOLVED THAT – the report be noted.

33. SERIOUS AND ACQUISITIVE CRIME PAG REPORT

The committee considered a report (Part 1 – agenda item 8) concerning an update on burglary and violent crime.

During discussion of the item the following points were made:

There has been a small reduction in domestic burglary offences.

Cross-border criminality was a key challenge and there have been difficulties working with neighbouring police forces. Meetings were now held between Rugby and Coventry police managers and stronger working links were being developed.

Geographic gaps were identified in the coverage of Neighbourhood Watch schemes.

There was a training event due to be held at Wolston Leisure Centre on 23 April which would involve all PCSOs, neighbourhood watch representatives and other agencies.

A new scheme has been introduced for PCSOs to become champions tasked with encouraging community involvement in policing, and this would support issues around domestic burglary. This work will become imbedded as part of their own personal development plans.

RESOLVED THAT – the report be noted.

34. COMMUNITY REHABILITATION

The committee considered a report (Part 1 – agenda item 9) concerning the implications of the impending changes in community rehabilitation.

The CSP Manager has been invited to become a member of a national working party in an advisory capacity to help support the Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRC). The work of the CRCs will champion what works well and this will benefit Rugby and other areas.

The Ministry of Justice (MoJ) will be a key stakeholder and Government agencies will bid for CRC contracts.

The Chief Executive-designate of the newly formed West Mercia and Warwickshire CRC was the current Chief Executive of Warwickshire Probation Trust. It was known that she recognised the success of the Futures Unlocked programme and it was hoped that she would continue to retain the current ethos and imbed this way of working in the new structure.

There was evidence to suggest that Warwickshire’s Probation Service is considered to be one of the top in the country. Work will continue in the same professional manner during the transition period.
Members commented that the monitoring of shorter sentences was a positive move.

RESOLVED THAT – the report be noted.

35. NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH REPORT

Chris Cade, the Chairman of Rugby Borough Neighbourhood Watch gave members the following update:

Incidents of domestic burglary were down.

It was important to get the message across to the public that the non-urgent Police phone number was 101. 999 was for emergencies only. Many people still seemed unaware of this.

Community forums were publicising Immobilise. This online database service does not replace Smartwater and is not a free service. There was a concern this was some misrepresentation on the police website.

There was some dissatisfaction expressed with the relay system due to a delay in messages being received and changes of addresses were not being notified.

It was hoped the forthcoming PSCO training day will result in positive outcomes. The urban area is more problematic that rural areas.

The former Warwickshire Neighbourhood Watch Chairman and his wife had been awarded a British Empire Medal.

A new Warwickshire Police Cadet volunteer scheme is being introduced but the nearest location to Rugby is Nuneaton meaning young people will need to travel.

There were policing concerns regarding the Rugby Radio Station site and it was possible there will be some form of temporary police station set up in the area.

The number of new watches was slightly up but there were some historic issues in Rugby with whole areas not wishing to become part of the scheme. Work is ongoing to try and resolve these issues.

RESOLVED THAT – Chris Cade be thanked for his report.

36. COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

Members were invited to email the Policy and Scrutiny Officer with suggested agenda items for the meeting on 29 July 2014. Other items will be agreed by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

37. VOTE OF THANKS

RESOLVED THAT - the Committee places on record its appreciation of the work undertaken by Councillor Stokes in his capacity as Chairman of the Committee for the 2013/14 municipal year.
The Chairman also thanked members of the committee, officers for their work during the past year and offered special thanks to Chris Cade, Chairman of Rugby Borough Neighbourhood Watch.

CHAIRMAN
## Warwickshire

### Monthly Performance against 2013/14 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>2012/13 Actual</th>
<th>2013/14 Target</th>
<th>2013/14 Actual</th>
<th>Actual Total to date</th>
<th>Residual Target</th>
<th>Projected Year Total</th>
<th>Performance vs same period 12/13</th>
<th>RAG Projected Performance vs Target</th>
<th>RAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority - TO REDUCE VIOLENT CRIME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime (All Offences)</td>
<td>5,396</td>
<td>5,395</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime (Alcohol/Drugs Marker)**</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Violent Crime</td>
<td>2,608</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Sexual Crime***</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARC Clients [clients seen at Blue Sky Centre]</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk Domestic Violence Repeats through MARACs (%)</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority - TO REDUCE ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour Incidents (All)</td>
<td>20,164</td>
<td>20,163</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>1,953</td>
<td>2,244</td>
<td>2,117</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>1,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuisance</td>
<td>14,403</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>1,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>1,222</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority - TO REDUCE DOMESTIC BURGLARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Related Alcohol Admissions</td>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>1,651</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate Per 100,000 2012/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority - CROSS CUTTING FOCUS ON ALCOHOL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local adult re-offending rates for 1 April 2012 to 31 March 2013, at the local authority level of disaggregation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwickshire</td>
<td>4,507</td>
<td>7.81%</td>
<td>9.29%</td>
<td>-15.93%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Please note the above information is based on a binary measure - i.e. whether an offender commits any further offence at all. It does not measure if there has been a reduction in the overall volume of offending but rather the % of offenders who commit any further offences over a given period.

---

**Priority - TO REDUCE OFFENDING**

**Source:** Ministry of Justice

---

**Notes:**

- **Priority - TO REDUCE VIOLENT CRIME**
  - indicates a realistic chance of improving performance, **Red** indicates significantly off target.
  - Projected year total is based on current performance to date and predicted trends throughout remainder of year.

- **Priority - TO REDUCE ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR**
  - **A** indicates an amber target, **G** indicates a green target.

- **Priority - TO REDUCE DOMESTIC BURGLARY**
  - **A** indicates an amber target, **G** indicates a green target.

- **Priority - CROSS CUTTING FOCUS ON ALCOHOL**
  - **A** indicates an amber target, **G** indicates a green target.

- **Priority - TO REDUCE OFFENDING**
  - **G** indicates a green target.
# Warwickshire - Additional Measures

**Actual Monthly Performance against 2013/14 Targets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>2012/13 Actual</th>
<th>2013/14 Actuals</th>
<th>2013/14 Actuals</th>
<th>Actual Total to Date</th>
<th>Predicted Year Total</th>
<th>Performance vs same period 12/13</th>
<th>RAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliberate Small Fires (WFRS)</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>28  65  30  18  21  18  7  TBC 32</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate Crime Offences</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>11  11  6  10  8  10  -</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Crime</td>
<td>3,878</td>
<td>321  340  322  332  286  315  346  303  304  355  323  332</td>
<td>3,547</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theft of a Vehicle</strong></td>
<td>788</td>
<td>64  54  52  51  47  65  53  55  57  41  55  591</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theft from a Vehicle</strong></td>
<td>3,094</td>
<td>257  287  270  280  235  268  281  250  249  282  276</td>
<td>2,957</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Road Safety Performance - Calendar Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>2012 Actual</th>
<th>2013 Actual</th>
<th>2013 Actual</th>
<th>Actual Total to Date</th>
<th>Performance vs Same Period 2012</th>
<th>RAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People Killed or Seriously Injured in Road Traffic Accidents</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>16  18  26  23  26  24  22  26  31  36  22</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fatal</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4  3  1  0  1  2  2  2  4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Serious</strong></td>
<td>271</td>
<td>12  18  15  22  20  25  24  21  24  29  34  18</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures in blue illustrate the levels required in order to achieve the target, adjusted for seasonal variations and actual figures this year to date.*

The final column indicates current status. Green indicates on course to achieve target, Amber indicates currently off target but realistic chance of improving performance, Red indicates significantly off target.

Projected year total is based on current performance to date and predicted trends throughout remainder of year.
### Proven re-offending by probation trust - based on first commencement, 2005 to September 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warwickshire</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>+ 1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands and Staffordshire</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>+ 0.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### YOT proven re-offending by probation trust - based on first commencement, 2005 to September 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warwickshire</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>+ 1.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>- 0.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proven re-offending of adult and juvenile offenders by lower-tier local authority, 2005 to September 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Warwickshire</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>+ 2.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of offenders</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average no. of previous offences per offender</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuneaton and Bedworth</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>- 1.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of offenders</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>2064</td>
<td>2078</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1725</td>
<td>1673</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average no. of previous offences per offender</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>+ 2.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of offenders</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>1253</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average no. of previous offences per offender</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>+ 1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of offenders</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average no. of previous offences per offender</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>+ 2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of offenders</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>1526</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>1188</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average no. of previous offences per offender</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proven re-offending by upper-tier local authority, 2005 to September 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prolific and other Priority Offenders</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>- 6.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average no. of re-offences per offender</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of offenders in cohort</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average no. of previous offences per offender</td>
<td>44.39</td>
<td>46.54</td>
<td>44.19</td>
<td>50.74</td>
<td>53.49</td>
<td>48.71</td>
<td>51.77</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Using Offender by Drug Action Team (DAT)</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>+ 6.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average no. of re-offences per offender (Rate)</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of offenders in cohort</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average no. of previous offences per offender</td>
<td>36.15</td>
<td>42.48</td>
<td>38.98</td>
<td>39.30</td>
<td>35.91</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>47.57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Drug testing in police custody only occurred in intensive DAT areas (during the period covered by this bulletin), therefore in non-intensive areas cohorts are likely to mostly consist of individuals identified through other means, particularly an OASys assessment.**

**Note:** Please note the above information is based on a binary measure - ie whether an offender commits any further offence at all. It does not measure if there has been a reduction in the overall volume of offending but rather the % of offenders who commit any further offences over a given period.

In the case of prolific offenders the binary measure only gives a partial picture, so the Intergated Offender Management County Steering Group will produce an analysis of volume reoffending from amongst the PPO cohort each September.
### Rugby

#### Actual Monthly Performance against 2013/14 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>2012/13 Actual</th>
<th>2013/14 Target</th>
<th>2013/14 Actuals</th>
<th>Actual Total to date</th>
<th>Residual Target</th>
<th>Projected Year Total</th>
<th>Performance vs same period 12/13</th>
<th>RAG</th>
<th>Projected Performance vs Target</th>
<th>RAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority - To reduce violent crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Serious Violence</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>3 3 4 8 10 8 3 4 0 11 7 7</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Violence (includes ABH)</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>29 43 40 45 40 37 35 28 40 35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>-4.1%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Abuse High Risk Repeats through MARACs - RUGBY FIGURES</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0% 0.0% 10.0% 0.0% 7.1% 8.3% 25.0% 30.8% 42.9% 14.3% 6.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority - To reduce domestic burglary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Burglary</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>31 33 20 38 20 27 24 30 23</td>
<td>16 20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority - To reduce the vulnerability of all Personal ASB victims that we support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour - Personal cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% victims of personal ASB whose vulnerability score has been reduced as a result of CSP interventions</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Local Indicators - Actual Monthly Performance against 2013/14 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>2012/13 Actual</th>
<th>2013/14 Target</th>
<th>2013/14 Actuals / Monthly Targets</th>
<th>Actual Total to date</th>
<th>Residual Target</th>
<th>Projected Year Total</th>
<th>Performance vs same period 12/13</th>
<th>YE Performance vs Target</th>
<th>RAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People Killed or Seriously Injured in Road Traffic Accidents</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 3 3 9 2 1 3 7 6 4 TBC</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Actual Monthly Performance against 2013/14 Targets - Rate Per 1000 Population (per 1000 households for burglary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>2012/13 Actual</th>
<th>2013/14 Target</th>
<th>2013/14 Actuals / Rate Per 1000 Population</th>
<th>Actual Total to date</th>
<th>Residual Target</th>
<th>Projected Year Total</th>
<th>Performance vs same period 12/13</th>
<th>RAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most Serious Violent Crime</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>0.03 0.03 0.04 0.08 0.10 0.08 0.03 0.04 0.00 0.11 0.07 0.07</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Violent Crime</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>0.29 0.43 0.40 0.45 0.40 0.37 0.35 0.26 0.28 0.40 0.35 0.38</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Burglary</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>0.74 0.79 0.48 0.91 0.48 0.64 0.57 0.72 0.55 0.38 0.48 0.68</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures in blue illustrate the levels required in order to achieve the target, adjusted for seasonal variations and actual figures this year to date. The final column indicates current status. Green indicates on course to achieve target, Amber indicates currently off target but realistic chance of improving performance, Red indicates significantly off target. Projected year total is based on current performance to date and predicted trends throughout remainder of year.*
MINUTES OF CUSTOMER AND PARTNERSHIPS COMMITTEE

3 APRIL 2014

PRESENT:

Members of the Committee:

Councillors Ms Edwards (Chairman), Allen, Mrs Avis (substitute for Councillor Mrs O’Rourke), G Francis, Mrs Garcia, Hazelton, Mrs New, Sandison and Mrs Watson

In attendance:

Etty Martin (Sexual Health Commissioner Public Health Warwickshire County Council)

Nick Andrews and Beth Piercy (Rugby Youth Council)

Councillor Mahoney

Officers:

Debbie Dawson (Scrutiny Officer) and Linn Ashmore (Democratic Services and Scrutiny Officer)

38. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 January 2014 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

39. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence from the meeting were received from Councillor Mrs O’Rourke.

40. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Mrs New declared a general non-pecuniary interest by virtue of her employment by Warwickshire County Council.

Councillor Leigh Hunt declared a general non-pecuniary interest by virtue of her employment by Warwickshire County Council.

41. RUGBY YOUTH COUNCIL UPDATE

Nick Andrews and Beth Piercy from Rugby Youth Council gave members a verbal update of their current activities. The main points raised were as follows:

Two key campaigns had been identified at a county level for the coming year, these being amongst the top five issues of most concern as voted for by young people in Warwickshire:

- Transport and Young People
- Bullying, equality and mental health
Transport and Young People

- The main issues were based around the need for a bus service that was cheaper and fairer for young people.

- The view of the youth council was that Stagecoach, which is the main local bus operator, should be challenged. They currently have little competition locally and it was hoped that, with the support of the County Council, other service providers could be encouraged to make some form of competitive bid.

- Meetings were being held with Johnsons and Arriva and their opinions on fares for young people would be sought.

- A further meeting was planned to be held in June when county councillors and the Police and Crime Commissioner would be invited to attend.

- Stagecoach fares were due to rise again on 13 April this year.

Bullying, equality and mental health

- Young people were keen to focus on equality and the factors that link bullying to mental health.

Future of the Youth Council

- The youth council is continuing to meet on a weekly basis until Easter but then meetings will take place fortnightly.

- A grant of £2180 has been secured from WCC which it was hoped would cover the running costs until April 2015.

- There is very little support available and WCC only have the equivalent of 1½ members of staff to cover the Rugby area.

Rugby Youth Council was continuing with its ‘Somewhere to go, Something to do’ campaign. It had not been possible to progress the plans for the youth hub café. There was little funding available and the arrangements with Brooke School to share premises had fallen through. In addition to this the ‘hub’ name has now been used by another business.

The Summer Festival will be held on 19 July this year which is the first Saturday of the school holidays. A music event will be held alongside this.

The youth council have met with an arts officer at Warwickshire County Council regarding their involvement in the Great Warwickshire Show and Tell exhibition in Warwick on 16 May. Officers from WCC will also be invited to the Summer Festival which will be an opportunity for them to engage with young people and promote their activities.

During discussion with the committee the following points were raised:

Members commented the youth council needed the experience and support from WCC to assist in their negotiations with Stagecoach.

The youth council hoped that a pilot scheme operating in Wales to offer a child fare to young people up to the age of nineteen would prove successful, and give them evidence to take to bus companies to support their case.

It was suggested that the youth council should liaise with Healthwatch who were undertaking some work around transport.
It was felt that the bus companies were taking a rather short sighted view and may miss a whole demographic of the population who in the future could become long term bus users as the running costs associated with cars becomes more expensive.

It was agreed that transport needed to be addressed as a county-wide issue.

Some form of press coverage for the transport campaign could be helpful. Local MPs or parliamentary candidates may be willing to help with this.

Securing ‘fair fares’ for young people should be a priority in the County Council’s procurement of transport services on behalf of the local residents.

A member commented that young people could benefit from some form of an opt-out scheme from the older persons bus pass, though many older people find the passes invaluable for local and longer distance travel.

The committee offered its support and assistance to the Youth Council.

**RESOVED THAT** – Rugby Youth Council be thanked for their report.

### 42. HEALTH AND WELLBEING UPDATE

The committee received a report (Part 1 - agenda item 6) that included a briefing note about sexual health services from the Director of Public Health.

Etty Martin, the Sexual Health Commissioner for WCC, gave members a presentation covering an overview of sexual health services and answered questions from the committee. A copy of the presentation is attached at Annex 1 to the minutes.

In addition to the presentation the following points were made:

Figures are produced by the Office for National Statistics but they are 18 months out of date by the time they are published. This means more intelligence needs to be gathered on the ground.

Current figures show that the rate for teenage pregnancy in Rugby has fallen by 4 compared to the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment for 2011 and the rate is now 20.3 per 1,000 of females aged 15-17. However, there is still more work to do in this area.

Sexual health services are a complex and personal area to work in which is carried out with a number of partner agencies.

Changes to the NHS last April mean sexual health services are no longer commissioned on a national basis.

Variations in services since 1998 means there is a lack of co-ordination.

The ‘Respect Yourself’ work had previously been jointly funded by the Warwickshire County Council’s People’s Group and by Public Health. The funding from the People’s Group had since been removed.

Rates for STIs and HIV for Rugby have risen as detailed in the report. However, the statistics can be distorted as clients may not necessarily be local and could come from anywhere. False names or addresses are sometimes used by individuals to preserve their confidentiality.
There are cultural issues and a stigma remains attached to obtaining sexual health help or guidance. In the 1980s the publicity at the time showed HIV as being a death sentence. However, this is no longer the case and there is less penalisation for testing when obtaining insurance etc.

The lead consultant at the Pine Clinic at the Hospital of St Cross was reported as having a very good reputation amongst HIV patients. This results in cross border patient flow between Coventry and Rugby because of their close proximity to each other. Coventry has 2% per 100,000 HIV positive cases compared with Rugby at 1.5%. Gonorrhoea and herpes are both proxies for HIV.

The Terrance Higgins Trust is working with new communities in Rugby to encourage HIV testing. There is an association of risky behaviours with drug misuse, which is also a particular problem in Rugby.

During further discussion the following points were made:

HIV testing cannot be enforced, although pregnant women are now routinely tested. Many clients opt to take a test available through the post.

Rates for HIV are highest in the over 50’s age group. One reason for this was the rise in people meeting away on holiday or via the internet. In some cases they have a more relaxed approach to protection because there is no fear of becoming pregnant.

The Respect Yourself campaign is targeted towards 13-25 year olds and is based around raising awareness. It was informed by a visit to Holland, with targeted youth support workers, to look at the way the Dutch dealt with young people’s sex education. Holland has a rate of STI and teenage pregnancy rate that is thirty times lower than the UK. They take a ‘sex positive’ approach to their education, where sex is treated as normal and pleasurable but it was important to be prepared and respect yourself and your partner.

The Respect Yourself website is the main form of access to information. Coventry University were involved in refreshing the website in 2011 and the number of hits has risen from 600 to 6,000 per month.

The FAQs section of the website was hosted by a consultant who responds in a humorous manner, where appropriate, though the answers were always factual. ‘Street’ terms are used and the campaign aims to send clear messages around respect. It seeks to cover the issues around pornography in an educational manner. Advice and information is based around healthy relationships and there are checks in place to help pick up criminal activity as well as links to support agencies. Information is also gathered on the areas of the website which are searched most often and are of the most interest to young people.

Pupils from Avon Valley School were involved in developing the website for the Respect Yourself Campaign. The young people also designed and created apps. There is an app available showing young people how to access sexual health services, which shows young people what to expect when they arrive at a service. The ‘rate my service’ app gives real time feedback on the experiences of service users which service managers are able to act on. Young people are also trained as mystery shoppers to provide feedback on services.
A range of services are available locally through:

- Pharmacies
- The Orchard Centre
- Relate (now merged with Coventry Relate)
- Local General Practitioners (GP’s)

Service provision varies across the county and the commissioner is working to address gaps in provision.

The Spring Fever campaign was aimed at primary schools and supports emotional trust. This was tested in Revel School and is being rolled out across the County.

The future aim of sexual health services commissioning is to move towards a one-stop-shop approach. An online triage service will allow clients to book appointments online.

WCC and Coventry City Council have been working on a joint model for sexual health services and will be going to tender for a provider. This process was still at an early stage.

In response to member questions, the following points were made:

The effects of budget cuts on youth provision have resulted in different agencies adopting different ways of working. The new approach was to provide online training for youth workers as well as group sessions and to develop links and relationships with local youth organisations. Previously organisations like Connexions had provided a good way in, but this no longer exists.

While the rate of teenage pregnancy in Rugby has fallen there is still work to be done. Overall the rate is higher in the north of the county than the south, where termination rates are higher, but there is a need to take an approach similar to that in Holland where it is seen as a negative experience to become pregnant. There is a need for culture change.

Figures are not recorded for female genital mutilation and this is hidden within communities along with other forms of sexual exploitation. It was important that training is made available so signs can be spotted at an early stage. It can be difficult to get messages across to schools if they are not open to this approach but teachers should be trained to look for the signs.

Training is required to help raise awareness of the signs that young people may be being groomed or exploited.

It was difficult to obtain figures for local ward areas in Rugby as the numbers were too low (numbers below five are not reported to maintain confidentiality) so more intelligence is needed from the ground.

Young people do not have to be accompanied by a parent when they access sexual health services. Health professionals were trained to use the ‘Fraser competencies’ to assess whether young people were mature enough to have responsibility for their own care.

The commissioner is generating income for Warwickshire by selling the website and other campaign material to other areas.

Home HIV testing was available online from 1 April. Chlamydia online testing is also now available online, funded by Public Health.
Parents were informed about the website through schools. A good school will embed Relationships and Sexual Education (RSE) within their teacher training programmes.

Young people have reported that they are uncomfortable dealing with doctors' receptionists and this should be addressed.

Copies of a Respect Yourself introduction paper was circulated to members of the Committee and is attached at Annex 2 to the minutes. Respect Yourself booklets were also made available to members.

**Health Champion and Warwickshire Health and Wellbeing Board Representative**

The health champion gave members a verbal update on the outcomes of recent health meetings attended. The main points raised were as follows:

**Coventry and Warwickshire Clinical Commissioning Group**

Members of the CCG and Healthwatch were now attending local community forums and meetings at the Hospital of St Cross which leads to a wider engagement.

**Young People’s GP Survey**

Healthwatch Warwickshire produced a report on what Warwickshire’s young people think of their GP surgeries. Some of the findings were:
- It was difficult to get appointments at suitable times
- There were issues around confidentiality
- 55% were sometimes offered a choice of appointment times
- 36% were able to get an advance appointment
- 40% of the young people did not feel that they were able to influence decisions about their care
- Young people were not aware they could complain, or did not have the confidence to do so.

**Mast Site**

It was envisaged that when complete the site would generate a need for eight GPs. There were outline proposals for schools and local shopping areas and it was hoped a health centre would be built at the same time as the first phase of houses.

**Vulnerable Adults**

A new service for vulnerable adults had been developed at the county council following the recommendations from the recent serious case review.

The CCG has an input into the next version of the Warwickshire JSNA which is currently under review.

**WCC Health and Wellbeing Board**

The meeting of district council health leads prior to the Health and Wellbeing Board meeting was cancelled at short notice and has been re-scheduled for May, in Rugby.

**Alcohol and Health Task Group**

The group has started work looking at the affects of alcohol on health. A second meeting has been planned when information and data that has been requested by the group would be available. There are many different issues being raised and more task groups may spring from this review.
The Scrutiny Officers gave members an update following reports in the local press and other sources that the Railings may close. The communications office at NHS Partnership Trust had confirmed that there are no changes and the Railings will remain open and will continue to operate as an important ‘spoke’ in the new service structure.

RESOLVED THAT –

(1) Etty Martin be thanked for attending the meeting and her informative presentation; and

(2) Councillor Mrs Watson be thanked for her report.

43. UNIVERSAL CREDIT AND WELFARE REFORM TASK GROUP – INTERIM REPORT

The Committee received a report (Part 1 – agenda item 7) concerning an interim report presenting the findings of the task group to date.

The Chairman of the task group, Councillor Tom Mahoney, informed the Committee that the group was still at the evidence gathering stage. Later in the year the group hoped to identify two or three specific areas to scrutinise in greater detail. The group would also be supporting the consultation exercise on the revised council tax reduction scheme.

Some issues already raised have included:
- Ex-service personnel whose needs were not being met
- The use of sanctions
- Impact of welfare changes on people with severe mental health difficulties
- Issues around access to computers, online security, and the level of support available.

Prior to their most recent meeting the task group had worked through a demonstration of an online application process for Universal Credit. They had identified concerns about use of jargon, making it difficult to understand. The review had also highlighted issues.

The task group is tracking forty cases of people affected by the welfare reforms to try to assess personal impact.

The Sustainable Inclusive Communities Portfolio Holder informed the Committee that the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) would be setting up a local Financial Inclusion Partnership, drawing on best practice from the Warwickshire Financial Inclusion Partnership. This would be working with the voluntary sector and exploring ways of offering advice and support on financial issues for the people of Rugby.

The Portfolio Holder requested the task group’s report be submitted to the next meeting of the LSP. The Portfolio Holder would liaise with Councillor Mahoney on this.

The Committee agreed a copy of the report should also be forwarded to Warwickshire Financial Inclusion Partnership for information.

RESOLVED THAT – the Committee noted the findings in the interim report.
44. FIXED TERM TENANCIES TASK GROUP – REVIEW REPORT

The Committee received a report (Part 1 – agenda item 8) concerning the final draft review report of the review of fixed term tenancies.

The Chairman of the task group, Councillor Belinda Garcia, informed the Committee that the group had met three times but had found there was not enough evidence currently available to support the introduction of fixed term tenancies.

Other local authorities had introduced fixed term tenancies but their schemes were still at an early stage and it was too soon to measure their success.

The task group concluded that the council should review its tenancy policy again in 2015, though there was also a need to explore the introduction of tenant incentive schemes and keep members informed on the national ‘Pay to Stay’ policy.

The council’s officers had highlighted the costs of implementing and administering the policy and the task group chairman stated that she had found their contribution disappointing.

Members commented it was important to look at this as part of a wider picture, including more focus on incentives to encourage people to buy in the private sector and finding better ways of profiling new tenants and monitoring and evaluating tenants’ changing needs.

RESOLVED THAT – the Committee approved the report and agreed its submission to Cabinet in June 2014.

45. COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

The Committee received a report (Part 1 – agenda item 9) concerning the progress of task group reviews within its remit and the future work programme.

The Committee agreed the future work programme for task group reviews as follows:

*Universal Credit and Welfare Reform* – the task group will continue to oversee the council’s corporate approach to the welfare reforms.

*Promoting independent living* and *Hackney Carriage Stands* – the Committee will scope the one-page strategies for these reviews at its next meeting in June, when the timings and resources will be discussed.

*Rugby BID* – It had been agreed by Overview and Scrutiny Management Board that this review should be carried out by the Committee as a light touch review over three meetings. The one-page strategy will be scoped in June and this will be followed by a special meeting of the Committee. The proposed date for this meeting was 16 July 2014.

The Scrutiny Officer informed the Committee that a suggestion had been received from a Head of Service that this review may need a more detailed approach. It was suggested that once further discussions had been held with Heads of Service a draft scope would be prepared for discussion at the Committee meeting in June when members could make a more informed decision on how long the review should take.
It was clear that care was needed to detach the work of the review from the BID vote itself.

**Ambulance service restructuring** – This review will be carried out as a light touch later in the municipal year though it was agreed that representatives from the ambulance service should be invited to a meeting of the Committee to talk generally about their work and also inform the review. This will allow time to share information gathered on the new ways of working, including patient transport.

**Sustainable urban drainage systems** – Overview and Scrutiny Management Board had agreed to defer this topic until a flooding summit, due to be held by WCC in May, had taken place.

The Committee agreed the Committee’s future work programme and the items in the programme for the meeting on 26 June 2014. During discussion the following points were made:

**Inward Investment and Rugby World Cup 2015 Update**
The Leader and the Economy Development and Culture Portfolio Holder have agreed to attend the meeting. Members were requested to consider what issues and questions they would like to raise at that meeting.

The Economic Development Officer will attend to give an update from the Steering Group on progress in the plans to mark the RWC2015.

Members commented that there had been a lack of engagement on progress so far and this had been disappointing.

In addition to the Steering Group there was also an officer group and the Committee sought clarification of who was sitting on which of these groups.

A suggestion was made that the event management company being contracted by the Steering Group could be invited to a future meeting of the Committee to outline its plans.

This was an international event and it was vital that Rugby should make the most of this opportunity.

**Neighbourhood planning** – this was a light touch review from the previous work programme that was delayed to allow time to capture learning from the Coton pilot. This item was scheduled for the meeting in September 2014.

The Committee thanked the officers from Democratic and Scrutiny Services for their hard work over the past year.

RESOLVED THAT –

(1) the future work programme for task group reviews be agreed as minuted above; and

(2) an item be included on the forward work programme to invite representatives from the ambulance service to a future meeting of the Committee.
46. VOTE OF THANKS TO CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED THAT - the Committee places on record its appreciation of the work undertaken by Councillor Ms Edwards in her capacity as Chairman of the Committee during the 2013/14 municipal year.

The Committee also thanked Councillor Mrs Watson in appreciation of her work as Vice-Chairman and also as the council’s Health Champion.

CHAIRMAN
Etty Martin
Sexual Health Commissioner
Public Health
Warwickshire County Council
Warwickshire:

• County (statistical neighbours are Staffordshire, Hampshire, Essex, Kent, Northamptonshire, Worcestershire, Leicestershire, East Riding of Yorkshire, Cheshire).
• Warwickshire has a population of 536,000 with 12% aged between 15-24 (2012 mid year estimates).
• Three CCGs - North, South, Rugby and Coventry
• NHS Midlands and East
• Health inequalities divided between the North and South.
Sexual Health in Rugby for 2012
latest ONS figures:

• Teenage Pregnancy rate per 1000 females aged 15-17 in Warwickshire 24.3 per 1000 - 41% decrease from the baseline in 1998.

• Rugby 20.8 per 1000 females aged 15-17

• National rate 27.7 per 1000 aged 15-17

• STI rates higher for genital warts and Gonorrhoea-refer to table in report.

• Health Warning!
All Services near Enter Postcode...

ASDA Pharmacy
12 Chapel Street, Rugby, CV21 3EB

Boots the Chemist – Retail Park
Unit 5, Junction 1, Retail Park, Leicester Row, Rugby, CV21 1RW

CHAT at The Orchard Centre
The Orchard Centre, Lower Hillmorton Road, Rugby, CV21 3SR

Co-operative Pharmacy
11A Olton Road, Rugby, CV21 3QJ

Contraception and Sexual Health Clinic – Rugby
The Orchard Centre, Lower Hillmorton Road, Rugby, CV21 3SR

Dudley Taylor Pharmacy
37 The Green, Etton, Rugby, CV22 7LZ

GUM Clinic – Rugby
Pine Centre, Hospital of St Cross, Berky Road, Rugby, CV22 5PX

Listers Chemist
Row Fell Shopping Centre, Houlowell, Brownsover, Rugby, CV21 1LT

Paddox Pharmacy
316 Hillmorton Road, Rugby, CV22 5BP

Relate – Rugby
44 & 46a Regent Street, Rugby, CV21 2PS

Rowlands Pharmacy
Central Surgery, Corporation Street, Rugby, CV21 3SP

FILTER BY SERVICE TYPE
- Show All Services
- Chlamydia Screening
- Condom Distribution
- Contraception
- Emergency Hormonal Contraception
- Emotional Health & Well Being
- Health Advice and Signposting
- HIV/AIDS Services
- Pregnancy Testing
- Sexually Transmitted Infections
- Young People’s Counselling Services

START A NEW SEARCH
Enter Postcode...
Improving Access:

www.respectyourself.info

- Rate my service App
- Instant Feedback
- Google Analytics
- Read time comments on all providers
- GUM, CASH, Pharmacy (In addition to Mystery Shoppers, Sexual Health Young Peoples Project Board, Pornography Sexual Exploitation, Domestic Abuse etc.)
- Sharing Feedback Increase and Decrease
What are we doing to raise awareness?

- RSE Boards x3 Avon Valley fully involved in Rugby
- Development of apps on:
  - Domestic Abuse
  - Child Sexual Exploitation
  - Pornography
  - Consent
- Website traffic and FAQs
- RSE in Schools - Spring Fever - pilot in Rugby - five more schools taking part.
- Spring Fever - secondary school package
- Recommission SH services (Not GP and Pharmacy)
What do users tell us?

Relationship and Sexual Health Education (RSE) too little too late and it doesn’t relate. Services need to be available out of hours and at one place not several. Confidentiality is an issue and concern for young people particularly. Users want a mixture of drop in and booked appointments. Ability to book online at a place that is convenient.
Sexual Health Integration

National Guidance  DoH Framework,NICEetc

Warwickshire / Coventry Procurement Process
Thank You!

Etty Martin
Sexual Health Commissioning Manager
Public Health Warwickshire County Council

Twitter - @rycwarks

www.respectyourself.info
Introduction

We have consulted with young people in Warwickshire to find out what they feel is important to achieve strong relationships and good sexual health, and to make sure our work is aligned to what is important to them.

Our consultation showed that local young people believe that making positive decisions about relationships and sexual health is all about self respect - by valuing yourself highly, taking control of your future by taking control of situations as far as possible, and not letting other people influence or treat you in any way that you’re not happy with.

Our Vision Statement

The Respect Yourself Campaign is committed to giving young people the power to confidently make positive informed decisions about their relationships and sexual health by building their knowledge and self-esteem.

Our Key Messages

1. Me
   - Being myself, and learning to recognise how I feel.
   - Learning to talk to someone I trust about things that matter - like relationships and sex.
   - Feeling comfortable with my decisions.
   - Enjoying the sex I choose to have.
   - Taking care of my body by being prepared for the sex I choose to have with who I want, when I want, finding out about STIs and contraception, and what’s the best option for me.

2. Being In Control
   - Making sure I’m safe.
   - Standing up for myself and sticking to decisions that are in my best interests.
   - Taking control of situations and being smart about taking actions before things go too far.
   - Being prepared in advance to deal with any situation so I can stay in control.
   - Knowing my limit.

3. Other People
   - In any relationship respecting the other person, and expecting them to respect me.
   - Making sure I trust the person I’m choosing to have sex with.
   - Only doing what makes me comfortable, not going along with what other people think or want.
   - Standing up for myself, and not giving into pressure.
   - Choosing when and if I have sex, no matter if I’ve done it before or what other people expect.
MINUTES OF THE CORPORATE PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE

10 APRIL 2014

PRESENT:

Members of the Committee:
Councillors Mistry (Chairman), Cranham (Vice-Chairman), Mrs Avis (substituting for Councillor Birkett), Dodd, Gillias, Lowe and Ms Robbins

Officers:
Doug Jones (Head of Business Transformation), Christopher Trezise (Corporate Performance Management Officer), Paul Ansell (Scrutiny Officer) and Veronika Beckova (Democratic Services and Scrutiny Officer)

37. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 February 2014 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

38. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence from the meeting were received from Councillors Birkett and Pacey-Day.

39. PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CORPORATE STRATEGY 2012-16

The Committee considered a report (Part 1 – Agenda item 5) concerning progress in implementation of the Corporate Strategy.

The Head of Business Transformation attended the meeting to present the report and answer questions. An updated appendix of the report was circulated at the meeting and is attached to the minutes.

The following points were made:

- The council is two years into the implementation of the strategy.
- The report presented summarised parent actions. During the course of the year, the committee received reports on each parent action as part of its systematic scrutiny of each strategic area.
- At this stage, it is difficult to draw any conclusions on the basis of the reports presented as we are only part way through the plan.
- 53% of the plan has now been completed.
- The contents of the Corporate Change and Improvement Plan (CCIP) constantly changes. At any one time, the CCIP consists of actions in the current year plus the four following years.
- Some actions can stretch over the entire life of the strategy while others may have a relatively limited life.
Members may obtain more detail from Covalent.
Members were assured that the strategy was on track.

A member raised a concern with regard to fly-tipping. An increase had been noticed, particularly in laybys. The Head of Business Transformation responded that cases of fly-tipping on council land were dealt with when they were reported. Instances could be reported using the Rugby App. He would be happy to provide further information following the meeting.

RESOLVED THAT –

(1) the Head of Business Transformation to provide committee members with more information on how the council responds to fly tipping; and
(2) the progress made in the Corporate Strategy be noted.

40. COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

The committee considered a report (Part 1 – Agenda Item 6) concerning the progress of task group reviews within its remit and the future work programme.

The committee considered ways of ensuring that each portfolio holder did not always report to the committee in the same cycle each year. An option would be to establish a routine whereby, each year, the portfolio holders attending the committee in September, November and February would move forward one cycle the following year, and the one reporting in June would move to February the following municipal year.

The light touch review of Best Value in Service Charge Contracts, originally scheduled to take place on 8 February and placed on the agenda for the 10 April, was deferred further due to a key officer’s sickness absence. The review has now been placed on the agenda for the next meeting of the committee on 3 July.

The Corporate Performance Management Officer extended an invitation to the members of the committee to one-to-one sessions to explore the performance management system.

RESOLVED THAT –

(1) the Committee Work Programme for 2014/15 be agreed; and
(2) the cycle in which each portfolio holder is invited to attend be changed each year in line with the system suggested in the report.

41. VOTE OF THANKS TO CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED THAT – the committee places on record its appreciation of the work undertaken by Councillor Ish Mistry in his capacity as Chairman of the committee for the 2013/14 municipal year.
### Corporate Strategy – Strategic Priority Overview
Updated to year end 2013/14

This table shows the percentage progress of actions planned to take place between April 2013 and March 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes and priorities</th>
<th>Progress at 31 Mar 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate action plan from 1 April 2012 in support of Corporate Strategy 2012/16</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes sought:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased employment and training opportunities for residents</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An attractive and thriving town centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A diverse and sustainable economic base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively encourage parish councils and community bodies in neighbourhood development planning</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish an environment that will attract new businesses into the borough and enable existing businesses to flourish</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support training in new technologies and promote apprenticeship opportunities</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with developers to provide new housing and infrastructure</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate the expansion of Rugby town by identifying and removing barriers to growth</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes sought:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residents find it easy to access local services</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Delivery of high-quality services built around the real demands of our customers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Innovative approaches to service delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the availability of information that will help residents and businesses</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve service delivery via customer-focused reviews and the development of our staff</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in partnerships to meet local needs, reduce costs and increase efficiency</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively seek revenue-generating opportunities and apply charges in order to meet our costs</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out innovative and high-quality business activities that aim to meet best practice and legal obligations</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes and priorities</td>
<td>Progress at 31 Mar 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes sought:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sustainable urban and infrastructure expansion</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduced carbon footprint across the borough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased waste recycling and a reduction of waste sent to landfill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A variety of habitats and uses supporting biodiversity across the borough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote the highest standards of sustainability</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively progress energy-saving initiatives within the council and by residents and businesses</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide new burial and cremation facilities</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase biodiversity across the borough</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote and maintain high levels of waste recycling</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the impact of litter and fly tipping</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes sought:</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High standards of existing and future housing stock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regeneration of our priority neighbourhoods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved health and wellbeing for all age groups and communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Safe and empowered communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support wider participation in decision making and help communities to deliver services</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate the provision and upkeep of good quality housing to meet local needs and to cater for the growth of Rugby</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide leisure facilities and support independent and healthy living</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with partners to reduce crime and antisocial behaviour</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide safe and attractive streets</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide events and services that support councillors, members of the public and internal customers of all types</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Completed Parent Actions update**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>2012/13 (whole year)</th>
<th>2013/14 (whole year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>284</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

Name of Meeting  Overview and Scrutiny Management Board

Date of Meeting  16 June 2014

Report Title  Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report

Ward Relevance  All

Contact Officer  Paul Ansell, Tel: (01788) 533591

Summary  The draft Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report 2013/14 is attached. The Board is asked to approve the submission of the report to Council, subject to any amendments.

Financial Implications  There are no financial implications arising from this report.

Risk Management Implications  There are no risk management implications arising from this report.

Environmental Implications  There are no environmental implications arising from this report.

Legal Implications  There are no legal implications arising from this report.

Equality and Diversity  No new or existing policy or procedure has been recommended.
## Summary

The draft Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report 2013/14 is attached. The Board is asked to approve the submission of the report to Council, subject to any amendments.

## 1. BACKGROUND

1.1 The constitution requires scrutiny committees to report annually to full Council on their work. It is in any case good practice for councils to produce an annual report on their overview and scrutiny work.

1.2 The draft annual report for 2013/14 is attached at Appendix 1.

## 2. PUBLICATION

2.1 The last five annual reports have been economically printed in-house in a compact A5 format. It is suggested that this approach should be repeated with the current report.

2.2 As in the past, the report should be distributed to partners and community groups and made available in public places to promote overview and scrutiny work externally and encourage greater community engagement.
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LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

There are no background papers for this item.
RUGBY
BOROUGH COUNCIL

DRAFT
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
ANNUAL REPORT
2013/14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CONTENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chairman’s foreword</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Scrutiny arrangements 2013/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Overview and Scrutiny Management Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Corporate Performance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Crime and Disorder Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Customer and Partnerships Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Review recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Committee dates 2014/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. CHAIRMAN’S FOREWORD

This year, the council has received ringing endorsements from two separate peer reviews: the Local Government Association peer review and the Equality and Diversity peer review. The LGA review described the council as “strong and progressive”, and I believe overview and scrutiny has made a significant contribution to the council’s success by maintaining a focus on the achievement of the council’s corporate priorities.

In the Equality Peer Challenge, the council became the first council to achieve the “excellent” standard. The peer challenge report said that outcomes for the community had been enhanced and positive action had been taken as a result of the scrutiny process. On the other hand, the same report pointed out that quality of our scrutiny would be improved if more members of the public and partners were to attend scrutiny committees and task groups. The involvement of people from outside the council is an important component of successful scrutiny. We have a good record of engaging with people outside the council in our scrutiny review work, but few members of the general public come to our meetings unless they have been invited for a particular reason.

I urge the people of the borough to come and witness scrutiny in action and to see their elected councillors at work. Some of this work takes place at our scrutiny committees, and the dates of their meetings are listed at the end of this report. However, much of our most important work takes place in “task groups”: small cross-party groups of councillors which carry out in-depth reviews of particular topics. In 2014/15 the subject of these reviews will include promoting independent living, fees and charges for council services and the siting of taxi ranks, along with continuing the overview of universal credit and welfare reform. Task group meeting dates are not set long in advance but their agendas are published on our committee papers web page www.rugby.gov.uk/meetings.

In the meantime, I commend this annual report to you and look forward to a further year of productive and inclusive scrutiny.

Councillor Dr James Shera MBE
Chairman, Overview and Scrutiny Management Board
KEY ACHIEVEMENTS FOR SCRUTINY 2013/14

In-depth exploration of the benefits and risks to the council if it were to introduce fixed-term tenancies for its council homes

Closure of inefficient local recycling centres and diversion of resources to the kerbside collection service

Establishment of a blueprint for household waste collection in new developments

The Housing Income Protection Review was chosen to be profiled in the Centre for Public Scrutiny publication *The Local Impact of the Introduction of the Universal Credit and The Wider Welfare Reforms*. This was submitted to the Department for Work and Pensions as evidence.

Customer and Partnerships Committee worked with the Youth Council to run a successful Local Democracy Week schools event.
Overview and Scrutiny Mission Statement

Overview and scrutiny at Rugby Borough Council aims to enhance the quality of life of all who live and work in the borough by ensuring services are delivered effectively and supporting improvement in the council’s services, policies and performance. Scrutiny aims to be objective, evidence-based, transparent and constructive, and to reflect the interests and concerns of local communities.

2. SCRUTINY ARRANGEMENTS 2013/14

Structure

The overview and scrutiny structure was as follows:

The Board, the Customer and Partnerships Committee and the Corporate Performance Committee each comprise nine members. The Crime and Disorder Committee, which had seven members, has been disestablished with effect from 2014/15. Any continuing work that would have been carried out by the committee will for the time being fall within the remit of the Customer and Partnerships Committee.

The committees have full work programmes, with five scheduled business meetings each year. However, most in-depth scrutiny review work is carried out by small task groups of between five and nine members. In the municipal year 2013/14, all but two of the 36 non-executive councillors sat on one or more of the scrutiny committees or task groups.
Six task group reviews were in progress during the year and all of them completed their work during the year. The agreement of clear, realistic action plans by Cabinet helps to ensure that overview and scrutiny is making a positive contribution to the council’s decision-making process and making a noticeable impact.

The Council Leader and all of the portfolio holders attended meetings of scrutiny committees or task groups during the course of the year. Dialogue with the Executive is regarded as being important not only to demonstrate real accountability but also to further the common aim of meeting the council’s objectives.

In relation to scrutiny reviews, this report aims to present:

- **the objectives of each piece of scrutiny work carried out** – to check that the problem was worth looking at and the desired outcomes were clear
- **how the task group went about its work** – and what it found out
- **the conclusions and recommendations arrived at** – showing how the evidence was used to address the objectives of the exercise
- **an evaluation of the impact of the scrutiny activity** – demonstrating the existence of firm approved action plans, together with progress reports on the implementation of the previous year’s action plans.

Full reports of each review may be downloaded from www.rugby.gov.uk/scrutiny.

**Involvement of outside organisations in scrutiny**

It is important that scrutiny reviews tackle issues that are important to the people of the borough and for which there is potential for making a positive impact. Suggestions for reviews are not only made by councillors and council officers but they are also sought from local organisations and the general public.

During the course of overview and scrutiny work by committees or task groups efforts are made to involve organisations form outside the council.

**Scrutiny support**

The Democratic and Scrutiny Services Team, which includes two dedicated scrutiny officers (approximately one full time equivalent), supports overview and scrutiny as well as the rest of the democratic process. In its scrutiny work, the team helps non-executive councillors to develop, plan and implement scrutiny work programmes. It conducts research, prepares papers for scrutiny meetings, advises committees, task groups and individual members, monitors outcomes, and continually develops the scrutiny function. Officers across the council provide specialist professional support.

**Action plans**

Scrutiny must be able to demonstrate that its review work is making an impact. It is important to have clear, agreed actions plans and to monitor them to ensure they are being implemented.
Scrutiny action plans are now routinely put on the council’s performance management system, where they form part of the Corporate Change and Improvement Plan. The action plans for reviews completed since 2010/11, with six-monthly progress updates for current action plans, are published at www.rugby.gov.uk/scrutiny.

The committees review action plan progress every six months and the Board receives a report on overdue actions between these reviews.

**Scrutiny development**

In August 2013, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board carried out an evaluation of overview and scrutiny. This was based on a limited amount of data from a members survey and a training event, but the indications were that:

- the council’s scrutiny work had evolved and matured, and that task groups had been particularly successful
- the Board’s present wide membership was appropriate
- the work of the Leisure Centre and Crematorium task groups illustrated scrutiny’s ability to produce original and practical solutions to complex and difficult issues facing the council

The Board felt that council website should be developed to publicise the work of overview and scrutiny and of councillors in general.
3. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD

Board members

Councillors Dr James Shera (Chairman), Helen Walton (Vice-Chairman), Tina Avis, Jim Buckley, Matthew Francis, Kathryn Lawrence, Tom Mahoney, Jerry Roodhouse,

Terms of reference

The Board draws up and manages the overview and scrutiny work programme. In addition, it:

- holds the Leader and the Executive Directors to account
- acts as gatekeeper for councillor call for action
- coordinates call-ins from Cabinet
- deals with motions that Council refers to it
- produces an Overview and Scrutiny annual report

Scrutiny review action plans

The Board systematically monitors the progress of task group scrutiny reviews. The Board also maintains an overview of the implementation of scrutiny review action plans by examining a twice-yearly report on actions that are overdue. Midway through the intervening periods, the other committees look at all of the actions arising from the reviews for which they have been responsible. This helps to ensure that overview and scrutiny has a real impact and that this is recognised.

Holding the Leader and Executive Directors to account

In January 2014, the Leader and the Executive Directors reported to the Board on the following:

- The present position of the council and the council’s future direction
- The council’s relatively healthy financial position
- The ability of the council to continue to make major improvements such as the new leisure centre, the crematorium and the Diamond Wood
- The good relationship between officers and members
- The high performance adaptability of council staff, as highlighted by the Local Government Association peer review
- The peers review’s conclusion that the council should:
  - Articulate a clear ambition and vision for Rugby (as a council and as a place)
  - Clearly define the council’s culture
  - Celebrate and communicate successes
  - Put appropriate succession planning in place

Overview and Scrutiny Evaluation

Following on from the evaluation, the Board looked at ways of publicising overview and scrutiny work and agreed that committees and task groups should take a proactive approach to publicising their work, before during and after. Full use should be made of the website and social media to do this.
Motions to Council and call-ins

During the year, no motions to Council were referred to the Board and no Cabinet decisions were called in. Similarly, no councillor calls for action were made.
4. CORPORATE PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE

Cllr Ish Mistry, Chairman, Corporate Performance Committee

Members

Councillors Ish Mistry (Chairman), Kamaljit Kaur (Vice-Chairman), Steve Birkett, Andy Coles, Richard Dodd, Tony Gillias, Ian Lowe, Chris Pacey-Day, Michael Stokes

What did the committee do?

Scrutinised the performance of the benefits service following the end-to-end review. This highlighted the difficulty of recruiting and retaining staff because of the uncertain future of benefits in local government.

Received an update on the Rainsbrook Cemetery and Crematorium project.

Reviewed customer demand in terms of value and failure measures. This struck a chord with an observation by the LGA peer reviewers that the council needs to be sure that it is doing what the customer wants and that it is delivering in response to customer demand. This will form part of the work of the 2014/15 task group review Systems Thinking – what next?

The action plan of the previous year’s review of the localisation of council tax support required the committee to review the use of the discretionary fund within the local council tax reduction scheme. There had been concerns that the fund would be inadequate to meet demand but, in fact, demand turned out to have been fairly low.

Reviewed performance in the implementation of the carbon management plan.

Reviewed the implementation of the corporate strategy.

Finance and performance monitoring

The committee monitors performance at several different levels. Each of four meetings a year focuses on performance within a particular portfolio, and the portfolio holder attends to discuss issues raised. At the same meeting, the committee receives a report on performance in one of the council’s strategic priorities. Between committee meetings, members are able to interrogate the council’s performance management system to view up-to-date information on all portfolios and all priorities. This process
increases the accountability of the Executive and puts the scrutiny focus on the achievement of the council’s objectives.

Additionally, the committee receives quarterly finance and performance monitoring data extracted from the reports submitted to the Cabinet.

**Task group reviews**

Much of the committees’ work is done through task groups, and the work of the task groups reporting to the Corporate Performance Committee is detailed in the following section. During the course of the year, the committee approved ‘one-page strategy’ scoping briefs for reviews, monitored progress and agreed final reports before submitting them to Cabinet. The committee also reviewed progress in the implementation of the action plans of completed scrutiny reviews that had been under the committee’s management.

**TASK GROUP REVIEWS MANAGED BY THE CORPORATE PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE**

**Local recycling centres**

**Members**

Councillors Kathryn Lawrence (Chairman), Andy Coles, Ish Mistry, Noreen New, Maggie O’Rourke, Chris Pacey-Day, Carolyn Robbins, Neil Sandison and Bill Sewell. (Councillor Sewell attended as a substitute for Cllr Matthew Francis, who had originally been selected as a member of the task group but was unable to attend.)

**Terms of reference**

Since the introduction of the three-bin system, there had been a reduction in the amount collected from the 27 local recycling centres; from 1,400 tonnes (97.4 per cent) to 350 tonnes (3.5 per cent) dry recycling. A growing body of opinion argued that the cost of operating the local centres could no longer be justified, particularly as it duplicated the three-bin kerbside service. If the local centres were closed, the resources used to run them could be redeployed. This would make it possible to postpone buying a new vehicle and setting up a new round to cater for Rugby’s growing population.

The review’s brief was to see whether the facts backed up this opinion, and to challenge the viability of the recycling centres on the basis of:

- the extent of misuse through contaminated waste being left in the recycling bins
- the extent of misuse by unlawful commercial and trade waste and recycling
- the extent of fly-tipping at the local recycling centres
- the impact on RBC’s street cleansing services on managing the sites
- the cost of maintaining the sites
What did the group do?

The task group had to devise ways to work quickly but at the same time encourage users to have their say and publicise the issue in the local media. It gathered quantitative and qualitative evidence from a range of sources to build up a full picture:

- Background information provided by Environmental Services, establishing the need to create additional capacity.
- Analysis of bin collections from recycling centres, showing the incidence of contamination
- Anecdotal evidence of the relative usage of the centres, derived from observations from the collection crews and councillors
- Data on misuse of sites
- Other councils’ practices
- An online survey of users (publicised at the sites and in the local press) to find out why they used the recycling centres.
- Responses to an invitation to users of the sites to comment on the proposal to close the recycling centres.
- Financial data establishing the business case for closure of the centres.

Misuse of sites

Three broad categories of misuse of sites were identified:

Contamination – the mixing of unpermitted material in the recycling bins.

Business use – using the containers for trade recycling such as glass, packing materials, and papers. This contravened the conditions of use of the sites and diverted income from the trade waste service.

Fly-tipping – householders or businesses leaving non-recyclable materials around the containers. This necessitated the diversion of street cleansing resources to clearing up the sites.

Other issues

Theft – The task group also learned of thefts of metal from the waste electrical equipment banks and of textiles from containers at the recycling centres which were operated by non-council organisations.

Low level of use of the majority of the sites was a further source of inefficiency.

Cost – The need to allocate resources to routinely check the sites and to remove fly-tipped and contaminated waste resulted in a significant difference between the cost of collection from the local recycling centres (£171 per tonne) and the cost of kerbside collection (£76 per tonne).
The results of an online survey suggested that users’ visits to the sites were generally infrequent. The consultation revealed dissatisfaction with the operation of the county council recycling facility at Hunters Lane on the grounds of limitations on opening hours, the types of vehicles permitted, and the materials accepted.

**Recommendations and outcomes**

The review’s principal recommendation was that all of the local recycling centres be phased out by the end of September 2013. An action plan was agreed with the portfolio holder and incorporated in the review’s report.

Cabinet approved the review’s recommendations (which included several subsidiary actions) on 19 August 2013.

The plan was implemented by the end of September 2013 and its effects were monitored by the task group during a second phase of the review on household waste collection in new housing developments.

**Household waste services in new developments**

**Members**

Councillors Kathryn Lawrence (Chairman), Ish Mistry, Noreen New, Maggie O’Rourke, Chris Pacey-Day, Carolyn Robbins, and Neil Sandison.

**Terms of reference**

The review’s aim was to ensure that the council’s policies for waste collection and for the planning of new developments were mutually supportive and environmentally and financially sustainable.

The review also followed up several topics touched on during the review of local recycling centres. These included hours and restrictions at Warwickshire County Council’s Hunters Lane recycling facility, monitoring of the effects of closure of the local recycling centres and the long term strategy for waste disposal sites.

**What did the group do?**

**Waste collection in new developments**

Given the number of significant new developments in Rugby, it was possible to build a body of qualitative evidence about how well different types of development lend themselves to efficient waste collection. This highlighted problems with communal bin store abuse in flats, bins on footways and problems arising from highway design and management.

The new Refuse and Recycling Design Guide for Developers included a number of requirements for new developments that the task group recognised would help to prevent the observed problems:

- Requirement for hard standing areas for single dwelling operating the three-bin system
- A preference for underground waste storage for flats and high density housing, including courtyard terraced dwellings, where individual provision is not always practical. Euro bin storage requirements are also specified for cases where this is not viable.
- Private roads either to be constructed to highways standard or alternatively for the an accessible bin storage area to be provided
- Roads to be wide enough to allow space round the vehicle and space for reversing
- A maximum distance of 10 metres from the bin to the vehicle
- Design to enable safe manual handling and operation of lifting equipment

The Refuse and Recycling Design Guide for Developers stated a preference for using underground waste storage systems in developments of flats and courtyard terraced housing where individual provision was not practical. The group asked challenging questions about the suitability of underground storage but, after looking at the experience of other councils, the task group was satisfied as to its suitability. The group agreed that the council should not bear the cost and management responsibility for storage systems. Similarly, the provision of kerbside bins should be the responsibility of the developer.

**The Waste (England and Wales) (Amendment) Regulations 2012**

The task group considered a letter from the responsible Defra minister reminding waste collection authorities that they must comply with regulations requiring collection authorities to collect paper, metal, plastic and glass separately if separate collection:

1. is necessary to provide high quality recyclates, and
2. is technically, environmentally and economically practicable.

The group received evidence that the performance of the materials recovery facility used by the council means that separate collection of recyclable materials is not necessary in order to produce high quality recyclate. It would also not be economically practicable to revert to separate collection.

**Effect of closure of local recycling centres**

The action plan for the review of local recycling centres required this task group to review the effect of the closure of the local recycling centres, There had been some fly-tipping at sites of the closed recycling centres but this had been minimal in comparison with the amount that regularly occurred before the closures. There was no evidence of any increase in fly-tipping elsewhere associated with the closure of the centres.

**Hunters Lane recycling centre**

The task group had continuing concerns about the operation of the Hunters Lane recycling centre and its ability to cope with the expanding population of the borough. These concerns, along with matters regarding waste disposal strategy, were discussed at a meeting with the county council portfolio holder and the responsible service manager.
Particular concerns highlighted were:

- Residents who wished to use larger vehicles that might be confused with commercial vehicles were often not aware that there was a restriction on the admission of such vehicles to the centre. Those who were aware often did not know they could apply for permits for the use of these restricted vehicles, so long as they were the residents’ only vehicle.
- There was a general need for improved quality of information and communication of information in respect of prohibited waste types, restricted vehicles and opening times.
- It needed to be made easier for pedestrians and cyclists to use the Hunters Lane facility, particularly in the light of new housing development nearby.
- Consideration should be given to finding ways of disposing of paint at Hunters Lane.
- The WCC strategy of improving kerbside recycling rates through educating householders is unlikely to result in sufficient reduction in residual waste to counteract the increased demand resulting from urban expansion.
- Improvements to signage are required at Hunters Lane, along with improved communication and education.

Waste Disposal Strategy

The task group concluded that the relocation of the main residual waste disposal point from Ling Hall to Whitley has had a detrimental effect on the cost-effectiveness of Rugby Borough Council’s waste collection service. As Rugby’s urban area expands there are fears that this problem will worsen. When future WCC treatment and disposal contracts are being procured, the County Council should consider the following when carrying out any tender evaluation:

- Whole cost to the public purse from collection to treatment and disposal, and not the disposal or treatment cost alone.
- Environmental as well as economic factors, providing the ability to reduce the overall carbon footprint associated with both the collection and disposal/treatment elements of waste.

Recommendations and outcomes

The review’s recommendations were as follows:

1. The emphasis in the Refuse and Recycling Design Guide for Developers on streamlining of refuse storage, including underground storage, be supported.
2. At the earliest possible stage in the planning process for each residential development, Planning consult Environmental Services on estate layout and provision for storage of household waste.
3. The cost of providing bins or other receptacles for waste be passed on to developers in the first instance.
4. Warwickshire County Council be encouraged to work in partnership with Rugby Borough Council to continually review opportunities involving waste disposal facilities for residual waste.
5. Warwickshire County Council be encouraged to expand the services, accessibility and information regarding the county council recycling centres in order to meet current and future demands of the borough.
6. The Sustainable Environment Portfolio Holder send a letter to Warwickshire County Council, expressing the points of concern raised following the evidence gathering meeting with the county council Portfolio Holder.

7. The kerbside collection of comngled recyclable materials shall continue.

**Leisure Centre Task Group**

**Members**

Councillors Ish Mistry (Chairman), Sally Bragg, Richard Dodd, Lisa Parker, Howard Roberts, Jerry Roodhouse

**Terms of reference**

The task group was originally set up to consider the short to medium term management of the Ken Marriott Leisure Centre (KMLC) and also to consider the longer term provision of leisure facilities to meet the diverse needs of the people of Rugby. Following the decision by the council to build a new leisure centre, the task group's brief was extended to oversee the project through to its conclusion.

**What did the group do?**

The task group continued to oversee progress in the project through to the opening of the new Queen’s Diamond Jubilee Centre on 30 August 2013.

The group met with the operator in July 2013 to learn about their activities during the transitional period and preparations for the public opening, and members of the task group visited the centre two days prior to opening. A final meeting of the task group was held in November 2013 to review the opening and initial operation of the new leisure centre and the final budget position, and to review the work of the task group and identify any lessons that could be learnt for similar capital projects. Future monitoring arrangements for the leisure centre were also agreed.

**Outcomes**

In reviewing their work over the course of the project, the task group and officers recognised the importance of the cross-party support for the project from the very outset, when the original task group identified the need and supported the proposal to build a new leisure centre. The task group had played a significant role, working alongside officers and providing support and challenge, and advocating for the project amongst the wider body of members. The continuity of the membership and chairmanship of the task group was felt to have been a key factor in its success.
5. CRIME AND DISORDER COMMITTEE

Committee Members

Councillors Michael Stokes (Chairman), Matthew Francis, Kamaljit Kaur, Dale Keeling, Lisa Parker, James Shera and Helen Walton.

Terms of reference

The committee’s terms of reference are defined by the Warwickshire County Council Crime and Disorder Protocol, to which Rugby Borough Council is a party. The council is required to have a committee with power to review and scrutinise, and make reports or recommendations, regarding the functioning of the responsible authorities that comprise the Community Safety Partnership.

The committee met on three occasions during 2013/14.

What did the committee do?

Community Safety Partnership updates

The committee received regular performance updates from the Community Safety Partnership Manager. It also received progress reports from the chairs of the Partnership’s Priority Action Groups.

Received reports or presentations on the following:

The performance of Operation X, the venture whereby different police agencies focused on Priority Policing Areas where most crimes occurred and on those individuals who caused the most harm in these areas.

The use of social media by the police.

The medium-risk domestic abuse project, which fills a gap in service provision left as a result of shortage of resources forcing the countywide multi-agency process to concentrate on high-risk cases.

The work of the Eastern European link worker employed by the Partnership to develop relationships with the Eastern European Communities and promote positive
behavioural change, integration into local communities and positive community relations.

The impending changes in community rehabilitation following the abolition of the Warwickshire Probation Board and the division of offender management work between a community rehabilitation company and the National Probation Service.

Priorities and funding bids for 2014/15.

**Alcohol Misuse**

The committee carried out scoping work on a possible review of alcohol misuse. The committee was already scrutinising aspects of this, such as domestic violence and drinking in public, and it received evidence that the current licensing regime was proving effective in limiting alcohol-related public disorder. In relation to problems associated with drinking in public, the committee considered the provisions of the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act (then still going through parliament) to allow the creation of public spaces protection orders where alcohol consumption and other forms of anti-social behaviour would be forbidden. The committee decided to carry out a review of this topic when the regulations were issued.

**Neighbourhood Watch**

Rugby Neighbourhood Watch gave updates on its work

**Future Crime and Disorder Scrutiny**

The committee was disestablished with effect from June 2014, when its functions were transferred to the Customer and Partnerships committee.
6. CUSTOMER AND PARTNERSHIPS COMMITTEE

Members

Councillors Claire Edwards (Chairman), Mrs Claire Watson (Vice-Chairman), Nigel Allen, Graham Francis, Mrs Belinda Garcia, Robin Hazelton, Mrs Noreen New, Mrs Maggie O’Rourke, Neil Sandison

What did the committee do?

Young people

Despite continuing pressures on youth service budgets and reduced support for the Youth Council, its members have continued to play an active role in the work of the committee during the year. Youth council members have attended each committee meeting, participating in discussions and briefing councillors on their activities and campaigns, in particular local transport and young people.

In November 2013 the committee worked in partnership with Rugby Youth Council to organise a Local Democracy Week Schools Event at the Town Hall. Students from four local secondary schools participated in the event, which focused on developing proposals for events that could be held in the borough to mark the occasion of the Rugby World Cup 2015 in England. A report of the outcomes of the event was submitted to the local Rugby World Cup 2015 Steering Group and a number of their proposals are now being actively pursued.

The council’s Children and Young People Member Champion also reported to the committee on her work in this capacity. Her feedback included information on the work of the Warwickshire Children’s Trust Rugby Area Partnership and the Rugby Youth Strategy Board and highlighted concerns about reductions in sexual health services for young people in the borough. This prompted the committee to invite the Warwickshire Sexual Health Commissioning Manager to meet with the committee to address these concerns.

Town Centre

The committee was briefed by officers on the latest proposals for planning policy relating to the town centre and assessed the impact and success of various town
centre events held in 2012, further to recommendations made in a scrutiny review of the town centre economy in 2009.

**Air quality**

The committee has maintained an overview of air quality monitoring and management, including scrutiny of the statutory annual Air Quality Management Area Progress Report.

**Health and Wellbeing**

The committee continued to meet with senior representatives from a range of health partners, including:

- Healthwatch Warwickshire
- Coventry and Rugby Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)
- Coventry and Warwickshire NHS Partnership Trust
- Warwickshire Sexual Health Commissioning Manager.

The committee also considered the latest health statistics for the borough. The JSNA update report for the borough highlighted concerns about the sexual health of young people and alcohol misuse and this prompted further scrutiny work in these areas.

Discussions with Coventry and Warwickshire NHS Partnership Trust encompassed the restructuring of mental health service provision in the borough as well as specific proposals about the closure of the Admirals Court specialist learning disability respite care facility in Rugby. The committee raised a number of questions and concerns with regard to this proposal, which formed the basis of the council’s response to the communication and involvement exercise.

The committee has received regular feedback from the council’s representative on the county Adult Social Care and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Warwickshire Health and Wellbeing Board and the council formally adopted the Protocol for Health Partnership Scrutiny in Warwickshire in February 2014. The committee chairman and vice chairman have also worked to develop links with Coventry City Council’s Health and Social Care Scrutiny Board, and the chairman attended a meeting of the Board to participate in scrutiny of the work of Coventry and Rugby CCG and commissioning of Patient Transport Services.

One of the issues identified for potential further work in the committee’s discussion with the CCG was the council’s role in supporting timely hospital discharge and prevention. This is likely to form a key element of a review of ‘promoting independent living’ which has been included in the 2014/15 overview and scrutiny work programme.

**Play Provision**

The committee met with officers to discuss the impact of the Planning for Play review recommendations on play provision in new developments, and the development of the council’s Play Strategy. The committee received evidence that, since the scrutiny review, there has been early consultation of play and parks officers by the Planning department, and that this is having a positive impact on provision in new developments.
Rugby World Cup 2015

The committee has received regular briefings from the local Rugby World Cup 2015 Steering Group on their preparations to mark the occasion in the borough and members have repeatedly challenged the group about their plans, to maximise the benefits to the borough in terms of inward investment.

Road and Pavement Surface Maintenance

This topic was included in the overview and scrutiny work programme for 2013/14 but it was subsequently found that a county council overview and scrutiny community was already engaged in scrutiny of the performance of the new Highways Management Contract. The committee received a report detailing the findings of the county council’s scrutiny exercise.

TASK GROUP REVIEWS MANAGED BY THE CUSTOMER AND PARTNERSHIPS COMMITTEE

Alcohol and Health

Members

Councillors Claire Watson (Chairman), Howard Avis, Richard Dodd, Belinda Garcia, Robin Hazelton, Jerry Roodhouse, and Neil Sandison

Terms of reference

The review took the form of a single meeting with officers of the Warwickshire Drug and Alcohol Team and Public Health Warwickshire, followed by a further meeting to draw conclusions and agree a report to the Customer and Partnerships Committee.

The purpose of the review was primarily to look at:

- what action was being taken locally under the Warwickshire Alcohol Implementation Plan (WAIP), and what the priorities were perceived to be
- what the effect so far had been
- whether there were any gaps becoming apparent that the council might be able to help to fill at local level

What did the group do?

The task group held a meeting to receive evidence and explore options with officers of the Warwickshire Drug and Alcohol Team (DAAT) and Public Health Warwickshire.

The task group learned of DAAT’s integrated approach to drugs and alcohol, commissioning a range of support services for drugs and alcohol from a range of agencies.

The task group learned that a key to success in alcohol treatment was early intervention, and encouraging people with harmful drinking levels to seek help from the commissioned agencies.
The task group explored ways in which Rugby Borough Council would be able to assist in this.

1. **Making Every Contact Count (MECC)**

An initiative to use front-line staff across a range of public services to deliver consistent brief advice on healthy lifestyle messages, including alcohol, and to signpost people to appropriate services to support behaviour change. This has already been implemented in the Housing Service.

2. **Drinking in public**

Problem public drinking is known to be prevalent at several locations, and the task group considered ways of dealing with this.

3. **Supporting publicity and promotions**

The task group identified no obvious gaps in service provision. However, there is potential for the council to make a useful contribution by supporting and participating in publicity and promotions and the raising of awareness, thereby encouraging the all-important early referral.

Additionally, the task group was disappointed to learn that councils had no powers to regulate the amount of alcohol advertising on posters and billboards.

**Recommendations and outcomes**

The following recommendations were assembled for submission to Cabinet and Customer and Partnerships Committee in 2014/15.

**Recommendations to Cabinet**

1. The council take an active role in assisting with local promotion and awareness-raising in relation to the Warwickshire Alcohol Improvement Plan.

2. The Local Government Association be asked to consider the scope for legislation to empower councils to regulate street alcohol advertising.

**Recommendation to the Customer and Partnerships Committee**

3. In conjunction with future work on Public Spaces Protection Orders, consideration be given to adding details of alcohol treatment services to signage in problem public drinking locations.

4. The committee annually review progress in the implementation of the Warwickshire Alcohol Improvement Programme in Rugby, focusing in particular on the borough council’s contribution in promotion and publicity and in giving direct advice on alcohol.
Universal Credit and Welfare Reform

Members

Councillors Tom Mahoney (Chairman), Claire Edwards, Belinda Garcia, Noreen New, Jerry Roodhouse, Helen Walton

Terms of reference

The task group has a watching group over the council’s corporate approach to managing the impact of the welfare reforms on the council and the local community. It is also monitoring the effectiveness of the measures put in place by the council and partners to prepare for benefit changes and prevent significant detrimental impacts.

What did the group do?

The task group has agreed a set of performance measures that is being used to monitor the impact of the reforms in the borough on an ongoing basis. These include tracking the number of residents affected by the social housing under-occupation charge and benefits cap, impact on rent arrears and council tax collection and details of discretionary awards. The task group is also tracking a sample of 40 anonymised customers affected by the council tax reduction scheme and 40 council tenants affected by the social housing under-occupation charge.

As well as monitoring this data, the task group has also received regular briefings and policy updates from officers regarding the welfare reforms. The task group hosted a select committee-style meeting with relevant council officers and key partners and agencies to receive evidence of the work being undertaken in the implementation of welfare reform. The group also issued a call for evidence and held a further meeting with voluntary and community sector representatives, taking evidence to provide a reality check on the impact of the reforms on borough residents and the effectiveness of measures being taken by the council and its partners to mitigate against negative outcomes. Task group members have also worked through a demonstration of an online universal credit application to learn for themselves how the system works.

Recommendations and outcomes

The task group made an interim report of its findings to date to Customer and Partnerships Committee in April 2014. However, as the group is still in the process of gathering evidence and maintaining an overview of the impact of the welfare reforms in the borough, it was not in a position to draw any firm conclusions or make any recommendations at that time.

In March 2014 the task group were invited to submit feedback to inform a review of the Warwickshire Local Welfare Scheme criteria. The task group asked that consideration be given to removing the blanket ineligibility of any applicant subject to benefits sanctions, suggesting that the reasons for the sanction should be considered on a case by case basis.

The interim report consolidated some important information about the impact of the welfare reforms in the borough and was to be presented to the Board of the Local Strategic Partnership (on the request of its chair) and sent to the Warwickshire Financial Inclusion Partnership.
Fixed-Term Tenancies

Members

Councillors Belinda Garcia (Chairman), Andy Coles, Robin Hazelton, Tom Mahoney, Lisa Parker, Ms Carolyn Robbins, Councillor Helen Walton
Ms Tracey Nuttall (co-opted member from the Tenant Representative Panel)

Terms of reference

The Localism Act 2011 introduced new flexibilities for housing providers to offer new tenants a tenancy for a fixed term. The purpose of the review was to explore the benefits and risks of the council introducing fixed-term tenancies for its council homes and, if appropriate, to consider the detail of how this would be implemented. This included consideration of the potential impact of fixed-term tenancies on community sustainability.

What did the group do?

The task group considered a range of evidence, largely from secondary sources, including:

- Details of the national and local policy context
- Statistics on the council’s housing stock, local housing needs and tenant profile
- Information about the current housing market in Rugby and likely future trends
- Information on the operational management of council housing in Rugby and related costs
- Feedback from other local housing providers
- Cost estimations provided by housing officers
- National research evidence regarding flexible tenancies
- Briefing on the proposed ‘Pay to Stay’ policy
- Legal advice on the status of a fixed-term tenancy in law.

Original research was undertaken by the scrutiny officer into the housing arrangements and, where relevant, the tenancy policy for each of the local authorities in Rugby BC’s ‘nearest neighbours’ group. Direct verbal evidence was received from one of these authorities, which had reviewed their tenancy policy and decided not to introduce fixed-term tenancies. Another authority was invited to give evidence about their decision to introduce fixed-term tenancies but did not respond.

A member of the Tenant Representative Panel was co-opted to the task group and brought an important insight to the discussions.

Recommendations and outcomes

The task group recommended to Cabinet that:

1. Fixed-term tenancies should not be introduced by the council at this time
2. The council’s tenancy policy should be reviewed again at the end of 2015
3. Housing officers are trained to work more proactively with tenants to discuss alternative housing options with them
4. Further work is undertaken to explore the potential introduction of tenant incentive schemes
5. Councillors are briefed on the national ‘Pay to Stay’ policy when the details are confirmed.

The review report and recommendations were to be submitted for consideration by Cabinet on 9 June 2014.
7. REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS

Most of the review work carried out during 2013/14 did not lead to recommendations to Cabinet during the year. In the case of the Leisure Centre review, this was because the task group was carrying out a monitoring role in relation to the outcomes from past work. In the case of Universal Credit and Welfare Reform, the task group did not reach a position to be able to make recommendations during the year and, in the case of Fixed Term Tenancies, the recommendations were due to be submitted to Cabinet during 2014/15. Similarly the Alcohol and Health task group was due to report to Customer and Partnerships Committee in June 2014.

Recommendations from the reviews of local recycling centres and of household waste services in new developments were submitted to Cabinet in 2013/14 on 19 August and 7 April 2014 respectively.

Action plans are managed using the Covalent performance management system, and periodic progress snapshots taken from Covalent are published on the public scrutiny pages of the council’s website.

8. COMMITTEE DATES 2014/15

Members of the public are welcome to attend meetings of overview and scrutiny committees. During the coming year, meetings will be held in Rugby Town Hall at 5.30pm on the following dates.

Overview and Scrutiny Management Board

16 June 2014
11 August 2014
13 October 2014
12 January 2015
16 March 2015

Corporate Performance Committee

3 July 2014
17 September 2014
20 November 2014
12 February 2015
16 April 2015

Customer and Partnerships Committee

26 June 2014
11 September 2014
13 November 2014
29 January 2015
26 March 2015
CONTACTS

For further information, please contact:

Debbie Dawson
Scrutiny Officer
Tel: (01788) 533592
Email: debbie.dawson@rugby.gov.uk

Paul Ansell
Scrutiny and Policy Officer
Tel: (01788) 533591
Email: paul.ansell@rugby.gov.uk

www.rugby.gov.uk/scrutiny
AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Meeting</th>
<th>Overview and Scrutiny Management Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Meeting</td>
<td>16 June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Title</td>
<td>Review of Fixed Term Tenancies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Relevance</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Officer</td>
<td>Debbie Dawson, Scrutiny Officer, Tel: (01788) 533592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**
Customer and Partnerships Committee included in its work programme for 2013/14 a review exploring the possibility of the council implementing new provisions in the Localism Act 2011 to offer fixed-term tenancies to new tenants.

The review is now completed and the report presents the findings and recommendations of the task group. This was approved by Customer and Partnerships Committee on 3 April for submission to Cabinet on 9 June 2014.

**Financial Implications**
Financial costs to the council are a key driver behind the task group’s recommendation not to introduce fixed term tenancies at this time and to review the evidence again at a future date. These considerations are detailed in the review report.

**Risk Management Implications**
There are no risk management implications arising from this report.

**Environmental Implications**
There are no environmental implications arising from this report.

**Legal Implications**
The task group considered confidential legal advice provided to the council regarding flexible tenancy policy and this has informed the task group’s recommendations.

**Equality and Diversity**
The recommendations of the report have no equalities impact.
Summary

Customer and Partnerships Committee included in its work programme for 2013/14 a review exploring the possibility of the council implementing new provisions in the Localism Act 2011 to offer fixed-term tenancies to new tenants.

The review is now completed and the report presents the findings and recommendations of the task group. This was approved by Customer and Partnerships Committee on 3 April for submission to Cabinet on 9 June 2014.

1. REVIEW REPORT

The Board placed a review of fixed term tenancies in the 2013/14 overview and scrutiny work programme, on the recommendation of the work programme workshop. The review topic had been suggested by the Leadership and Operations Team.

The Localism Act introduced new flexibilities for housing providers to offer new tenants a tenancy for a fixed term and the council needed to take a view as to whether it wished to take advantage of this new flexibility. The review aimed to explore the benefits and risks of introducing fixed-term tenancies for council homes, drawing on the experience of other councils and housing providers who have already introduced fixed-term tenancies.

A draft one page strategy for the review was agreed by Customer and Partnerships Committee on 20 June 2013. A task group was appointed and began work on 2 October 2013.

2. REPORTING PROCESS

The task group has completed its work and the appendix to this paper details its findings. The report is presented to the Board for information.

The review recommendations form section 1 of the report. The report will be considered by Cabinet on 9 June 2014 and the Cabinet decision will be reported verbally to the meeting. As the task group is not recommending the introduction of fixed term tenancies at this time, a review action plan is not required.
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As a task group we were charged with exploring the benefits and risks of introducing fixed-term tenancies for our council homes and to come to an informed and evidence-based view as to whether they should be offered in Rugby.

The issue is undeniably politically-charged and we recognised at the outset that there were some points on which there would be no objective answer. Fundamentally, questions about the purpose of council housing and who it is for are matters of personal opinion, and there were a range of views represented around the table.

Nevertheless, we tried to adopt a thorough, evidence-based approach and considered a wide range of data about the local housing context as well as detailed research evidence about tenancy policies in other areas. We were disappointed not to be able to hear first-hand from an authority that had decided to introduce fixed-term tenancies, but were still able to glean some valuable insights from web-based research.

What was particularly apparent was that, at this stage, there is no robust evidence about the actual costs of the policy, or indeed the potential benefits. It was even difficult to establish how many of our tenants might be in a position to move on to alternative housing options, as data about tenants’ income and employment status is simply not collected. Faced with this lack of hard evidence, alongside concerns about the potential costs to the council, the group felt unable to recommend the introduction of fixed-term tenancies at this time. We are not closing the door entirely, however, and suggest that the question is revisited at the end of 2015.

I would like to thank the officers involved and all of the task group members for their input. It was particularly valuable to have the contribution of Tracey Nuttall, as a co-opted member from the Tenant Representative Panel, who brought an important insight to our discussions.

Councillor Belinda Garcia
Chairman
1. RECOMMENDATIONS

Having reviewed the available evidence, the task group recommends to Cabinet that:

1. Fixed-term tenancies should not be introduced by the council at this time
2. The council's tenancy policy should be reviewed again at the end of 2015
3. Housing officers are trained to work more proactively with tenants to discuss alternative housing options with them
4. Further work is undertaken to explore the potential introduction of tenant incentive schemes
5. Councillors are briefed on the national ‘Pay to Stay’ policy when the details are confirmed.

When reviewing the tenancy policy in 2015, it is recommended that members should consider the following:

- evidence about the impact of fixed-term tenancies where they have been introduced by other authorities (ie. costs of tenancy reviews, proportion of fixed-term tenancies that have ended and what additional housing capacity has been delivered);
- the profile of the private rented sector in Rugby (including numbers of ‘buy to let’ properties) and evidence of the likely impact of any increase in interest rates and the consequent level of housing need;
- figures relating to the loss of council housing stock under ‘Right to Buy’ as well as numbers of any new-builds within the housing stock;
- details of the impact of officers more proactively encouraging tenants to consider alternative housing options and incentives; and
- details of any emerging case law relating to fixed-term tenancies.
2. OBJECTIVES

2.1 Background

On the recommendation of the work programme workshop held in March 2013, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board placed a review in the overview and scrutiny work programme looking into the council’s potential use of new provisions to offer new tenants ‘flexible tenancies’. The review topic had been suggested by Leadership and Operations Team.

The Localism Act 2011 introduced new flexibilities for councils to offer new tenants ‘flexible tenancies’. Flexible tenancies are for a fixed term and offer similar rights to secure tenancies during that fixed term. The purpose of the review was to investigate the merits and implications of Rugby Borough Council introducing fixed-term tenancies for its council homes and to make a recommendation to Cabinet as to whether or not the council should take advantage of these new powers. The Council is party to a Joint Tenancy Strategy which has been agreed on a county-wide basis. This allows all social housing providers to continue to offer qualifying tenants ‘secure tenancies’ or to introduce flexible tenancies if they wish.

A draft one-page strategy for the review was agreed by Customer and Partnerships Committee on 20 June 2013 and was adopted by the task group unamended. The first meeting of the task group was held on 2 October 2013.

2.2 The One-Page Strategy

The one-page strategy is the name given to the scoping document for the review. It defines the task and the improvements being aimed for and how these are going to be achieved. The review’s one-page strategy is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the broad topic area?</th>
<th>The Council’s tenancy policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the specific topic area?</td>
<td>The Localism Act introduced new flexibilities for housing providers to offer new tenants a tenancy for a fixed term. The council needs to take a view as to whether it wishes to take advantage of this new flexibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well do we perform at the moment?</td>
<td>The review will explore the benefits and risks of introducing fixed-term tenancies for council homes and, if appropriate, consider the detail of how this would be implemented. It will include consideration of the potential impact of fixed-term tenancies on community sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the ambition of the review?</td>
<td>The council’s tenancy policy supports best use of its housing stock to meet local housing needs and ensures sustainable local communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well do we perform at the moment?</td>
<td>The Council is party to a Joint Tenancy Strategy agreed on a county-wide basis. This is scheduled to be reviewed in January 2014. The strategy allows the council to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
continue to offer qualifying tenants ‘secure tenancies’. The Council currently offers introductory tenancies for the first 12 months to new tenants, and then tenants normally transfer to secure tenancy after that period.

Key considerations for the task group include how well the council currently satisfies demand for social housing and the availability of alternative housing options for those whose tenancy might not be renewed. The task group will draw on the evidence collated for the previous review of housing stock and housing need, and the ensuing actions taken to redesignate properties to better meet local need.

In terms of current council housing provision:
- The council owns just over 3,900 properties, 37% of which is sheltered housing
- Over the last three years we have let on average 315 properties per year and roughly 20% of these were let to existing RBC tenants. Around 44% of lettings were of sheltered housing.
- As at 1 April 2013 there were 2,068 applicants on the housing register of which 425 (21%) had a high or medium level of need. This was a significant increase on the previous year when there were 1,655 applicants including 282 (17%) in high or medium need.

The task group will also need to understand the housing market in Rugby now and likely future trends (eg. average house prices and market rents, and availability of affordable housing) as well as the profile of income levels of council tenants and borough residents.

**Who shall we consult about the current service and about how we can improve it?**
- Tenant Representative Panel (to be co-opted to the task group)
- Current housing applicants (survey through Housing Options Team?)
- Rugby Homelessness Forum

The group is also able to draw on existing findings of RSL and housing staff consultation carried out by the housing team (autumn 2012). If introduction of fixed-term tenancies is proposed, fuller consultation with tenants and residents may be required.

**What other help do we need?**
- The task group could learn from the experiences of other housing providers and local authorities who have decided to introduce fixed-term tenancies, about their reasons for choosing this approach and the potential benefits eg. Midland Heart, Waterloo, Solihull Community Housing (introducing FTTs from 2013/14), St Edmundsbury Borough Council (introduced them in 2012).
- The task group may also want to hear from Warwickshire Rural Housing Association about their rationale for not adopting this approach
- Officer support from Housing Service and Legal Services Team
- Briefings, research and guidance produced by external organisations such as HQN and CIH

**How long should it take?**
Maximum of 6 months, aiming to report to Customer and Partnerships Committee on 30 January 2014.

**What will be the outcome?**
An informed and evidence-based view about whether to offer fixed-term tenancies in Rugby. If the review supports the introduction of fixed-term tenancies, there should also be robust recommendations to inform the revised tenancy policy.
2.3 **Alignment with the Corporate Strategy**

The review relates to the following corporate priority:

Facilitate the provision and upkeep of good quality housing to meet local needs and to cater for the growth of Rugby.
3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Fact-finding

The task group met three times, in October 2013, December 2013 and March 2014. The evidence received was largely from secondary sources and included:

- Details of the national and local policy context
- Statistics on the council’s housing stock, local housing needs and tenant profile
- Information about the current housing market in Rugby and likely future trends
- Information on the operational management of council housing in Rugby and related costs
- Research evidence from other local authorities about their response to the provisions in the Localism Act 2011
- Feedback from other local housing providers (gathered through a small-scale consultation exercise by the council in autumn 2012 on the provisions in the Localism Act)
- Cost estimations provided by housing officers
- National research evidence regarding flexible tenancies
- Briefing on the proposed ‘Pay to Stay’ policy
- Legal advice on the status of a fixed-term tenancy in law.

Direct evidence was sought from two other similar local authorities that had reviewed their tenancy policy, one of which had decided not to introduce fixed-term tenancies and the other which had introduced them. Verbal evidence was received from High Peak Borough Council but the other authority approached did not provide any evidence.

A member of the Tenant Representative Panel was co-opted to the task group. It was decided that direct consultation with residents on the housing register was not appropriate before an in-principle decision had been taken in support of the introduction of fixed-term tenancies.

All of the task group review papers are all available online at www.rugby.gov.uk in the section ‘agendas, reports and minutes’.
4.1 National and local policy context

The Localism Act 2011 enabled councils and other social housing providers to offer ‘flexible tenancies’ to new tenants, for all types of new let, from April 2012. This does not affect existing secure tenants.

The Localism Act also required local authorities, working with other providers such as housing associations, to develop a tenancy strategy for their area.

4.1.1 What is a Flexible Tenancy?

A flexible tenancy is a fixed-term tenancy which would normally last for a minimum term of 5 years\(^1\), although in some exceptional circumstances (for example, young people seeking work and likely to move on) they may last for a minimum term of no less than two years, in addition to any probationary tenancy. There is no limit on the maximum length of a fixed-term tenancy.

Tenants are made aware from the outset that the tenancy will expire after a stated period and may not necessarily be renewed. Six months before the end of the flexible tenancy the landlord assesses the household’s circumstances and decides whether to:

- issue a new flexible tenancy at the same address;
- issue a new flexible tenancy at a different address (for example if the property is now too big for the household’s needs); or
- issue no new tenancy, if the landlord considers that the tenant no longer needs affordable housing.

Where registered providers choose to let homes on fixed-term tenancies, they are required to offer reasonable advice and assistance to tenants whose tenancy ends.

Housing providers have considerable discretion in setting the criteria and framework for their own tenancy agreements.

4.1.2 Why has the Government introduced these new powers?

The Government set out its overarching policy aim as being “to ensure that social landlords grant tenancies which are compatible with the purpose of the housing, the needs of individual households, the sustainability of the community and the efficient use of their housing stock”\(^2\).

According to the CIH (Chartered Institute of Housing) the Government has three main aims in its housing reforms:

---

\(^1\) The regulatory framework for social housing in England from April 2012, Homes and Communities Agency, March 2012

\(^2\) Local decisions: next steps towards a fairer future for social housing – Summary of responses to consultation, DCLG, February 2011
• Power will be devolved to social landlords so they can make decisions on the basis of local need and circumstances
• The system will be better focused on need: social housing should provide protection and support for those who need it most for the period they are in need
• There will be a change in the public perception of social housing; it should be seen as a springboard into work and self-sufficiency.

The CIH states that it is the government’s explicit belief that “social housing is welfare and should be a step on to other types of housing”.3

Following reports of a poor take-up of the new powers by local authorities, the housing minister urged councils to use the new flexibilities “to ensure homes go to those in greatest need in their area, better meet the needs of current and future tenants and cut waiting lists”4.

4.1.3 Rugby Borough Council Tenancy Policy

Rugby Borough Council is party to a Joint Tenancy Strategy which has been agreed on a county-wide basis. All registered providers of affordable housing in the area (including the council itself) must have regard to this tenancy strategy when formulating their policies relating to the:
• type and length of tenancies that they grant;
• circumstances in which they will grant a tenancy of a particular type; and
• circumstances in which they will grant a further tenancy at the end of an existing tenancy.

The Warwickshire Joint Tenancy Strategy provides flexibility for social housing providers in Warwickshire to continue to offer qualifying tenants ‘secure tenancies’ or to introduce flexible tenancies. The Strategy sets out the aims that registered providers are expected to support through the use of social housing tenancies. These are to:
• help local households to meet their current and future housing needs
• make the best use of social housing stock by promoting social mobility, financial inclusion issues and reducing under occupation and overcrowding
• invest in Warwickshire and provide affordable housing, as well as the associated economic benefits
• create, encourage and maintain sustainable communities and protect vulnerable households
• ensure appropriate use of tenancies and tenancy options
• support and incentivise employment and training opportunities for existing and prospective tenants.

Currently, most new tenants of Rugby Borough Council are awarded an introductory tenancy for the first year. As long as the introductory tenancy is conducted in a satisfactory way, it automatically becomes a secure tenancy, with additional rights

---

3 Managing the impact of housing reforms in your area, CIH, June 2011
4 (Citing Mark Prisk MP) Minister urges councils to set fixed-term tenancies, Inside Housing, 11 January 2013
(such as the right to buy and the right to exchange) at the end of the first year. This is confirmed by letter and no tenancy review is undertaken.

4.2 Housing stock and housing need data

4.2.1 Rugby Borough Council Housing Stock

The Council has 3885 properties, including twelve pitches at Woodside. 1427 of these properties are designated sheltered housing and 2458 general needs. Approximately 200 sheltered properties are set to be redesignated as general needs accommodation, and when officers reported to the task group in October, seventeen properties had been redesignated to date.

The housing stock profile as reported to the task group in December 2013 was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Stock Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 bedroom Bungalow</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bedroom Flat</td>
<td>1222</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bedroom House</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bedroom Bungalow</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bedroom Flat</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bedroom House</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bedroom Maisonette</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bedroom Flat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bedroom House</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bedroom House</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 bedroom House</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedsit</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy and Traveller Plot</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3896</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2011/12 there was a turnover of 360 council properties. 38.9% of these related to sheltered housing and 61.1% general needs. In 2013, 12 tenants were evicted from council properties.

4.2.2 Housing need in the borough

Following a review of the allocations policy in 2013 the housing list was cut by around 700. Applicants for general needs properties (aged under 60) are no longer accepted on the waiting list if they are home owners or have funds to solve their own housing needs. Applicants with no recognised housing need cannot now access the housing list.

In October 2013 it was reported that there were currently 628 on the housing list. 64.6% of those on the housing waiting list required one bedroom, while only 13% required 3 or more bedrooms.
According to data contained in the draft 2013 Strategic Housing Market Assessment, an estimated 43% of households in the borough are unable to afford market housing without subsidy. The number of households in housing need is projected to increase considerably.

It was suggested that mortgage interest rates were likely to rise in the medium-term and that this would have an impact on the private rented sector. There are apparently a large number of ‘buy to let’ properties in the new developments in the borough and an increase in interest rates may impact on local availability of affordable housing in the private rented sector. The task group suggested that further evidence on the private sector housing profile should be collected to inform consideration of the tenancy profile.

### 4.2.3 Tenant profile

The table below shows the composition of households living in the council’s properties, and as a percentage of the total number of tenancies, as reported in December 2013. (The total number of tenancies included in the table is 2564, with other properties being void or the household type not yet recorded.) This shows that around 20% of the council’s properties are let to tenants with children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Number of tenancies</th>
<th>Percentage of tenancies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Adult aged 16-59</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Adult aged 60 or over</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Adults, aged 16-59</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Adults, at least 1 over 60</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more adults, 16 or over</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 parent family, 1 or more children under 16</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 parent family, 1 or more children under 16</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 – Household composition (Northgate)

According to calculations by the council’s housing team, the position regarding under-occupation and overcrowding in the council’s stock is as follows:

- Overcrowded: 6.6% or 257 households
- At standard: 53.7% or 2092 households
- 1 above standard: 29.4% or 1145 households
- Under-occupied: 10.2% or 397 households
Census 2011 data indicated that around 260 council properties in the borough with three or more bedrooms were occupied by one person.

60-70 per cent of the council’s tenants are in receipt of benefits. Almost 600 households living in three, four, and five bedroom general needs properties in the borough are not in receipt of housing benefit. This represents almost half of these properties.

The council does not collect housing income data from tenants who are not in receipt of housing benefit, and there is no legal requirement for tenants to disclose this information. There is also no current understanding of the numbers of tenants in receipt of benefits moving into work and their level of income. Anecdotally, most would move into lower paid work and potentially insecure and part-time employment.

4.3 Costs of administering fixed-term tenancies

It was emphasised to the task group that indicative costs of administering fixed-term tenancies could not be definitive and were simply a best estimation of the potential costs involved. There were many variables over which the council would have discretion, for example the tenancy term to be offered and to which tenants the policy would apply. The expectation was that the policy would only apply to general needs stock (around 2,500 properties).

Officers estimated that administration costs relating to fixed-term tenancies would amount to approximately £17,900 for the first year of tenancy reviews. This equated to £89,500 over a 5 year period. This figure was based on an average of 235 general needs voids per year, with each requiring a tenancy review prior to the end of the tenancy. The suggested costs reflect estimated officer and management time relating to these tenancy reviews, as detailed below:

- Average number of general needs voids per year – 235
- All require visits 9 months prior to end of tenancy – likely to be on average 3 hours per case
- Therefore an extra 705 staff hours required per year
- Extra resources required to deal with reviews, complaints, chasing evidence etc – average 3 hours per week – 156 hours
- A total of 861 hours equates to half a housing officer post – £16,600 per year
- Manager oversight per year – £1,300
- Total cost for first year – £17,900

In addition, officers provided indicative costs of ending fixed-term tenancies. Research (by Shelter and Heriot Watt University) suggests that less than 1% of fixed-term tenancies end after five years, and in Rugby this would mean 3 tenancies per year ending.

The average cost to the council of a void (including rent loss and repairs) has been calculated to be £1411. Potential costs of ending fixed-term tenancies therefore include:
- Void costs of £4,233 per annum and £21,165 over a 5-year period (on the basis of 3 voids per year)
- If tenancies are ended due to rent arrears (not taking account of court or eviction action):
  - 10 cases per year = £14,110 (£70,550 over 5 years)
  - 20 cases per year = £28,220 (£141,100 over 5 years).

Practice guidance from the Chartered Institute of Housing states that the average cost of taking a case to court is around £2,000 and it has been estimated that every eviction costs a landlord £6,000. These costs include staff costs, legal costs, void costs, homelessness costs and the costs to the agencies.

It was also noted that if a tenancy was not renewed the tenant would be entitled to appeal against the decision, and that this process would create further costs.

A further potential cost that was identified was the loss of rent arrears when a new fixed-term tenancy was agreed. Legal advice was sought on the question of whether each fixed-term tenancy was a discrete tenancy and the implications of this for recovery of rent arrears. The legal advice can be summarised as follows:

- there is as yet no body of decided caselaw on this specific matter
- essentially each fixed-term tenancy will be a new tenancy (not a renewal or extension) and there is no presumption that a new statutory tenancy will preserve rent arrears
- however, it is open to the council to include a provision in their Tenancy Strategy that rent arrears are a basis for refusing new flexible tenancies, unless a satisfactory payment plan has been entered into; and
- there is nothing stopping the council from obtaining judgment against a tenant for past rent arrears, regardless of whether a new tenancy has been entered.

Officers advised the task group that, based on current experience, the likelihood of recovering payments in such circumstances would be slim. Tenants would always be advised to prioritise their current bills over arrears payments to avoid eviction. Small arrears were dealt with by the council on a daily basis and currently around 30% of tenants were in arrears.

4.4 Response of other local authorities and housing providers

It was not possible to find any authoritative national data on the number of local authorities or social housing providers that had introduced fixed-term tenancies since the new flexibilities had become available.

In Warwickshire, all of those local authorities with housing stock were continuing to offer secure tenancies and, like Rugby, to offer 12-month introductory tenancies to new tenants. However, in the wider area, both Northampton Borough Council and Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council (whose housing service is run by arms-length management organisation Solihull Community Housing) had decided to introduce fixed-term tenancies.
Rugby Borough Council’s housing team had carried out a small consultation exercise with other registered social landlords with stock in the borough on the Localism Act provisions in summer 2012. This found that:

- Midland Heart were using 5-year fixed-term tenancies, preceded by a 1-year starter tenancy
- Waterloo Housing had introduced fixed-term tenancies on Affordable Rents homes
- Warwickshire Rural Housing Association did not use fixed-term tenancies and had no plans to do so.

An article published by *Inside Housing* magazine in January 2013 reported the outcomes of a survey which found that 29 out of 50 English councils who responded were rejecting the use of flexible tenancies.

Similarly, a report by the Housing Quality Network published in May 2012 stated that “to date, there is no evidence that social landlords are rushing head first into using FTTs” but that “many associations and councils are still discussing whether to use them”.

Desk-top research was undertaken to give an indication of how similar authorities were responding to the new provisions in the Localism Act for local authorities and social housing providers to offer fixed-term tenancies. The CIPFA nearest neighbours group was used, as this provides the best comparator group of statistically similar local authorities.

The table below summarises the findings from the research, indicating the housing arrangements and, where relevant, the tenancy policy for each of the local authorities in Rugby BC’s ‘nearest neighbours’ group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local authority</th>
<th>Housing arrangements</th>
<th>Tenancies offered</th>
<th>Size of stock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>Manage own stock</td>
<td>Introductory and fixed-term tenancies</td>
<td>3,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Peak</td>
<td>Manages own stock (recently returned in-house, having been managed by ALMO since 2004)</td>
<td>Introductory and secure - do not support FTT</td>
<td>4,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Leicestershire</td>
<td>Manage own stock</td>
<td>Secure tenancies</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Kesteven</td>
<td>Manage own stock</td>
<td>Introductory and secure tenancies</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford</td>
<td>Manage own stock</td>
<td>Fixed-term</td>
<td>4,702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Stock Type</th>
<th>Tenancy Type</th>
<th>Tenants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Lancashire</td>
<td>Manage own stock</td>
<td>Introductory and fixed-term</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>Manage own stock</td>
<td>Introductory and secure</td>
<td>3,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Staffordshire</td>
<td>No housing stock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Northamptonshire</td>
<td>No housing stock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichfield</td>
<td>No housing stock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Edmundsbury</td>
<td>No housing stock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braintree</td>
<td>No housing stock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendip</td>
<td>No housing stock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorley</td>
<td>No housing stock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark and Sherrwood</td>
<td>Housing stock managed by arms-length organisation</td>
<td>Introductory and secure tenancies</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, seven of these authorities manage their own stock, seven no longer have housing stock and one has stock managed by an arms-length organisation (ALMO). Of the seven that manage their own stock, three have introduced fixed-term tenancies: Kettering, Ashford and West Lancashire. High Peak District Council provides an example of a council that has considered the question carefully and concluded that they do not support fixed-term tenancies. Case studies of each of these councils were considered by the task group, and the two most influential to the task group are included below.

4.4.1 Case studies

Kettering

Kettering Borough Council approved their Tenancy Policy in September 2012, and members of the Tenants Forum were consulted on the draft policy prior to this.

The policy for new tenancies created after 1 April 2013 is outlined in the table below (taken from the Tenancy Policy):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Tenancy Type</th>
<th>Proposed length of new tenancy</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Families (including single parent households) – including those who require intervention to reduce the risk of eviction due to antisocial behaviour | Flexible Family Intervention Tenancy (with support) | 5 years (renewed until children reach 18) | Security and stability during a child’s education is critical. Families also rely on nearby friends and relatives to provide care for their children. These factors will be considered by us in...
reaching a decision about the use of fixed-term tenancies for this household group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elderly (65/retirement age)</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Lifetime</th>
<th>To provide older people assurance that they can live in their home as long as they want.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Housing</td>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>Lifetime</td>
<td>To provide older people assurance that they can live in their home as long as they want.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Households/Couples</td>
<td>Flexible (with support if appropriate)</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>To provide accommodation (and support) while they need it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with a disabled person</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>To give households with a disabled person security within an appropriate property while they need it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table gives some examples of the exceptional circumstances in which a fixed-term tenancy may be offered or renewed for 2 years and not 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceptional circumstances</th>
<th>Length of tenancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If an introductory tenancy has been extended due to antisocial behaviour</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a household is overcrowded at the time of the review, but no alternative accommodation has been secured</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a geographical area where shorter tenancies could help to tackle anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where a Notice of Seeking Possession has been issued due to rent arrears and the Court has accepted a payment agreement which the tenant has kept to</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The policy states that tenancies will be reviewed between six and 12 months before the end of the tenancy term. This will aim to assess the individual circumstances of each tenant so that an informed decision can be taken as to whether to renew the tenancy. A decision is to be made no less than six months before the end of the tenancy, in order to allow adequate time to find alternative accommodation if a tenancy is not being renewed.

Tenancies are renewed as a matter of course unless there has been a major change in circumstances. Kettering Borough Council may not renew a fixed-term tenancy in certain circumstances. These include:

- The property is under-occupied. In cases of under occupation, the tenant should normally be offered an alternative home with a registered provider. (Under-occupation is defined as under-occupying by more than one bedroom.)
The tenant’s financial circumstances have significantly improved so that other housing options are available, such as home ownership or renting at market value.

Any breaches of tenancy or tenancy fraud have been identified during the fixed-term tenancy review process (which would result in enforcement action)

Possession proceedings have commenced or conditions of tenancy have been breached (for example, rent payments, anti-social behaviour) and possession proceedings could be commenced due to this breach.

The tenant and/or his or her advocate do not engage in the review of the Flexible Tenancy.

The property has been extensively adapted for a person with a disability but the household no longer requires the adaptations. In such cases, the tenant should be normally offered an alternative home with a registered provider

Works are planned on the property in the next five years (which would require its redevelopment or demolition)

Exceptions to this may include where:

- Care and support needs have been identified and these can only be maintained if the household continues to remain in the property (and the loss of the care and support would be detrimental to the household)
- The tenancy falls within an area operating a Local Lettings Policy (LLP) and ending the fixed-term tenancy would conflict with the objective of the LLP. An example of this would be an LLP aimed at creating a mixed income neighbourhood.

The Policy also states that any decision not to ‘renew’ a fixed-term tenancy will take full account of the likelihood of re-housing opportunities.

The guiding principle for those determining the tenancy policy was the “need to make better use of the housing stock owned by both the Council and housing associations in the Borough, due to increasing demand from applicants and lack of affordable housing supply to meet their needs”.

The council report recommending the tenancy policy for Kettering Borough Council argued that “one of the Government’s reasons for promoting fixed-term tenancies is the desperate shortage in supply of social rented homes. This is borne out in our Borough, as the Council is placing increasing numbers of homeless households into privately rented homes due to the shortage of social housing supply locally.”

The report identified medium to long-term resource implications. These included additional staff time taken in conducting reviews and appeals, increased churn within the housing stock leading to increased void and re-letting costs and increased pressure on staff resources as a result of having to provide additional advice and assistance to tenants whose tenancies are under review. It went on to recommend that the outcomes delivered by the Tenancy Policy should be “carefully monitored, to assess the impact on both the management of our own housing stock and wider housing services across the Borough”.
High Peak

The council’s housing stock was managed by an arms-length management organisation when the council took decisions relating to the provisions in the Localism Act 2011. The consultation process in relation to the drafting of the Tenancy Strategy consisted of:

- High Peak Borough Council and High Peak Community Housing Board Member workshop
- Housing association questionnaire and stakeholder meeting
- Public consultation on the draft strategy
- Consultation with the Community Select Committee.

The High Peak Borough Council Tenancy Strategy states that “the council in general does not support the use of fixed-term tenancies as evidence suggests they will have a detrimental effect on communities and limit community cohesion and sustainability”. Responses to the consultation demonstrated that this was reflected in the views of the majority of consultees.

The cost of tenancy reviews was a key consideration in the decision not to introduce fixed-term tenancies. The council could not envisage many cases where they would not renew a tenancy and therefore did not consider that the cost involved could be justified. They also felt that fixed-term tenancies could disincentivise work if people were required to move out of their property when their income reached a certain level. In addition, the relatively low turnover of social housing stock suggested that “the majority of tenants put down roots when they have been allocated a property and go on to create stable and sustainable communities”.

Officers reported, however, that bringing the housing back in-house had changed councillors’ perceptions. Scrutiny members were (in February 2014) engaged in a series of workshops around the HRA business plan, and the policy with regard to tenancies was being reviewed in this wider context.

4.5 Alternative approaches

The task group has discussed whether there may be alternative approaches that could be adopted that would achieve some of the policy aims behind flexible tenancies. For example:

- The national social housing under-occupancy charge is already encouraging better use of council housing, with more tenants now living in homes more suited to their household’s needs

- The ‘Pay to Stay’ policy (see below), if introduced, could help to address the question of fairness by ensuring that tenants who can afford to pay a higher rent do not receive (in effect) a public subsidy by living in a council home at a low rent.

- It was also suggested that housing officers could look to proactively identify the tenants most likely to be able to afford alternative housing options and train housing officers to discuss different options available to tenants. This could help
to raise the aspirations of council tenants by offering clearer pathways to other housing options. This would include discussion of ‘right to buy’, shared ownership and other forms of tenure. Officers were already researching tenant incentive schemes, which would add another dimension to this approach.

The task group learnt about another new initiative that the council was exploring called the Rental Exchange, delivered by Big Issue Invest and Experian. The Rental Exchange was a secure way to include a tenant’s payment history in their credit file and share data to enable social housing tenants to build a positive credit history and create an ‘online’ proof of identity. This would enable council tenants who pay their rent regularly to access more mainstream credit. Rental Exchange would provide the council with information about tenants’ credit status, but not their income levels. This may, however, help to inform a more targeted proactive approach to discussing alternative housing options with tenants.

‘Pay to Stay’ is a proposed national policy whereby households with high incomes living in social housing pay higher than the social rent level. In March 2014 it was reported to the task group that the policy was in a consultative stage, with the expectation that it would be implemented in April 2015. A consultation document published in June 2012 suggested that landlords would be able to charge market rents to households living in social housing with a household income of more than £60,000 per year (with a maximum of two incomes taken into account). Details of how household income data would be collected were yet to be determined, but it seemed likely that it would be the responsibility of the tenant to declare their income level.
The group was also persuaded that there were a number of alternative approaches that could be pursued to help achieve the policy aims of fixed-term tenancies (see section 4.5), and some of these were only at an emergent stage. The task group supports the work that has begun to research the potential use of tenant incentive schemes and urges officers to continue to explore and test out more proactive approaches to encouraging those tenants who are able to consider alternative housing options.

In summary, the key arguments in favour of introducing fixed-term tenancies that have been articulated in discussions within the task group are:

- The council’s housing stock is a public resource that should be used for public benefit
- The purpose of council housing is to meet housing need for those unable to afford private sector housing. It is a welfare benefit and should be viewed as a springboard into work and self-sufficiency
- Fixed-term tenancies enable more efficient use of housing stock to meet the needs of households for the period during which they are in housing need. This is necessary because we are unable to meet demand from those in housing need within our existing stock
- Fixed-term tenancies help ensure that council homes go to those in greatest need and better meet the needs of tenants. They offer landlords flexibility to provide suitable housing when the circumstances of households change – which they frequently do
- It is unfair for people who can afford to relinquish their council home to remain in the property when there are many on the housing waiting list in greater need. There is a clear view from the public that social housing should be allocated fairly and that social housing tenants should pay a higher rent if they are able.

However, a number of questions and concerns were also raised about the viability of introducing fixed-term tenancies, including:
• There are indications that only a very small proportion of tenants would be able to afford to access alternative housing options and would not, therefore, have their tenancy renewed

• Over time there will be significant costs to the council in administering fixed-term tenancies and no identifiable savings to be made

• Fixed-term tenancies could have a detrimental effect on communities and undermine community cohesion and sustainability

• Fixed-term tenancies have the potential to disincentivise employment if people feel they will lose their home if their income reaches a particular level.

Fundamentally, it was felt that the costs to the council of introducing fixed-term tenancies would be higher than the likely benefits at this time, but that this position could change if increased demand for affordable housing made the availability of council housing more imperative.
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| **Contact Officer**         | Debbie Dawson  
(01788) 533592 |
| **Summary**                 | On 5 June 2014 Council resolved to disestablish the Crime and Disorder Committee and transfer its functions to the Customer and Partnerships Committee. The Board is asked to consider the implications of this decision for the overview and scrutiny committee work programmes. |
| **Financial Implications**  | There are no financial implications arising from this report. |
| **Risk Management Implications** | There are no risk management implications arising from this report. |
| **Environmental Implications** | There are no environmental implications arising from this report. |
| **Legal Implications**      | The Police and Justice Act 2006 and regulations made under the Act require the council to have a committee that meets at least once a year to scrutinise the local crime and disorder work of the member authorities of Rugby Community Safety Partnership. |
| **Equality and Diversity**  | No new or existing policy or procedure has been recommended. |
Summary

On 5 June 2014 Council resolved to disestablish the Crime and Disorder Committee and transfer its functions to the Customer and Partnerships Committee. The Board is asked to consider the implications of this decision for the overview and scrutiny committee work programmes.

1. BACKGROUND

The remit of the three overview and scrutiny committees prior to the decision of Council on 5 June 2014 was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee remit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate Performance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crime and Disorder</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customer and Partnerships</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The decision of Council was to disestablish the Crime and Disorder Committee and transfer its functions to the Customer and Partnerships Committee.

Section 19 of the Police and Justice Act 2006 requires the council to have a committee with power to review or scrutinise the decisions and actions of the responsible authorities within the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) in relation to their crime and disorder functions.
The detail of how these requirements are undertaken is largely at the discretion of the local authority. The Crime and Disorder (Overview and Scrutiny) Regulations 2009 state that the committee with responsibility for crime and disorder shall meet as often as considered necessary, provided that the committee meets at least once a year to carry out this role.

2. WORK OF CRIME AND DISORDER COMMITTEE

The Crime and Disorder Committee’s work to date has included routine scrutiny of the performance of the CSP, including a focus at each meeting on the work of one of the CSP’s three priority action groups. The committee has received regular reports on the work of Rugby Neighbourhood Watch and on a range of matters of interest or concern. During the last year, the topics that these have covered have included CSP priorities and funding, community rehabilitation, the Eastern European link worker project, medium-risk domestic abuse, the work of the Policing Priority Area Team, and alcohol misuse.

Following its work on alcohol misuse, the committee placed in its work programme a review on the use of powers conferred by the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 to make public spaces protection orders to control nuisance caused by alcohol consumption and other anti-social behaviour. Work on this review was due to begin after the regulations and any other further guidance on PSPOs were published. It is assumed that it will be possible to proceed later in the year. The Board is asked to consider whether and how this work should be taken forward. It should be noted that this work is not part of the Crime and Disorder Committee’s statutory role of scrutinising the work of the CSP.

3. CONCLUSION

The Board is asked to consider the implications of the decision to disestablish the Crime and Disorder Committee for the remaining scrutiny committee work programmes and to determine the broad principles for the council’s approach to crime and disorder scrutiny in future.
Name of Meeting: Overview and Scrutiny Management Board

Date of Meeting: 16 June 2014

Subject Matter: Disestablishment of Crime and Disorder Committee

There are no background papers relating to this item.
### AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Meeting</th>
<th>Overview and Scrutiny Management Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Meeting</td>
<td>16 June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Title</td>
<td>Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Relevance</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Officer</td>
<td>Debbie Dawson (01788) 533592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary
The Board is asked to:
1. review progress in task group reviews;
2. note the work programmes of the scrutiny committees;
3. agree the process for submitting suggestions for Warwickshire County Council review topics
4. determine the Board’s future work programme;

#### Financial Implications
There is a budget of £500 available to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board in 2014/15 to spend on the delivery of the overview and scrutiny work programme.

#### Risk Management Implications
There are no risk management implications arising from this report.

#### Environmental Implications
There are no environmental implications arising from this report.

#### Legal Implications
There are no legal implications arising from this report.

#### Equality and Diversity
No new or existing policy or procedure has been recommended.
Summary

The Board is asked to:
1. review progress in task group reviews;
2. note the work programmes of the scrutiny committees;
3. agree the process for submitting suggestions for Warwickshire County Council review topics
4. determine the Board’s future work programme;

1. REVIEWS

Current progress in the programme of overview and scrutiny reviews is reported below.

Corporate Performance Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current reviews</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fees and Charges</td>
<td>The draft one page strategy for this review will be considered by Corporate Performance Committee on 3 July 2014, and the task group membership will be confirmed at that meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Later in the year

| Systems Thinking – What Next? | It is intended that this review will commence in the autumn once the fees and charges review has concluded. |

Customer and Partnerships Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current reviews</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universal credit and welfare reform</td>
<td>The task group continues to oversee the council’s corporate approach to the welfare reforms and monitor the impact of the reforms on the local community. The review is expected to last at least until the end of the 2014/15 municipal year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The task group has published an interim report of its</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
findings to date, which was considered by Customer and Partnerships Committee in April. Since the group is at an evidence-gathering stage, it is not in a position to draw any firm conclusions or make recommendations at this time.

The group met with representatives from the local Jobcentre Plus office on 4 June 2014 to take evidence about the practical implementation of benefit reforms in the borough, including use of sanctions. The group also agreed a revised set of data measures to support its ongoing monitoring of the impact of welfare reform.

The group will meet again in September as part of the consultation on the council’s revised council tax reduction scheme and hold a further meeting shortly after to identify any specific issues it wishes to investigate in greater depth.

### Alcohol and Health

The task group held an evidence-gathering meeting on 24 March, and reviewed the evidence it had received at a subsequent meeting. The group will report its findings and recommendations to Customer and Partnerships Committee on 26 June 2014.

### Rugby Business Improvement District

This is now likely to be a more substantial task group review than initially discussed. It will be proposed to Customer and Partnerships Committee on 26 June that a task group should be formed to review the outcomes from the Council’s investment in the town centre, with a particular focus on the Council’s relationship with Rugby First and the BID. It is suggested that a private workshop will be held for the task group in August to explain the role and activities of Rugby BID and Rugby First and their relationship with the Council. The task group would develop its one page strategy at that workshop and would need to conclude its work by the end of 2014.

### Hackney Carriage Stands

The draft one page strategy for this review will be considered by Customer and Partnerships Committee on 26 June, and the task group membership will be confirmed at that meeting.

### Later in the year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promoting independent living</th>
<th>The draft one page strategy for this review will be considered by Customer and Partnerships Committee on 11 September 2014. It is intended that work on the review will begin in the autumn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Misuse – Public Spaces Protection Areas</td>
<td>This review was to have been conducted by the former Crime and Disorder Committee, whose functions have now been transferred to the Customer and Partnerships Committee. This review will explore the use of the powers proposed in the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 to control nuisance caused by alcohol consumption and other anti-social behaviour in public. Among other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
things, this legislation gives local authorities the power to outlaw certain activities by imposing public spaces protection orders (PSPOs). Work on this review will begin after regulations and any other further guidance on PSPOs have been published.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other reviews in the work programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As previously reported, this light touch review has been deferred as progress on the Coton Park pilot has been slower than anticipated, and other matters have become more pressing. CUSP will now scope the review in September, with the intention of undertaking the review at the Committee’s November meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need for this proposed review is to be considered following a Warwickshire County Council flooding summit, due to be held in September or October 2014. This summit is being held in conjunction with the Strategic Flood Forum, a bringing-together of Warwickshire County Council, the districts and boroughs, the Environment Agency, Severn Trent Water and other bodies associated with flooding. The format and objectives of the summit are expected to become clearer after the Forum’s July meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance service restructuring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This review topic is to be considered after the changes in the service have taken effect. However, the Committee has agreed that representatives from the ambulance service should be invited to a meeting of the Committee to talk generally about their work and also inform the review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMMES

The most recently produced work programme tables for the scrutiny committees are appended. These are subject to amendment as the year progresses.

3. WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME

Warwickshire County Council will be holding its overview and scrutiny work programming event in late July, and district and borough scrutiny committee members are invited to suggest topics that they strongly feel should be scrutinised by a county council scrutiny committee or task and finish group. All non-Executive members – regardless of whether they are members of a scrutiny committee – have been invited to make suggestions.

Individual members could submit suggestions direct to the county council but they will probably have more force if they come from a committee. It would seem most likely that suggestions will be about the type of topics in which Customer and Partnerships Committee takes an interest, especially so now that crime and disorder has been added to that committee’s terms of reference.
The deadline for suggestions is 30 June, so the CUSP meeting on 26 June is well timed to deal with this. It is therefore suggested that Customer and Partnerships Committee be authorised to make suggestions.

4. **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD**

The Board will next meet on 11 August 2014 and the agenda will include a routine exception report on progress against scrutiny review action plans and an update on the overview and scrutiny work programme. The Board is asked to consider whether there are any other specific agenda items it wishes to consider at its next meeting or any future meetings.
Name of Meeting: Overview and Scrutiny Management Board
Date of Meeting: 16 June 2014
Subject Matter: Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme Progress

There are no background papers relating to this item.
## Committee Work Programmes
### Corporate Performance Committee

3 July 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Who to involve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance report – Portfolio to be agreed</td>
<td>Discussion of performance with the portfolio holder.</td>
<td>Portfolio holder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Report – Strategic area to be agreed</td>
<td>Covalent reports</td>
<td>Head of Business Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrutiny review action plans</td>
<td>Routine report on progress against scrutiny review action plans within the committee’s remit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other items to be agreed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Who to involve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby Youth Council</td>
<td>Standing item</td>
<td>Councillor Health Champion and council representative on WCC Adult Social Services and Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and wellbeing update</td>
<td>Standing item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Progress Report</td>
<td>To consider the Council’s annual submission to Defra</td>
<td>Regulatory Services Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inward Investment</td>
<td>Update on inward investment activity in the borough and the work of Coventry and Warwickshire Local Enterprise Partnership</td>
<td>Economy, Development and Culture Portfolio Holder and Leader of the Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from Rugby World Cup Steering Group</td>
<td>To receive an update from the Steering Group on progress in their plans to mark the RWC2015 in Rugby</td>
<td>Economic Investment Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Rugby BID one page strategy</td>
<td>To agree a one page strategy for this review</td>
<td>Executive Director, Head of Environmental Services, Head of Planning and Culture, Rugby BID Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Hackney Carriage Stands one page strategy</td>
<td>To agree a one page strategy for this review</td>
<td>Head of Environmental Services, Regulatory Services Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol and health in Rugby</td>
<td>To receive a report from the task group on the outcomes of this light touch review</td>
<td>Task group chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrutiny review action plans</td>
<td>Routine report on progress against scrutiny review action plans within the committee’s remit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Who to involve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby Youth Council</td>
<td>Standing item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and wellbeing update</td>
<td>Standing item&lt;br&gt;West Midlands Ambulance Service to be invited to talk to the committee about their emergency and community transport services in Rugby</td>
<td>Councillor Health Champion and council representative on WCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from Children and Young People’s Champion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Children and Young People’s Champion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood planning – light touch review</td>
<td>Scoping this light touch review, which will capture learning from the Coton pilot about the benefits and resource implications of supporting local areas to produce a neighbourhood plan and help to inform the council’s approach to neighbourhood planning across the borough.</td>
<td>Head of Planning and Culture&lt;br&gt;Development Strategy Manager&lt;br&gt;Economy, Development and Culture Portfolio Holder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from Warwickshire County Council Flooding Summit</td>
<td>Feedback from the summit (date tbc) to inform decision regarding the need for a scrutiny review on Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems</td>
<td>Head of Planning and Culture&lt;br&gt;Cllr Peter Butlin (WCC Portfolio Holder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of promoting independent living one page strategy</td>
<td>To agree a one page strategy for this review</td>
<td>Head of Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 November 2014</td>
<td>Rugby Youth Council</td>
<td>Standing item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health and wellbeing update</td>
<td>Standing item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrutiny review action plans</td>
<td>Routine report on progress against scrutiny review action plans within the committee’s remit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Light touch review of neighbourhood planning</td>
<td>To capture learning from the Coton pilot about the benefits and resource implications of supporting local areas to produce a neighbourhood plan and help to inform the council’s approach to neighbourhood planning across the borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 January 2015</td>
<td>Rugby Youth Council</td>
<td>Standing item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health and wellbeing update</td>
<td>Standing item</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>