CUSTOMER AND PARTNERSHIPS COMMITTEE – 1 SEPTEMBER 2011

A meeting of the Customer and Partnerships Committee will be held at 5.30pm on Thursday 1 September 2011 in Committee Room 1, Town Hall, Rugby.

Councillor Claire Edwards
Chair of Customer of Partnerships Committee

AGENDA

PART 1 – PUBLIC BUSINESS

1. Minutes
   To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2011

2. Apologies
   To receive apologies for absence from the meeting

3. Declarations of Interest
   To receive declarations of:

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

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

   (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 personal interests at the commencement of the meeting (or as soon as the interest becomes apparent). If that interest is a prejudicial 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

To receive any Call Ins from Cabinet

5. Air Quality Monitoring Network Review – final report

6. Air Quality Management Area Action Plan – Environmental Protection Officer to brief the Committee

7. Review of Youth Provision – draft one page strategy

8. Committee Work Programme

Any additional papers for this meeting can be accessed via the website.

Membership of the Committee:

Councillors Ms Edwards (Chairman), Mrs Watson (Vice Chairman), G Francis, Hazelton, Miss Lawrence, Mahoney, Mrs New, Sewell, Warwick

If you have any general queries with regard to this agenda please contact Veronika Beckova, Democratic and Scrutiny Services Officer (01788 533522 or e-mail veronika.beckova@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.
Name of Meeting: Customer and Partnerships Committee

Date of Meeting: 1 September 2011

Report Title: Air Quality Monitoring Network Review – Final Report

Ward Relevance: All

Contact Officer: Debbie Dawson, Tel: 01788 533592

Summary: The Committee included in its work programme for 2011/12 a review of the air quality monitoring network, to make recommendations regarding the future requirements for the borough after the current air quality monitoring contract ends in June 2012. A task group was appointed and began its work in June 2011. The review is now complete and the report presents the findings and recommendations of the task group for consideration by the Committee and submission to Cabinet.

Financial Implications: The review recommendations, if accepted, will deliver significant savings for the Council. The cost implications are detailed in section 6 of the review report. The task group also considered the financial implications of the different options for air quality monitoring as part of their evidence gathering and analysis.

Risk Management Implications: The Council is under a legal duty to review and assess air quality, and if an air quality management area is declared, to produce an action plan to manage air quality. Future air quality monitoring arrangements must enable the Council to fulfil its legal obligations, and this has been a consideration in the review.

Environmental Implications: Effective air quality management should result in actions that reduce levels of air pollution in the borough. Air quality monitoring data is used to inform local transport planning, to help address pollution caused by NO₂ emissions.
**Legal Implications**

The Council has legal obligations with regard to air quality management under the Environment Act 1995. The legislative context for the review is detailed in section 4.1 of the review report.

**Equality and Diversity**

As a result of this report an existing or new policy or procedure has been recommended.

An Equality Impact Assessment has not been carried out for the following reason(s):

The EIA will be carried out when the review finalised for submission to Cabinet.
Summary

The Committee included in its work programme for 2011/12 a review of the air quality monitoring network, to make recommendations regarding the future requirements for the borough after the current air quality monitoring contract ends in June 2012. A task group was appointed and began its work in June 2011. The review is now complete and the report presents the findings and recommendations of the task group for consideration by the Committee and submission to Cabinet.

1. Introduction

It was agreed by the Committee in June 2010 that a full review of air quality monitoring should take place at least 6 months after the opening of the Rugby Western Relief Road, so that its impact on air pollution in the town could be assessed. This would also coincide with the potential re-tendering of the air quality monitoring contract, with the current 5-year AECOM contract ending in June 2012.

The item was therefore included in the overview and scrutiny work programme for 2011/12 with the understanding that it would report to Cabinet in October 2011 to allow time for any tendering process to be completed before the current contract expires. A draft one page strategy for the review was agreed by the Committee on 23 June 2011, and the appointed task group began work the following week.

The task group has now completed its work and appendix 1 to this report details their findings. The review report includes a draft action plan which has been agreed by the task group members, and service officers advising the group. The Sustainable Environment Portfolio Holder also met with the task group to discuss its findings on 24 August 2011.

2. Reporting Process

The Chairman of the Task Group, Councillor Carolyn Robbins, will attend the meeting to present the report.

The review will be reported to Cabinet agenda on 17 October 2011, subject to the approval and comments of the Committee.
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The task group consisted of the following members:

Councillor Ms Carolyn Robbins (Chairman)
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Councillor David Cranham
Councillor Ish Mistry
Councillor Mrs Noreen New
Councillor Neil Sandison
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Scrutiny Officer
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Democratic and Scrutiny Services Officer
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The Group thanks the following for their contribution to this review:

Sean Lawson, Head of Environmental Services, RBC
David Burrows, Regulatory Services Manager, RBC
Anthony Devonish, Environmental Protection Officer, RBC
Adrian Hart, Transport Planning Team Leader, Warwickshire County Council

The Group is also grateful to the environmental officers from neighbouring authorities who responded to requests for comparative information.
CHAIRMAN’S FOREWORD

With the Council’s current air quality monitoring contract ending in June 2012, the task group set out to make value for money recommendations regarding the future requirements for air quality monitoring in the borough. We focused specifically on the air quality monitoring arrangements, and did not seek to address the wider question of how air quality in the borough can be improved.

We worked to a tight timescale, given the possibility that the Council would need to undertake an EU tendering process for its monitoring arrangements after June 2012. It was important for us to have a clear understanding of the current and likely future air quality issues and the different options for monitoring in future and, despite the short time available, the task group considered a wide range of information and evidence. This included a submission from Warwickshire County Council’s transport planning team – one of the main users of the data we gather – and comparative information from neighbouring local authorities.

It was clear from the air quality monitoring reports that the main air quality issue in Rugby is traffic-related nitrogen dioxide. With significant developments planned in the borough in future years, traffic patterns are likely to change and the Council will need the flexibility to monitor a wider area and respond to new areas of concern. On the other hand, the reports also show that there have been no recorded exceedences of air quality objectives for PM$_{10}$ in the borough since monitoring began in 1999 and therefore the task group felt that the Council could no longer justify expenditure on continued PM$_{10}$ monitoring.

This all pointed to the conclusion that continuous air quality monitoring using the automatic air quality monitoring station was no longer necessary and resources would be better used to support a wider diffusion tube network, allowing greater flexibility and responsiveness in our monitoring.

I believe that the task group’s recommendations will result in more effective and better targeted air quality monitoring in the borough, whilst also delivering significant cost savings for the Council – a positive result all round. I would like to thank all of the councillors and officers who supported this review and worked so quickly and intensively to achieve a positive outcome in the short time we had available.

Councillor Carolyn Robbins
Chairman
# 1. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Task Group proposes the following specific recommendations:

## IMPROVEMENTS THAT COULD BE MADE QUICKLY AND AT LOW COST

1. The annual Air Quality Progress Report should be subject to scrutiny by the Customer and Partnerships Committee.

## MODIFICATIONS OF EXISTING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

2. The Council should cease continuous air quality monitoring using the Air Quality Monitoring Station when the current air quality monitoring contract ends in June 2012.

3. The Council should cease to monitor PM$_{10}$ levels, and take the 5 Turnkeys out of service when the current air quality monitoring contract ends in June 2012.

4. Air quality data reporting should be reduced in line with statutory requirements.

## SIGNIFICANT PROPOSALS WHICH WILL REQUIRE COMMITMENT OF TIME OR FINANCIAL RESOURCES

5. The NO$_2$ diffusion tube network should be expanded and a budget of £4,500 in 2012/13 and subsequent years be set for this purpose.

6. Officers should set the criteria for selection of monitoring sites and determine the precise number of diffusion tubes required, within the budget set by Council.

### 1.1 Alignment with the Corporate Strategy

The review relates to the following corporate priorities:

*Priority 4: Enable and sustain an environment which our residents can take pride in and which impresses our visitors.*
2. OBJECTIVES

2.1 Background

It was agreed by the Customer and Partnerships Committee in June 2010 that a full review of air quality monitoring should take place at least 6 months after the opening of the Rugby Western Relief Road, so that its impact on air pollution in the town could be assessed. This would also coincide with the potential re-tendering of the air quality monitoring contract, with the current 5-year AECOM contract ending in June 2012.

This item was therefore included in the overview and scrutiny work programme for 2011/12 with the understanding that it would report to Cabinet in October 2011 to allow time for any tendering process to be completed before the current contract expires. A task group was established in June 2011 to review the air quality monitoring network and make recommendations regarding the future requirements for the borough after the current air quality monitoring contract ends.

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, finalised by the task group in June 2011, is as follows:

What is the specific topic area?
To review the air quality monitoring network (in relation to the requirements under the local air quality management regime only) and make value for money recommendations regarding the future requirements for the borough after the current air quality monitoring contract ends.

This will include consideration of whether the current air quality management area remains appropriate and necessary, and what the options (including costs and benefits) are for air quality monitoring arrangements in the future.

What is the ambition of the review?
To put in place cost-effective air quality monitoring arrangements which provide robust data to inform decisions potentially affecting air quality.

How well do we perform at the moment?
The review will establish:
- What are the Council’s legal obligations in respect of air quality management and monitoring?
- What monitoring arrangements are currently in place in the borough (what is measured, and what equipment is used) and what is the annual cost of monitoring?
- What is the boundary of the existing air quality management area
- What does the current monitoring data tell us about air quality in the borough, and how is this data used? (Does the data collection support decision making where there may be an impact on air quality?)
Who shall we consult about the current service and about how we can improve it?
The subject area is governed by strict technical guidance which defines the duties and responsibilities of the Council. Given the tight timescale for the review it will not be possible to undertake any significant consultation, or to take evidence from a number of witnesses. The review will rely on published literature and presentations from officers.

Key documents include:
- Local Air Quality Management Technical Guidance (LAGM. TG09) 2009 (sets out the regulatory framework for air quality management and monitoring)
- 2011 Air Quality Progress Report for Rugby Borough Council (sets out results of air quality monitoring over the past year and gives a summary of previous monitoring reports and processes)

Individuals to involve include:
- Sustainable Environment Portfolio Holder (final meeting)
- Head of Environmental Services
- Regulatory Services Manager
- Environmental Protection Officer

Written input to be sought from WCC Transport Planning
Consultation feedback from consultation on the last Detailed Assessment (Sep 2010)

What other help do we need?
National or regional comparators to establish whether the trends in air pollutant levels in Rugby are comparable with other areas, and whether the level of monitoring is comparative and proportionate to the air quality exceedences recorded in the borough.

Data regarding traffic flows in the borough and overall traffic levels.

How long should it take?
3 months (to report to Cabinet 17 October 2011 – and therefore to Customer and Partnerships Committee on 1 September 2011)

Programme of work
29 June 2011 – introductory briefing
13 July 2011 – further evidence
2 August 2011 – draft recommendations and any further evidence required
24 August 2011 – confirmation of final report and review recommendations

What will be the outcome?
A report to Cabinet regarding the future requirements for air quality monitoring for the borough after the current contract ends, that provides value for money and will allow compliance with our legal duties.

2.3 Key Questions

Aside from understanding the Council’s statutory responsibilities and its current air quality monitoring arrangements, the initial questions that the group sought to address in the review were:
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- Would we be meeting legal obligations if we changed the monitoring programme?
- Does air quality monitoring currently offer value for money and how can it be improved to offer better value for money?
- Does the Air Quality Management Area need to be revised?
- How do we compare with other similar towns with regard to air quality?

In drawing its conclusions and recommendations, the group considered the following questions:

- What is the purpose of our air quality monitoring? Is there any value in doing more than fulfilling our legal obligations?
- Do we wish to continue monitoring PM\textsubscript{10} levels?
- How much and what type of air quality monitoring equipment do we need?
  - Do we wish to retain the AQMS and Turnkeys?
  - Do we wish to expand the diffusion tube network?
- What level of reporting should there be in future?
- What arrangements do we wish to put in place for ongoing maintenance / servicing of air quality monitoring equipment?
3. METHODOLOGY

In order to develop the evidence base for the review, the Panel considered a wide range of data and information. This included:

- Detailed briefings from officers on the Council’s legal obligations and the current air quality monitoring arrangements – including equipment used, locations and costs
- Air quality data and trends, including the 2011 Air Quality Action Plan Progress Report
- Traffic flow trend data
- Consideration of statutory guidance in relation to the Council’s obligations under the Environment Act 1995
- Advice from Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) and AECOM (the Council’s current air quality monitoring contractor) regarding the possibility of the Council ceasing to carry out continuous air quality monitoring using the Air Quality Monitoring Station
- Results of the public consultation on the last Detailed and Further Assessment conducted by the Council in September 2010
- A presentation of the options for air quality monitoring in the future, with analysis of costs, benefits and risks

Neighbouring authorities were consulted and internet research was undertaken to gather comparative data regarding the monitoring equipment they use, what data they collect, contracts and servicing arrangements. Research was also undertaken to establish how Rugby compares with other similar areas regarding air quality.

The task group also requested written evidence from Warwickshire County Council’s Transport Planning team, specifically about how they use the air quality monitoring data gathered by the Borough Council and about traffic patterns and areas of congestion in the borough – both current and potential future changes.

During the review the Council received a response from Defra to its consultation on the 2011 Air Quality Action Plan Progress Report. As the comments made by Defra had relevance to the review recommendations, the consultation response was considered by the task group.
4. FINDINGS

4.1 Legislative context

The Council has a legal obligation under the Environment Act 1995 to conduct local air quality assessments and to designate an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) where there is a likelihood that national or international air quality objectives may be exceeded. The air quality standards set by Government are health-based and the Council’s primary concern is to protect the health of any vulnerable receptors resident in an area of potential exceedence. The Council must have an action plan in place to deal with the issues identified in the AQMA.

There are seven pollutants covered by Local Air Quality Management Regulations in England:

- Benzene
- 1,3-Butadiene
- Carbon monoxide
- Lead
- Nitrogen Dioxide
- Particles (PM10)
- Sulphur Dioxide

A new air quality directive (Directive 2008/50/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 May 2008 on ambient air quality and cleaner air for Europe) came into force in June 2008, and was transposed into national legislation in June 2010. This provides a new regulatory framework for PM$_{2.5}$, with a target of 15% reduction in concentrations at urban background between 2010 and 2020. This monitoring is to take place as part of the existing Automatic Urban and Rural Network (AURN), and this is already in place locally in Warwick. Monitoring PM$_{2.5}$ is a national objective rather than the responsibility of local authorities.

Every 3 years the Council must undertake an Updating and Screening Assessment (USA) which reviews any changes in air quality issues that have occurred since the last assessment. Where the USA identifies a risk that an air quality objective may be exceeded, a Detailed Assessment (DA) must be undertaken. The Council is required to produce annual air quality Progress Reports for the years when no USA or DA is due.

The Environment Agency is responsible for monitoring the emissions from the Cemex plant, not Rugby Borough Council.

4.2 Pollution in Rugby

NO$_2$ and the respirable particles known as PM$_{10}$ are the two pollutants of concern in Rugby borough. Rugby Borough Council declared an AQMA for nitrogen dioxide (NO$_2$) in December 2004. Whilst the AQMA covers the whole urban area of Rugby, there is in reality only one vulnerable receptor, situated on the Warwick Road Gyratory. This wide area was identified because the issue was traffic pollution, and
any action plan would require the whole traffic system around Rugby to be reviewed. At present there is no evidence to suggest the current AQMA will not continue to be needed in the future. Nationally, AQMAs for traffic-related NO₂ are very common.

There is increasing concern regarding NO₂ concentrations in the town centre area. This is thought to be the result of both changes to the national emissions factors and variations in traffic flows, which have removed the positive impact of technological developments.

Traffic levels and patterns are the key cause of NO₂ exceedences. Traffic flow has a direct impact on emissions of NOx and NO₂, but the complex chemical interactions mean that levels of NO₂ are not directly proportional. In order to reduce NO₂ to acceptable levels in the town centre, there would need to be an approximate 44% reduction in traffic (data from Detailed Assessment, September 2010).

There is a national issue with elevated levels of PM₁₀. In Rugby, PM₁₀ has been monitored since 1999. This has shown some occasional peaks and incidents, with some elevated levels recorded in the vicinity of Cemex, Murray Road and Ling Hall Quarry. However there have been no recorded exceedences of national air quality objectives. Where leaks have occurred from the Cemex plant these have mostly involved large nuisance dust and not respirable particles. The elevated levels in Murray Road are the result of large traffic volumes and construction work.

Other local authorities make savings by not monitoring PM₁₀, and there is no requirement to continue to monitor PM₁₀ in Rugby. There is no practical benefit in monitoring for any other pollutants in the ambient air as the levels are well below any established standards.

Detailed conclusions from the latest air quality monitoring data are reported in the 2011 Air Quality Action Plan Progress Report, and were reported to the task group at their first meeting.

4.2.1 Air Quality Action Plan Progress Report – Consultation Response from Defra

Defra has expressed concerns over two particular issues in the 2011 Air Quality Action Plan Progress Report:

- A recorded exceedence at Ryton of 40.7 µg/m³
- An annual mean NO₂ concentration of 60 µg/m³ at the Webb Ellis Pub, Warwick Street, indicating a possible exceedence of the hourly mean objective

The Council’s air quality consultants AECOM were asked to perform a distance correction to determine the annual mean concentration of NO₂ for the monitoring site at Ryton. This resulted in a predicted annual mean level of NO₂ at Ryton of 31.2 µg/m³, which is well below the annual objective, and confirmed the Council’s view that there is no need for any further action.
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Previous monitoring at the Webb Ellis Pub has shown exceedences, but not at such a high level, and officers suspect the result may be an anomaly. Further monitoring is needed to determine the true level and the advice from AECOM is to make this a triplicate diffusion tube site, which would increase the reliability of the data. Continuous monitoring using an Air Quality Monitoring Station is not practical at this site.

4.3 Air quality monitoring equipment and costs

The Council is approaching the end of a 5-year air quality monitoring and air quality services contract with AECOM (formerly Faber Maunsell) which ends in June 2012.

4.3.1 Air Quality Monitoring Station

The Council owns one Air Quality Monitoring Station (AQMS), which is located on the corner of Newbold Road and Essex Street. It monitors NO$_2$ and particulates (PM$_{10}$), and is the most accurate method of measuring air quality, with data accurate to +/- 10%. It provides continuous monitoring and can provide average data for 15-minute intervals, and can therefore pick up specific events and data spikes.

However, annual maintenance costs are high, and the unit is costly and difficult to move. If it were moved the continuity of data would be lost and it would be difficult to situate it close to where the problems lie (in the town centre) because it is too big and there are highway safety, land ownership and electricity source issues.

The AQMS unit is 4 years old and has a predicted lifespan of 5 years, though it may well exceed this. The unit is currently covered by a 5-year fixed price maintenance and full repair contract which expires in June 2012. It is estimated that the unit could be kept in use thereafter (until it fails mechanically) at a cost of around £6,000 per annum. It would cost around £20,000 to replace. The existing unit has little or no current re-sale value.

The AQMS is currently used to provide bias correction data for the diffusion tubes. However, this could be carried out at a neighbouring authority. The diffusion tube manufacturers also provide an annual bias (rather than a local bias) which is usually used in reporting.

4.3.2 Turnkeys

The Council also operates 5 Turnkey Units. These are not a Government-approved method of monitoring, but are accepted as a useful screening tool. They are less costly to run and can be more easily moved. Turnkeys are used to monitor particulates and provide continuous monitoring. In Rugby they are currently used for this purpose at the following locations:

- Lawford Farm
- Townsend Lane
- Avenue Road
- Russelsheim Way
- Murray Road
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The Council’s Turnkey monitoring is probably the least cost effective monitoring at present.

4.3.3 Diffusion Tubes

The Council has 17 diffusion tube sites monitoring NO₂, and 3 monitoring SO₂. They are small and portable and easily set up and handled by Council officers, but can only provide data in the form of a monthly average. The data is accurate to +/- 20%. They cost around £7 per unit, meaning that a year’s monitoring data can be obtained at a cost of £80 per site. Diffusion tubes are not able to monitor particulates (PM₁₀). The majority of air quality data collected by the Council comes from the diffusion tubes.

As traffic pollutants are the main issue, expansion of the diffusion tubes could offer the flexibility to monitor a wider area in less detail, whilst still informing the Local Transport Plan. It would also allow the Council to respond more effectively to new issues and changes in traffic movements. Monitoring at more locations would assist in building up a more accurate picture of air quality trends across the borough. There may also be opportunities to respond to wider concerns, for example about environmentally sensitive habitat sites.

At present, determination of suitable locations and sites for the diffusion tubes involves complicated approval by elected members. The monitoring arrangements could be more responsive if members were to recommend an overall strategy (e.g. equipment, approximate numbers of tubes and areas of priority) while allowing officers to determine the detailed site locations.

4.3.4 Overall costs and comparisons

Current spend by the Council is approximately £24,000 pa on the AQMS and Turnkeys (including reports and other ancillary activities), and £2,000pa on provision of monthly monitoring at 20 sites with diffusion tubes. Prior to the last review in 2007, air quality monitoring cost the council £100,000 per annum.

By comparison:
- North Warwickshire have 17 NO₂ diffusion tube sites (20 tubes in total including triplicate collocation ones and 1 control) at a cost of approximately £1,000 pa.
- Nuneaton and Bedworth have 42 NO₂ diffusion tubes at a cost of approximately £2,000 per annum. They have 2 air quality monitoring stations, one of which has been put out of service. The service contract for the operational AQMS is £2,000 per annum.
- Stratford on Avon decommissioned and sold their automatic analysers and now rely on diffusion tubes only. They have 26 diffusion tubes, and the cost of monitoring is around £3,000 per annum, excluding officer time.

There is a growing tendency in other authorities towards officers carrying out calibration, data downloading and data ratification in-house, to help reduce costs. However, the significant officer time costs involved can be hidden and this may be the case in the figures listed above. There may however be potential savings to be
made (potentially up to 30-40%) by going out to tender for the maintenance contract and changing the specification regarding ancillary activities.

The use of real time data was considered by the Group but is unlikely to offer value for money as the system is not widely used and the cost compared to the numbers of users is high. The system would alert the Council to rising pollution, but only when it would be too late to inform appropriate people and there would be very little, if any, action that could be taken.

The current arrangements regarding air quality monitoring comply with statutory guidelines. However, both AECOM and Defra have advised that the Council could fulfil its legal obligations without use of the AQMS and Turnkeys.

4.4 How monitoring data is reported and used

The Council has an obligation to produce statutory reports on annual and 3-year cycles. Officers do not have the specialist knowledge to write the complex statutory reports, so the Council requires support for this from a specialist air quality consultant or contractor.

The current contractor also currently produces detailed results and trend analysis quarterly and annually, as well as ad hoc reports (for example on the effects of the Icelandic volcanic dust). These inform officers and members about changing priorities or actions needed. However, these reports are not statutory and do not have to be offered by the Council. They are mainly of academic value, and generate little public interest. The ad hoc reports are mainly for respirable particles, and so require the continuation of automatic or Turnkey monitoring. They often identify nuisance dust (not generally considered a health risk) but have not resulted in identification of any statutory breaches of air quality objectives. The cost of this non-statutory and ad hoc reporting amounts to around £7,000 per annum.

The data gathered by the Council is used by developers to inform development plans, and is a factor taken into account by Warwickshire County Council (WCC) in determining road layout. In particular, the County Council reported that air quality monitoring data is important in informing the development of individual transport schemes – for example the Rugby Western Relief Road – to deliver the objectives of the Local Transport Plan.

The County Council’s Local Transport Plan (LTP) includes an Air Quality Strategy covering the whole of Warwickshire which uses information on air quality provided by the District and Borough Councils in their role as the Environmental Health Authority. The County advised that the availability of good quality and up to date air quality monitoring data is useful for this purpose. All existing Air Quality Action Plans are also included in the LTP, and are based on recent air quality and traffic data.

There is a statutory requirement for all environmental data to be published and consultants can gather information this way free of charge. It is not possible to require developers to contribute to the costs as part of planning approvals.
The Council has controls in place in its planning application process to mitigate against any negative air quality impacts of developments. New guidance in this regard is being developed for the Council’s Core Strategy and this will draw on good practice from other authorities highlighted by the task group.

4.5 Traffic patterns and planned developments

Warwickshire County Council identified the following routes as being the most congested during peak times:

- A426 Leicester Road/Newbold Road/Corporation Street
- A428 Crick Road/Hillmorton Road/Lawrence Sheriff Street
- A426 Dunchurch Road/Rugby Road
- B4642 Bilton Road/Coventry Road
- A428 Lawford Road
- Warwick Street Gyratory system
- Oliver Street
- Evreux Way/North Street/Church Street
- Clifton Road/Whitehall Road
- Murray Road/Mill Road/Boughton Road
- B4429 Ashlawn Road

WCC are currently monitoring traffic flow in the areas which will be affected by the forthcoming major developments planned at the Mast Site, DIRFT 3 and Gateway sites. They expect to see the following effects:

1. An increase in traffic on the main radial routes serving the town
2. An increase in traffic on the A5, at M6 Junction 1 and M1 Junction 18
3. A gradual increase in traffic using the Rugby Western Relief Road
4. Increases on other routes, such as the B4429 Ashlawn Road, B4429 Coventry Road (Dunchurch), B4642 Bilton Road, Clifton Road/Whitehall Road and Butlers Leap/Mill Road/New Technology Drive.

The pedestrianisation scheme will result in traffic being directed to areas where no pollution issues currently exist, which may result in a need for additional monitoring sites. The timescale for delivery of the scheme will be dependent on securing the necessary funding. The speed at which certain other key town centre developments come forward will also be instrumental in determining the timescale.

Coventry Airport is likely to commence commercial flights again, which could cause an increase in NO₂ and PM_{10} pollutants. It is more likely this will affect Coventry, particularly the Willenhall area, which is the responsibility of Coventry City Council. At present there is a diffusion tube located at the hotel on the A45 Oxford – Tollbar Island section of road which has recorded levels below the national objective. The Ryton area could be a potential site for another diffusion tube in this regard.

There are a number of sites which could be identified for monitoring to build a database of background information and assist in measuring the ultimate impact of the developments due to take place across the town. If more locations were monitored it would be possible to provide trend data, and this may also assist in better modelling and more accurate identification of areas of likely exceedences.
The proposed crematorium will be a brand new facility built to meet all the current emission standards. The Council will run the facility and will be responsible for regulating it, through separate teams. The level of risk to air quality for a crematorium as a type of industry, as categorised by Government, is quite low.
5. CONCLUSIONS

The task group drew the following conclusions from the evidence that it gathered:

- The main purpose of air quality monitoring by the Council is to fulfil the Council’s legal obligations. It is not necessary to continue to exceed these legal obligations in the level of monitoring undertaken.

- There have been no recorded exceedences of national objectives for PM\textsubscript{10} levels since monitoring began in 1999. There is therefore no necessity to continue monitoring PM\textsubscript{10} levels in the borough.

- The use of Turnkeys for particulate monitoring across the borough has helped to address particular public concerns and provide some public reassurance in the past. The remaining units could be sold, with the possibility of storing one or two in the short-term in case they are required again.

- Ongoing monitoring using the automatic air quality monitoring station beyond the life of its contract (June 2012) would be costly, with annual maintenance and repair expected to cost around £6,000 per annum. The continuous monitoring data is not needed to fulfil the Council’s statutory obligations and the size of the unit means that it is difficult to move and not suitable for some locations where additional monitoring would be of value. The AQMS should therefore be taken out of use.

- The diffusion tube network should be expanded to allow greater flexibility to respond to new concerns and to enable robust monitoring of the areas of high or potentially high traffic volumes identified by the County Council. Around 40-50 diffusion tubes should be adequate for this purpose, which would bring the annual cost of diffusion tube monitoring to approximately £4,500.

- Determination of suitable locations and sites for the diffusion tubes currently involves complicated approval by elected members. To allow maximum flexibility and responsiveness, officers should in future be given the discretion to set the criteria for selection of monitoring sites and to determine the precise number of diffusion tubes required.

- It will be important to ensure ongoing public accountability for the Council’s air quality monitoring and management arrangements, and this could best be achieved through routine reporting to the Customer and Partnerships Committee. The Committee should receive the draft of the annual Air Quality Progress Report as part of the public consultation, before it is submitted to Cabinet.

- The non-statutory and ad hoc reporting is unnecessary and does not represent value for money. The Council should contract with specialist air quality consultants to produce statutory reports only.

- In drawing up its recommendations, the Task Group considered a detailed analysis of the costs, risks and benefits of the different options for future monitoring available to the Council. This is available as a background paper to the review (see section 7).
6. COST IMPLICATIONS

The conclusions and recommendations of the task group would result in significant savings to the Council. An appraisal of the cost implications of the proposals is detailed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Air quality monitoring equipment or service</th>
<th>Current estimated cost per annum</th>
<th>Estimated cost if contract retendered</th>
<th>Estimated cost if automatic AQM cancelled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Monitoring Station (nitrogen dioxide and particulates)</td>
<td>£6,000</td>
<td>£4,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnkeys (5 units, approx. £2000 per unit)</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data handling (including non-statutory reports)</td>
<td>£8,000</td>
<td>£8,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Diffusion tubes</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional 30-35 tubes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>£26,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>£19,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>£4,500</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total saving</strong></td>
<td><strong>£7,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>£21,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>£0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* NB - all above figures exclude the cost of statutory reports/requirements*
7. BACKGROUND PAPERS

All of the agendas, reports and minutes relating to this review can be found online at [www.rugby.gov.uk](http://www.rugby.gov.uk), by following the links to the Committee Papers system and then clicking on ‘Air Quality Monitoring Network Task Group’.

References to the key supporting documents for the review are listed below:


## A Review of Rugby Borough Council’s Air Quality Monitoring Network – Draft Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions / Milestones</th>
<th>Managed by</th>
<th>Assigned to</th>
<th>Due date</th>
<th>Date complete</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The annual Progress Report be scrutinised by the Customer and Partnerships Committee</td>
<td>David Burrows</td>
<td>Debbie Dawson</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing (annual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milestone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit Air Quality Progress Report to Customer and Partnerships Committee as part of public consultation</td>
<td>David Burrows</td>
<td>Debbie Dawson</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing (annual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decommission the Air Quality Monitoring Station and Turnkeys when the current air quality monitoring contract ends</td>
<td>Sean Lawson</td>
<td>David Burrows</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce air quality reporting to reflect statutory requirements</td>
<td>Sean Lawson</td>
<td>David Burrows</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milestone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage air quality specialist contractor to undertake statutory reporting only</td>
<td>Sean Lawson</td>
<td>David Burrows</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand diffusion tube network (45-50 tubes)</td>
<td>Sean Lawson</td>
<td>David Burrows</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milestone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget of £4500 for expanded diffusion tube network proposed to Council in the 2012/13 budget-setting</td>
<td>Sean Lawson</td>
<td>David Burrows</td>
<td>February 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milestone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional diffusion tubes purchased as required</td>
<td>Sean Lawson</td>
<td>David Burrows</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers should set the criteria for selection of monitoring sites and determine the precise number of diffusion tubes required, within the budget set by Council.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is a recommendation regarding working practice and not suitable for monitoring in an action plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

Name of Meeting          Customer and Partnerships Committee
Date of Meeting         1 September 2011
Report Title            Review of Youth Provision – draft one page strategy
Ward Relevance          All
Contact Officer         Debbie Dawson, Tel: 01788 533592

Summary
A special meeting of the Committee is scheduled for Thursday 13 October to undertake a light touch review of youth provision in the borough. The Committee is asked to approve the one page strategy for the review, making any amendments considered necessary.

Financial Implications
The Committee should consider the potential resource implications of their programme of work, which will be funded from an overall budget of approximately £1000 in 2011/12. The costs of holding the special meeting at Lawrence Sheriff School will be taken from this budget and are detailed in the 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

A special meeting of the Committee is scheduled for Thursday 13 October to undertake a light touch review of youth provision in the borough. The Committee is asked to approve the one page strategy for the review, making any amendments considered necessary.

### 1. BACKGROUND

The Customer and Partnerships Committee originally planned to look at youth provision at this meeting. However, it was clear when making plans at the Committee meeting in June that it was unlikely that much progress would have been made at this stage in terms of the changing arrangements for youth services in the borough. The Committee therefore decided to hold a special meeting in the autumn looking specifically at youth provision in the borough and in particular the potential impact in the borough of Warwickshire County Council’s reduced budget for the youth service, and what plans are in place to ensure ongoing provision.

The Committee currently has in its work programme for February plans to scope an in-depth task group review of activity for young people. The Committee agreed in June that subsequent to the special meeting on youth provision, a decision would be taken as to whether there is value in undertaking this review into the activities available for young people.

### 2. ONE PAGE STRATEGY

A draft one page strategy for the review is appended. This has been drafted in consultation with the Chair of the Rugby Youth Consortium and has already been circulated to committee members in advance of the meeting.

The Committee is asked to approve the one page strategy, making any amendments considered necessary.

### 3. ARRANGEMENTS FOR SPECIAL MEETING

#### 3.1 Venue

It was agreed that a special meeting would be arranged to undertake this review and if possible this should be held outside of the Town Hall. The Committee has a practice of
holding at least one meeting each year outside of the Town Hall in order to try to encourage greater community interest.

The meeting will be held on 13 October 2011 in the Learning Resources Centre at Lawrence Sheriff School. The associated costs are detailed below, to be funded from the overview and scrutiny budget, which is managed by the OSMB. The Chairman and Vice Chairman of OSMB have given their approval for this expenditure.

| Hire of venue (for 4 hours, to include set up time etc) | £72.00 |
| Refreshments (at £1.25 per head net)                  | £43.75 |
| **Total cost**                                         | **£115.75** |

### 3.2 Meeting format

It is suggested that, where possible, the contributors are invited to make written submissions to the Committee in advance of the meeting, in order to maximise the time available on the evening. Key contributors would be then invited in turn to speak for up to 5 minutes at the start of the meeting, and after that the meeting would take the form of a round-table discussion. The discussion will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting, and time taken at the following meeting of the Committee to agree any conclusions and review recommendations.

It is also suggested that the Committee Chairman writes to the individual groups who work with young people in the borough and are members of the umbrella groups listed in the one page strategy, informing them about the meeting and inviting them to submit any comments to the Committee in advance, or via their umbrella body.
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Appendix 1

YOUTH PROVISION LIGHT TOUCH REVIEW
DRAFT ONE PAGE STRATEGY

What is the broad topic area?
Youth provision

What is the specific topic area?
To consider the potential impact in the borough of reduced budgets for youth services, and what plans are in place to ensure ongoing provision.

To consider the change in service model from universal services to early intervention services, and how the universal service will be delivered in the future.

What is the ambition of the review?
The best possible use is made of the combined resources of all those involved in providing youth services and activities for young people in the borough to ensure that a comprehensive service is maintained which meets the needs of all young people.

How well do we perform at the moment?
The meeting will aim to establish:

- What is the latest position with regard to the proposals in the ‘Facing the Challenge – Youth Services’ consultation by Warwickshire County Council and what are the implications of the policy shift towards more targeted services with an early intervention model?
- How are partners are working together to respond to the financial challenges?
- What is the strategic role of the Youth Consortium in response to these challenges?
- How will co-ordination and assessment of youth services be delivered in the future?
- What is being done to map youth provision in the borough, and how is this information being used?
- What is the role of Positive Futures and what are the future plans for this service?
- Are there any known gaps in provision and needs that are not being met under the proposed new arrangements?
- What capacity does the wider voluntary and community sector have to fill any gaps in services?
- What role are young people playing in informing decisions and shaping future youth provision in the borough?
- How will future youth provision relate to the borough’s Regeneration Strategy priorities?
- What is the role of the Community Centres in youth provision and how will this relate to future service level agreements?

Who shall we consult about the current service and about how we can improve it?
Warwickshire County Council (Steve Bell)
Children and Young People’s Theme Group of Rugby LSP (Mark Gore)
Rugby Youth Consortium (Martin Green)
RBC Sports and Recreation (Kevin Brookes)
Rugby Youth Council
Warwickshire Community and Voluntary Action
The Bradby Club (Rex Pogson)
YMCA
Warwickshire Association of Youth Clubs
Warwickshire Children and Voluntary Youth Services

What other help do we need?
Involve relevant Cabinet portfolio holders from the Borough and County Council

How long should it take?
Light touch review – one special meeting (13 October 2011, to be held in the Learning Resources Centre, Lawrence Sheriff School)

What will be the outcome?
The meeting will provide an opportunity for interested parties to come together to discuss these issues and highlight any concerns about potential gaps in youth provision. The Committee may make recommendations as to how partners could address these gaps and ensure best use is made of combined resources.

The issue is wide-ranging and it will not be possible to address all aspects fully at this meeting. It is likely the Committee will wish to return to this topic at a future date. Following this meeting, the Committee will decide whether there is value in undertaking a detailed review of activities for young people at this time.
AGENDA MANAGEMENT SHEET

**Name of Meeting**  
Customer and Partnerships Committee

**Date of Meeting**  
1 September 2011

**Report Title**  
Committee Work Programme

**Ward Relevance**  
None

**Contact Officer**  
Debbie Dawson, Tel: 01788 533592

**Summary**  
The report updates the Committee on the progress of task group reviews within its remit and details the Committee's forward work programme. The Committee's work programme is attached at appendix 1.

**Financial Implications**  
There is a budget of £1,000 available to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board in 2011/12 to spend on the delivery of the overview and scrutiny work programme. Where known, the potential costs of items in this committee’s work programme are identified in the 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.
Public Report to the Customer and Partnerships Committee

1 September 2011

Committee Work Programme

Summary

The report updates the Committee on the progress of task group reviews within its remit and details the Committee's forward work programme. The Committee's work programme is attached at appendix 1.

1. PROGRESS ON SCRUTINY REVIEWS

1.1 Air Quality Monitoring Network

This review is now completed and is reporting to this meeting as a separate agenda item.

1.2 Planning for Play

The members are:

Councillors Noreen New, Peter Butlin (Chairman), Robin Hazelton, Kathryn Lawrence, Graham Francis, Ramesh Srivastava, Maggie O'Rourke

The first meeting of the task group took place on 4 July and a site visit was held on 25 July. The meeting on 15 August discussed play provision with the developer of the Gateway Site. The group identified the need to consult on play provision at outline planning stage in housing developments. The next meeting, to be held on 21 September 2011, will receive a presentation by the Green Spaces Officer on the allocation of play provision in housing developments and will also consider the outcome of user consultations held during the summer holidays.

Following staffing changes within the Community Sports and Recreation Team, it is now anticipated that the review will be completed by January 2012.

1.3 Housing stock and housing need

The one page strategy for this review was agreed by Committee on 23 June, with amendment. Additional members were appointed to the task group at that meeting and the membership is now as follows:

Councillors Andy Coles, David Cranham, Claire Edwards, Graham Francis, Tony Gillias, Tom Mahoney, Carolyn Robbins, Jerry Roodhouse, Ramesh Srivastava, Claire Watson (Chairman)
The first meeting of the task group was held on 12 July to set the scene and clarify the remit of the review. The next meeting will be held on 30 August and will discuss “what fair looks like” in the designation of housing. The task group aims to report to the Committee by April 2012.

2. PLANNING FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

The Committee will be holding a special meeting on youth provision in the borough on 13 October 2011, and this is detailed as a separate item on the meeting agenda.

The items included in the work programme for the Committee’s meeting on 3 November 2011 are detailed in the future work programme at appendix 1. Further explanations are given below.

2.1 Biodiversity Strategy

When the review of the Management of Biodiversity in Open Spaces reported to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board in January 2011 the Board asked this Committee to review progress against the action plan and to look at the revised Biodiversity Strategy when it is completed in October.

2.2 Energy/warmth plans/seasonal deaths

This topic was one of the review proposals considered at the overview and scrutiny work programme workshop in February 2011, and was included in the work programme for 2011/12 by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board as a light-touch review.

A draft one page strategy for this review is attached at appendix 2 for consideration by the Committee.

3. CONCLUSION

The Committee is asked to:

- note the progress in the active scrutiny reviews
- approve the forward work programme for the Committee (appendix 1)
- approve the one page strategy for the light touch review of seasonal deaths and affordable warmth plans (appendix 2).
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### Customer and Partnerships Committee – Work Programme

1 September 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Who to involve</th>
<th>Budget considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft Revised Air Quality Action Plan</td>
<td>Update on progress on the draft revised Air Quality Action Plan from the officer Air Quality Management Area Steering Group</td>
<td>Regulatory Services Manager</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Monitoring Network Review</td>
<td>Report of the Task Group (to be submitted to Cabinet in October 2011)</td>
<td>Task Group Chairman</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for Play Review</td>
<td>Interim feedback on the work of the Task Group</td>
<td>Task Group Chairman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy/warmth plans/seasonal deaths light touch review</td>
<td>Scope review</td>
<td>Karen Weber, RBC Sustainability Officer Warwickshire County Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Special meeting, 13 October 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Who to involve</th>
<th>Budget considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Provision</td>
<td>To consider the potential impact in the borough of reduced budgets for the youth service, and what plans are in place to ensure ongoing provision.</td>
<td>Youth Consortium Children and Young People’s Theme Group Lead Officer Rugby Youth Council RBC Community Sports and Recreation WCAVA</td>
<td>£115.75 for hire of external venue and refreshments, to be funded form the overview and scrutiny budget managed by OSMB.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3 November 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Who to involve</th>
<th>Budget considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity Strategy</td>
<td>Receive revised Biodiversity Strategy and review progress against recommendations from the scrutiny review of Biodiversity</td>
<td>Review Chairman, Cllr Ms Lawrence Head of Environmental Services</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy/warmth plans/seasonal deaths</td>
<td>Light touch review</td>
<td>Karen Weber, Sustainability Officer, RBC Warwickshire County Council (Public Health) Act on Energy Warwickshire Affordable Warmth Steering Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth provision review – recommendations</td>
<td>To consider the outcomes of the special meeting and agree any recommendations arising from the review</td>
<td>Special meeting attendees Scrutiny officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2 February 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Who to involve</th>
<th>Budget considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning for Play Review</td>
<td>Report of the Task Group</td>
<td>Task Group Chairman, Cllr Peter Butlin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Well-being Update</td>
<td>An update on developments in relation to health and well-being in the borough, including organisational changes and action taken to address priorities identified by the Healthier Communities and Older People Group of the LSP</td>
<td>Cllr Claire Watson (Health and Older People’s Champion) Rugby GP Consortium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Neighbourhood Councils</td>
<td>Reconsider deferred review. (One page strategy agreed 14 April 2011)</td>
<td>WCC Rugby Area Manager Sustainable Inclusive Communities Portfolio Holder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity for Young People Review</td>
<td>Scope in-depth review (nb Committee to decide whether to pursue this review after the special meeting on 13 October)</td>
<td>Rugby Youth Council Positive Futures team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 12 April 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Who to involve</th>
<th>Budget considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Stock and Housing Need Review</td>
<td>Report of the Task Group</td>
<td>Task Group Chairman, Cllr Claire Watson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13 Committee Work Programme</td>
<td>To consider recommendations from OSMB regarding the draft work programme for the coming year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Customer and Partnerships Committee – Programme of Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review title</th>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Expected report date</th>
<th>Budget considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Misuse</td>
<td>Proposed as a joint review with the County Council. The County Council has included it in their work programme, however, the WCC Overview and Scrutiny Board decided in November 2010 to defer the review pending further discussion with the District and Borough Councils over the scope of the review and to allow a review being carried out by the Drug and Alcohol Management Group (DAMG) to explore the current position in the county and identify how licensing activity can be better co-ordinated across the County, to be completed.</td>
<td>Not yet determined</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Action Plan</td>
<td>Draft Revised Air Quality Action Plan</td>
<td>Officers to update the Committee at this meeting</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Monitoring Network</td>
<td>June 2011</td>
<td>Review completed and reporting to this meeting</td>
<td>September 2011</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for Play</td>
<td>June / July 2011</td>
<td>Membership agreed, one page strategy prepared, meetings held 4 and 25 July and 15 August. Next meeting planned 21 September.</td>
<td>January 2012</td>
<td>To be based on review of literature, therefore no costs anticipated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching housing stock to housing need</td>
<td>July 2011</td>
<td>Review scope and membership agreed by Committee 23 June 2011. First meeting took place 12 July and a further meeting is planned for 30 August.</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
<td>None as yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review title</td>
<td>Start date</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Expected report date</td>
<td>Budget considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Councils</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>One page strategy agreed by the committee on 14 April 2011, but the review was deferred pending the outcome of the Localism Bill later in the year and the implementation of Warwickshire County Council proposals for new arrangements for locality working. WCC to reconsider proposals at full Council in December 2011</td>
<td>Not yet known</td>
<td>Not yet known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity for young people</td>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>OSMB decided that as the impact of the recent budget reductions by the County Council and their effects would not become clear for some time, this review should be carried out later in the year. The Committee agreed to take a decision to be taken on whether to pursue this review subsequent the special meeting on 13 October</td>
<td>Not yet known</td>
<td>Not yet known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inward Investment</td>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>OSMB decided on 21 March 2011 that, on the recommendation of the overview and scrutiny work programme workshop, this review should be deferred to 2012/13 pending clarification of Local Enterprise Partnership responsibilities and mode of operation</td>
<td>Not yet known</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIGHT TOUCH REVIEW OF SEASONAL DEATHS
AND AFFORDABLE WARMTH PLANS

DRAFT ONE PAGE STRATEGY

What is the broad topic area?
Affordable warmth plans / seasonal deaths / energy efficiency in homes

What is the specific topic area?
What is the latest position regarding seasonal deaths in Rugby and what actions have been
taken to make energy more affordable for those living in fuel poverty and the vulnerable?

What is the ambition of the review?
The numbers of people experiencing fuel poverty in the borough are reduced and everyone
living in fuel poverty is given access to support to reduce energy costs by improving energy
efficiency in their homes and increasing household income.

How well do we perform at the moment?
A joint review of excess winter deaths was carried out by Warwickshire County Council,
Coventry City Council and Solihull MBC in 2009, with involvement also from Cllr Claire
Watson from this Council. A county-wide steering group, consisting of representatives from
all the local authorities, NHS Warwickshire, Warwickshire Fire Service, Act on Energy and
Energy Saving Trust Hestia, has been established to take forward the recommendations from
this review. The purpose of this review is to update the Committee on the latest position and
consider what action is and could be taken in Rugby.

The meeting will aim to establish:
- What action has been taken at the county level to tackle fuel poverty following the joint
  review on excess winter deaths?
- What progress is being made, with partners, in the delivery of the Affordable Warmth
  Strategy for Rugby Borough 2009 – 2012?
- How will this work be taken forward once the strategy expires?
- What specific action is being taken to reduce fuel poverty locally, and what has been the
  impact of this?
- What do we know, statistically, about patterns in energy costs and winter weather, and
  has there been any shift in policy locally and nationally to reflect the apparently more
  severe winters and rising energy costs?
- Has there been any change in the pattern of excess winter deaths in Rugby in recent
  years?
- How is the Council’s Housing Service addressing affordable warmth?

Who shall we consult about the current service and about how we can improve it?
Karen Weber, Sustainability Officer, Rugby Borough Council
John Hier, Housing and Regeneration Manager, RBC
Tim Margerison, Corporate Property and Building Control Manager, RBC
Bill Campbell, Chair of Warwickshire Affordable Warmth Steering Group
Rachel Jones, Partnership Manager, Act on Energy
Jo Barnes, Project Officer, Act on Energy
Warwickshire County Council Public Health
Rugby Affordable Warmth Action Group
What other help do we need?
Information on RBC’s Affordable Warmth Strategy and progress in delivering it
Latest figures on excess winter deaths in Rugby (2011 Health Profile), including comparative and trend data
Full report on data collected for NI187 (fuel poverty) 2010-11
Legislative background and national policy context regarding fuel poverty

How long should it take?
Light touch review – one meeting (3 November 2011)

What will be the outcome?
An understanding of what progress has been made towards the reduction of fuel poverty in Rugby and identification of any aspects that would benefit from further detailed scrutiny.