

Policy Committee

Wednesday, 04 June 2014 at 10:30

County Hall, County Hall, West Bridgford, Nottingham, NG2 7QP

AGENDA

- 1 Appointment of Chair and Vice-Chair
To note the appointment by the County Council on 15 May 2014 of Councillor Alan Rhodes as Chair of the Policy Committee and Councillor Joyce Bosnjak as Vice-Chair
- 2 To note the membership of the Committee.
- 3 Minutes of last meeting held on 7 May 2014 3 - 8
- 4 Apologies for Absence
- 5 Declarations of Interests by Members and Officers:- (see note below)
(a) Disclosable Pecuniary Interests
(b) Private Interests (pecuniary and non-pecuniary)
- 6 Better Broadband for Nottinghamshire 9 - 14
Superfast Extension Application Programme and Resource Implications
- 7 Consultation Response 15 - 34
Proposal to Amend Legislation Relating to Combined Authorities and Economic Prosperity Boards
- 8 Revision of Safeguarding Adults Procedures and Guidance 35 - 38
- 9 Policies for Safety at Sports Grounds 39 - 48
- 10 County Council Civic Service 20 July 2014 49 - 50
- 11 Rural Services Network - Proposed Membership 51 - 52

Notes

- (1) Councillors are advised to contact their Research Officer for details of any Group Meetings which are planned for this meeting.
- (2) Members of the public wishing to inspect "Background Papers" referred to in the reports on the agenda or Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act should contact:-

Customer Services Centre 0300 500 80 80

- (3) Persons making a declaration of interest should have regard to the Code of Conduct and the Council's Procedure Rules. Those declaring must indicate the nature of their interest and the reasons for the declaration.

Councillors or Officers requiring clarification on whether to make a declaration of interest are invited to contact Paul Davies (Tel. 0115 977 3299) or a colleague in Democratic Services prior to the meeting.

- (4) Councillors are reminded that Committee and Sub-Committee papers, with the exception of those which contain Exempt or Confidential Information, may be recycled.
- (5) This agenda and its associated reports are available to view online via an online calendar - <http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/dms/Meetings.aspx>



Meeting POLICY COMMITTEE

Date Wednesday, 7 May 2014 at 10:30am

membership

Persons absent are marked with `A`

COUNCILLORS

Alan Rhodes (Chairman)
Joyce Bosnjak (Vice-Chairman)

Reg Adair
Jim Creamer
Kay Cutts MBE
Kevin Greaves
Glynn Gilfoyle
Stan Heptinstall MBE
Richard Jackson
David Kirkham
John Knight

Diana Meale
Philip Owen
John Peck JP
Ken Rigby
Gail Turner
Stuart Wallace
Muriel Weisz
Liz Yates

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE

Councillor Roy Allan
Councillor Nicki Brooks
Councillor Kate Foale
Councillor Alice Grice

Councillor Sheila Place
Councillor Liz Plant
Councillor John Wilkinson

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE

Mick Burrows	Chief Executive
Carl Bilbey	Policy, Planning and Corporate Services
Paul Davies	Policy, Planning and Corporate Services
Jayne Francis-Ward	Policy, Planning and Corporate Services
Matthew Garrard	Policy, Planning and Corporate Services
Tim Gregory	Environment and Resources
Anthony May	Children, Families and Cultural Services
Paula Mullin	Policy, Planning and Corporate Services
Ivor Nicholson	Environment and Resources
Anna Vincent	Policy, Planning and Corporate Services

Michelle Welsh Policy, Planning and Corporate Services
Clare Yau Policy, Planning and Corporate Services

TEMPORARY MEMBERSHIP CHANGES

The following changes to the membership were reported:-

Councillor Ken Rigby replaced Councillor Jason Zadrozny for this meeting only.
Councillor Liz Yates replaced Councillor Martin Suthers for this meeting only.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the last meeting held on 2 April 2014 having been previously circulated were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

None

REDEFINING YOUR COUNCIL – A FRAMEWORK TRANSFORMATION

RESOLVED 2014/025

- (1) That the draft “Redefining Your Council” report be approved for consultation.
- (2) That Policy Committee review the draft “Redefining Your Council” report at its meeting on 2 July 2014.
- (3) That approval be given to the adoption of the portfolio, programme and project management approach and commencement of targeted reviews outlined in section four of “Redefining Your Council”.
- (4) That the Chief Executive be requested to consider how the organisational structure of the Council aligns with the approach set out in “Redefining Your Council”, and to make recommendations for change in the autumn.

ICT STRATEGY 2014-17

RESOLVED 2014/026

That the ICT Strategy 2014-17 be approved.

CHILDREN MISSING EDUCATION STRATEGY

RESOLVED 2014/027

- (1) That the proposed Children Missing Education Strategy be approved.
- (2) That six-monthly updates on progress with the action plan be reported to Children and Young People's Committee.

UNDER-16 HOME TO SCHOOL TRANSPORT POLICY 2014 AND POST-16 TRANSPORT POLICY 2014/15

A motion was moved and seconded in terms of Resolution 2014/028 below. After a show of hands the Chairman indicated that the motion was carried.

A recorded vote was requested and it was ascertained that the following 10 Members voted for the motion:-

Joyce Bosnjak
Jim Creamer
Glynn Gilfoyle
Kevin Greaves
David Kirkham

John Knight
Diana Meale
John Peck
Alan Rhodes
Muriel Weisz

The following 9 Members voted against the motion:-

Reg Adair
Kay Cutts
Stan Heptinstall
Richard Jackson
Philip Owen

Ken Rigby
Gail Turner
Stuart Wallace
Liz Yates

RESOLVED 2014/028

- (1) That the revised Under-16 Home to School Transport Policy 2014 be approved.
- (2) That the revised Post-16 Transport Policy 2014/15 be approved.

REVISED ASSISTANCE WITH MEDICATION POLICY

RESOLVED 2014/029

That approval be given to the Assistance with Medication Policy for Short Term Assessment and Re-ablement Team (START) Re-ablement Support Workers Operating in a Service User's Home.

COUNCILLORS' DIVISION FUND – REVISED POLICY AND GUIDANCE

During discussion, it was suggested that the selection of applications to be audited be carried out as part of the quarterly report to Finance and Property Committee. It was agreed to amend the revised Policy and Guidance to reflect this.

A motion was moved and seconded in terms of Resolution 2014/030 below. After a show of hands the Chairman indicated that the motion was carried.

A recorded vote was requested and it was ascertained that the following 10 Members voted for the motion:-

Joyce Bosnjak
Jim Creamer
Glynn Gilfoyle
Kevin Greaves
David Kirkham

John Knight
Diana Meale
John Peck
Alan Rhodes
Muriel Weisz

The following 8 Members voted against the motion:-

Reg Adair
Kay Cutts
Richard Jackson
Philip Owen
Ken Rigby

Gail Turner
Stuart Wallace
Liz Yates

Councillor Stan Heptinstall abstained from voting.

The Chairman declared the motion carried, and it was

RESOLVED 2014/030

That the revised Policy and Guidance for the Councillors' Divisional Fund be approved and implemented with immediate effect, subject to section 4(f) being amended so that the selection of applications to be audited be carried out as part of the quarterly report to Finance and Property Committee.

UPDATE ON NEW ARRANGEMENTS FOR TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

RESOLVED 2014/031

- (1) That the overall positive percentage of feedback received by The Language Shop to date be noted.

- (2) That in view of the positive performance to date, approval in principle be given to an extension of the initial contract for a further 12 months (commencing in November 2014) subject to ongoing satisfactory performance.

MENTAL HEALTH CHALLENGE

RESOLVED 2014/032

- (1) That approval be given to signing the pledges set out under the Mental Health Challenge.
- (2) That Councillor Joyce Bosnjak be appointed member champion for the Mental Health Challenge,
- (3) That reports on the progress of and activities undertaken as part of the Mental Health Challenge be reported to the Health and Wellbeing Board on an annual basis.

FIRST WORLD WAR CENTENARY COMMEMORATIONS 2014-18 COMMUNITY FUND

RESOLVED 2014/033

That a World War One Community Fund of £10,000 per year be established as the County Council's contribution to World War One commemorations.

WORK PROGRAMME

RESOLVED 2014/034

That the Committee's work programme be noted.

The meeting closed at 1.00 pm.

CHAIRMAN

REPORT OF CHAIR OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

BETTER BROADBAND FOR NOTTINGHAMSHIRE SUPERFAST EXTENSION PROGRAMME

Purpose of the Report

1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval for the submission of a formal application to the Government for Superfast Extension Programme resources.

Information and Advice

Better Broadband for Nottinghamshire programme (BBfN)

2. Previous reports to Economic Development Committee, Policy Committee and Full Council have updated Members on the progress of the Better Broadband for Nottinghamshire programme (BBfN). The BBfN programme has now entered the delivery phase of activities and the phase one exchange locations were duly announced at 1 April 2014 Economic Development Committee meeting. Further information relating to fibre-enabled areas will be made available to all Members shortly, as agreed at Full Council on 15th May.

BDUK SUPERFAST EXTENSION PROGRAMME (SEP)

Overview

3. As reported to 11 March 2014 Economic Development Committee, in the 2013 Autumn Statement the Chancellor announced that an additional £250 million would be allocated by the Government towards initiatives that support the delivery of superfast broadband to over 95% of premises in the UK – clearly as an average, some locations will secure more, some less than the 95% national target. The Government's 2017 targets, as set out in *Investing in Britain's Future* (June 2013) are that every premise should be able to access broadband at speeds of at least 2 Mbps and that superfast broadband (defined as providing more than 24 Mbps) should be available to 95% of premises in each local authority area. This extends the reach of fibre-based broadband access across the UK from the 90% that will be delivered through the existing Broadband Delivery UK (BDUK) programme.
4. The Government has called the new fund the 'Superfast Extension Programme' (SEP). It will be managed through BDUK along similar lines to the existing programme.

Principles for funding allocations and objectives

5. On 25 February 2014, the Government announced county level allocations of the SEP. Nottinghamshire's funding allocation of £2.63 million [£1.83m/£0.8m respectively to the county/city] is essentially BDUK's best assessment (given the margin for error and the many uncertainties surrounding modelled data) of what is required to secure the government's national objective. The Nottingham City allocation was modelled to raise superfast coverage from 96.0% to 98.8% and for Nottinghamshire County from 94.3% to 96.8%, which would mean a total for the partnership from 94.8% to 97.3%.
6. Members' attention is drawn to the fact that the submission of a formal application to the Government for Superfast Extension Programme resources also requires the County Council to be able to evidence that match funding commitments are in place. The Government will match local resources on a £ for £ basis. Therefore, if a commitment to the full £2.63 million cannot be secured, the amount of Government funding available will decrease accordingly.
7. Every effort is currently being made to secure the full match funding allocation through the D2N2 Local Economic Partnership (LEP) Local Growth Deal and future European funding allocations to the area.
8. However, an under-write is required for the submission of the application by the 30th June deadline. Any under-write will recognise that should Nottingham City Council wish to proceed, it will need to under-write the £800,000 match required for the Nottingham City Council area.
9. The remaining £1.83 million will need to be under-written by the County Council and its Borough and District Council partners. The apportionment of this under-write cannot be considered at this stage as the extent of investment required in each Borough/District Council area is not known. The County Council will shortly be conducting a second 'Open Market Review' which will provide up-to-date and accurate figures in terms of the extent and scope of the Superfast Extension Programme.
10. The Open Market Review (OMR) requests information from telecoms providers on their commercial roll-out plans over the next three years and analyses this against likely broadband speed outcomes by postcode. This second OMR will include investment planned through the existing Better Broadband for Nottinghamshire programme (BBfN) and will therefore provide a detailed picture of where the Superfast Extension investment is required. Crucially, this time around the OMR will capture all known premises whose postcodes are attributed to a commercially funded street cabinet but are a very long way from their cabinet rendering speed uplifts negligible at best and non-existent at worst.
11. As indicated to in paragraph 9, a separate discussion between Nottinghamshire County Council and all of the Borough and District Councils will be convened once the outcomes of the OMR are known. This will inform the individual levels of under-write required.
12. This could mark the second major wave of the BBfN programme and complements the more innovative solutions to maximise commercial investment. In terms of how BDUK funding is utilised, it is essentially a matter for the BBfN Programme Delivery Board to determine. Essentially we are free to use the funding as we see fit in pursuit of the national target. The

Programme Delivery Board will need to manage the tensions and trade-offs this may entail, including managing how we might utilise match funding contributions from partners should the submission for the full match funding made to the D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership be unsuccessful.

13. Notwithstanding any national target, BDUK would of course expect the Better Broadband for Nottinghamshire Programme to seek to maximise coverage and value for money through normal contract management.

The SEP challenge - Expected coverage outcomes

14. It is estimated that approximately 21,400 premises will not be able to obtain a service or connection capable of delivering superfast broadband access line speeds of 24 Mbps by the end of current activities (commercial and rural intervention). These will be the target premises for the new investment.

Procurement Approaches

15. There are three commercial and procurement options available to Nottinghamshire Council using the available funding:

- **Option 1:** Change control of the existing contract
- **Option 2:** New mini-competition for a Call Off Contract using the BDUK Broadband Framework contract
- **Option 3:** New open (OJEU) procurement supported by BDUK guidance and procurement materials - either a standalone procurement or establishing a local framework

16. Having sought legal advice, it is proposed that **Option 1 - Change control of the existing contract** will offer the quickest and lowest administration cost to extend coverage outcomes and will ensure maximum likelihood of outcomes remaining compliant with the UK's State aid National Broadband Scheme. The change control route will be subject to materiality limits and timeframes but importantly would ensure that the private sector supplier investment ratio of 31% to the combined public investment of 69% is maintained as illustrated in *Table 1*.

Table 1: Illustrative Superfast Extension Programme (SEP) Funding Table

Funding Partner	Amount	Investment ratio
BDUK	£2.63m	69%
Local Funding (i.e. D2N2 Local Growth Fund)	£2.63m	
Supplier	£2.36m	31%
SEP TOTAL	£7.62m	100%

Funding approval process

17. The approval process for allocating funding to projects is based on the following approach:

- **Stage 1 [25 February 2014]: Announcement of funding allocation**
Where BDUK confirmed the indicative funding allocation for each Local Body
- **Stage 2 [25 March 2014]: Expression of Interest (EOI)**

- Submission of an EOI to give BDUK an indication of the likely take-up of the funding and to provide a high level summary of the expected coverage outcome and funding. No further formal approval is necessary for projects to progress to the next stage of submitting a bid for funding.

- **Stage 3 [30 June 2014]: Formal request for funding: Addendum to Local Broadband Plan**

Confirm details for the scope of the project, the funding and the delivery route.

Note: as the County Council also has a Local Broadband Plan (LBP) all that is required would be to complete the Funding Request - effectively an addendum to the LBP.

18. The 11 March 2014 Economic Development Committee approved the submission of a non-committal Expression of Interest (EOI) to the Superfast Extension Programme for Nottinghamshire. The County Council has since been invited to submit a full application by 30 June 2014.

19. At its meeting on 16 May 2014 the City of Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Economic Prosperity Committee, which consists of the Leaders and Chief Executives of all Nottinghamshire local authorities, agreed to:

- continue to lobby D2N2 LEP to secure match funding resources through the Local Growth Deal;
- continue to explore alternative sources of funding and return to the Economic Prosperity Committee's next meeting on 20th June with a more detailed assessment of likely funding sources and risks in terms of any under-write

20. The County Council is currently at 'Stage 3' i.e. the final element of the approval process. It should be noted that submission of a funding application by the 30th June deadline will not form a binding commitment in terms of match funding or under-writing. A binding commitment would only be enacted at the point where a new contract with BT and BDUK is signed.

Other Options Considered

21. Do nothing: This option was discounted as Nottinghamshire would not benefit from an additional £4.19m of match funds to extend the reach of fibre-based broadband i.e. Government's £1.83m grant and the private sector supplier making a similar commitment in line with the existing investment ratio expected to be in the region of £2.36m.

Reasons for Recommendations

22. The reasons for recommendations are to enable the submission of an application to the Government's Superfast Extension Programme by the deadline of 30th June.

Statutory and Policy Implications

23. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of crime and disorder, finance, human resources, human rights, the NHS Constitution (Public Health only), the public sector equality duty, safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults, service

users, sustainability and the environment and ways of working and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

Financial Implications

24. There will be financial implications as outlined in the body of this report associated with the mandatory capital match funding for the government's Superfast Extension Programme (SEP).

RECOMMENDATIONS

25. It is recommended that Committee:

- a. approve the submission of a formal application to the Government for Superfast Extension Programme resources.

Report of the Chairman of the Economic Development Committee Councillor Diana Meale

**For any enquiries about this report please contact:
Nicola M^cCoy-Brown, Broadband Programme Manager, Economic Development
Ext 72580**

Constitutional Comments (NAB 16.05.14)

26. Policy Committee has authority to approve the recommendations set out in this report by virtue of its terms of reference.

Financial Comments (SEM 21/05/14)

27. The financial implications are set out in the report.

Background Papers and Published Documents

- Nottinghamshire Local Broadband Plan (www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/broadband)
- Nottinghamshire Local Broadband Plan – report to Full Council, 15-12-2011
- Update on Nottinghamshire Local Broadband Plan – report to Policy Committee, 20-06-2012
- Response to Petitions presented to Economic Development Committee – report to Economic Development Committee, 20-09-2012
- Nottinghamshire Local Broadband Plan – report to Full Council, 28-02-2013
- ERDF Funding Agreement, 14-05-2013
- Investing in Britain's future – Presented to Parliament by the Chief Secretary to the Treasury by Command of Her Majesty, 6-2013
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/209279/PU15_24_IUK_new_template.pdf

- Superfast Broadband for Nottinghamshire – report to Policy Committee 17-07-2013
- Superfast Broadband for Nottinghamshire – report to Economic Development Committee 09-07-2013
- Better Broadband for Nottinghamshire – Resource Requirements for Delivery Phase – report to Economic Development Committee, 12-12-2013
- Better Broadband for Nottinghamshire – report to Economic Development Committee 14-01-2014
- Superfast Extension Programme indicative funding allocation letter – BDUK on behalf of the Department for Culture Media and Sports, 25-2-2014
- Better Broadband for Nottinghamshire – Superfast Extension Programme – report To Economic Development Committee, 11-03-2014
- Better Broadband for Nottinghamshire – Phase One – report to Economic Development Committee, 1-4-2014

Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected

- All

REPORT OF THE LEADER**CONSULTATION RESPONSE: PROPOSAL TO AMEND LEGISLATION
RELATING TO COMBINED AUTHORITIES AND ECONOMIC PROSPERITY
BOARDS****Purpose of the Report**

1. To seek approval to authorise the Corporate Director, Policy, Planning and Corporate Services in consultation with the Leader to submit a formal response to a Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) consultation on proposed amendments to the legislation on combined authorities and economic prosperity boards (EPBs).

Information and advice

2. On 30th April 2014 the Department for Communities and Local Government issued a consultation on proposals that the department is putting forward in relation to the legislation surrounding the establishment and operation of combined authorities and economic prosperity boards. The deadline for responses is 24th June 2014.
3. Combined authorities are formal and legally separate partnerships of local authorities. They are created in areas where they are considered likely to improve outcomes and impacts in relation to transport, economic development and regeneration. Combined authorities are created voluntarily and allow a group of local authorities to pool appropriate responsibility and resources and receive certain delegated functions from central government in order to deliver transport and economic policy more effectively over a wider area. For transport purposes combined authorities are able to borrow money and can levy constituent authorities.
4. Economic prosperity boards (EPBs) are similar in status and role to combined authorities, but without having the responsibilities for transport functions. Both combined authorities and EPBs have the power to exercise any function of their constituent councils that relates to economic development and regeneration.
5. Legislation relating to combined authorities and EPBs was introduced in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009. This is still the current legislation, and it contains technical parameters for the establishment of combined authorities and EPBs as follows:

- They must consist of two or more contiguous English local government areas;
 - Their creation is voluntary and all local authorities within the area must give their consent before they can be created;
 - It is not possible for only part of a county council area to become part of a combined authority or EPB;
 - A local authority may only belong to one combined authority / EPB
6. The amendments proposed to the 2009 legislation aim to address some of the geographical and structural anomalies that have been created since the introduction of the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) in 2011, some of which have overlapping areas. This is particularly pertinent in Nottinghamshire, where Bassetlaw District is part of both the D2N2 LEP and the Sheffield City Region LEP. The Sheffield City Region Combined Authority order was signed by the Secretary of State on 1st April 2014 but in its current form it does not cover Bassetlaw.
7. A copy of the consultation document is appended to this report (appendix 1). The consultation focuses on amendments to five areas of the existing legislation:
1. To allow councils with non-contiguous boundaries to join or form combined authorities or EPBs;
 2. To allow county councils to become part of a combined authority or EPB with respect to part of its area, that area being the same area as that of those district councils that wish to join or form an EPB or combined authority;
 3. To allow combined authorities and EPBs to exercise their functions on a patchwork basis across their area;
 4. To simplify the process for amending the functions, changing the boundaries of dissolving a combined authority or EPB;
 5. To require combined authorities and EPBs to have one or more overview and scrutiny committees constituted with a membership reflecting the political balance of the councils concerned

The proposed response from Nottinghamshire County Council

8. The deadline for responses to this consultation is 24th June. Work is ongoing with partner organisations and DCLG to understand some of the complexities of the proposed changes. It is proposed that the final response from the County Council will be approved by the Corporate Director, Policy, Planning and Corporate Services in consultation with the Chair of the Economic Development Committee.
9. We recognise that the current legislation created some restrictions to the development of combined authorities and EPBs which may be perceived as unhelpful, however the following points require more consideration before those restrictions are removed or relaxed:

- A failure of the consultation proposals to adequately reflect the full nature of two-tier local authority areas, of joint working and established relationships across these areas;
- The proposals around enabling non-contiguous areas to join combined authorities or EPBs appear to be at odds with the generally accepted notion and evidence base around what constitutes a single functional economic area;
- Functional economic areas are generally ill-defined but cannot necessarily be based on the consultation's stated lowest level of building block of a whole district

10. Clarification may also be sought on the following specific considerations:

- As noted in paragraph six above, governance arrangements in Nottinghamshire (and Derbyshire) are complicated by the 'overlap' of the D2N2 and Sheffield City Region Local Enterprise Partnerships. As it stands, the proposed changes to the legislation do not appear to resolve this issue and this could compromise future governance arrangements in Nottinghamshire;
- County councils that may consider their boundaries to be broadly consistent with functional economic areas could potentially lose the integrity and critical mass of their services. The proposals appear to enable district councils to join combined authorities or EPBs as constituent members, even without the participation of their county council;
- In a two-tier context the highways and transport operations are generally clear; they are the responsibility of the County Council. However, as non-statutory, discretionary functions, both the District and County Councils may operate economic development services. In this context, the impact of one authority (but not the other) deciding to join a combined authority or EPB requires clarification;
- In such a scenario, it is not clear how economic development delivered by county councils across their entire area would be affected, as the consultation suggests that transport related matters could be handled separately (see below) but that the combined authority or EPB would '*take over functions relating to economic development and regeneration which are held at a district level*'. The functional role and remit of a combined authority or EPB in this regard could usefully be made more explicit, recognising that there are varied models of delivery across two-tier areas;
- The proposed simplifications to the process for amending existing combined authority or EPB schemes might generally be welcomed, should the issues raised above about establishing them in the first place be effectively addressed and that any proposals for amending existing combined authorities or EPBs be the subject of guidance reinforcing the principle of securing consensus and limiting the numbers of changes within a County Council area to prevent over-fragmentation to a very small level;
- In terms of overview and scrutiny, Nottinghamshire County Council recognises its importance in terms of public accountability and democratic legitimacy. However as an authority that runs a Committee-

based governance system, this particular issue may carry less significance for the County Council. Related, the final response may also consider the implications from a democratic perspective should some aspects of the Council's services potentially be managed through a number of combined authorities or EPBs operating over the Council's area.

11. In addition to this Committee's consideration of the above, the consultation requires a further detailed review in the context of the established Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Economic Prosperity Committee, developments within the D2N2 and Sheffield City Region LEPs and how the outcome of the consultation may impact on the integrity of services delivered by the County Council. These will feature in the response, the final version of which will be shared with Policy Committee members upon its submission on 24th June.

Reason(s) for Recommendations

12. Responses to consultations are required to be approved by Committees of the Council. As this consultation could affect future governance arrangements in Nottinghamshire, Policy Committee approval to the response is required.

Statutory and Policy Implications

13. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of finance, equal opportunities, human resources, crime and disorder, human rights, the safeguarding of children, sustainability and the environment and those using the service and where such implications are material they are described in the report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

14. It is recommended that Committee authorises the Corporate Director, Policy, Planning and Corporate Service in consultation with the Leader to submit a formal response to a Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) consultation on proposed amendments to the legislation on combined authorities and economic prosperity boards (EPBs).
15. A copy of the response will be sent to all Policy Committee members for information and appended to the minutes of the Policy Committee meeting in July

Report of the Leader of the Council, Alan Rhodes

For any enquiries about this report please contact: Matt Lockley, 72446

Constitutional Comments [HD – 19/5/2014]

Policy Committee has the authority to determine the recommendations set out in the report.

Financial Comments [NR 21/05/2014]

There are no financial implications arising directly from the report.

Background Papers

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

- None

Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected

- All



Department for
Communities and
Local Government

Proposal to amend legislation relating to combined authorities and economic prosperity boards

Consultation

© Crown copyright, 2014

Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/ or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

This document/publication is also available on our website at www.gov.uk/dclg

If you have any enquiries regarding this document/publication, email contactus@communities.gov.uk or write to us at:

Department for Communities and Local Government
Eland House
Bressenden Place
London
SW1E 5DU
Telephone: 030 3444 0000

For all our latest news and updates follow us on Twitter: <https://twitter.com/CommunitiesUK>

April 2014

ISBN: 978-1-4098-4224-8

Contents

Chapter 1 – Introduction	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Why we are consulting• Who we are consulting• How to respond	
Chapter 2 – Proposed changes to combined authority and economic prosperity board legislation	8
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• To enable councils with non-contiguous boundaries to form or join a combined authority or economic prosperity board• To enable a county council to join with respect to a defined part of its area a combined authority or economic prosperity board• To enable a combined authority or economic prosperity board to deliver different services in different parts of its area• To simplify the administrative processes involved in making changes to an existing combined authority or economic prosperity board• To clarify scrutiny arrangements in combined authorities and economic prosperity boards• Other proposed changes• Summary of consultation questions	
Chapter 3 – Next Steps	13

Chapter 1- The Consultation

Why we are consulting

1. In its White Paper response to the Heseltine review¹, the Government set out a “view of a future where local authorities put economic development at the heart of all they do; collaborating, including with private sector partners across a functional economic area.”² Such collaboration by councils is an important priority for Government.
2. In its guidance around Growth Deals, the Government has recognised that councils establishing combined authorities under the Local Democracy, Economic Development, and Construction Act 2009 (“the Act”) can be an effective way of collaborating over a functional economic area. Through a combined authority councils across the functional economic area can streamline and integrate their joint working on economic development and transport, increasing the transparency and accountability of their joint decision taking. Similarly, establishing under the Act an economic prosperity board, which has responsibility for economic development but not transport, can also be an effective, transparent, and accountable means of collaboration.
3. Accordingly, as the Government has explained to Parliament in the recent debates on the Orders providing for the establishment of four combined authorities³ in April 2014, where the local choice is for collaboration through a combined authority, and if the Secretary of State considers that the statutory conditions have been met, he will invite Parliament to approve the necessary Order for the establishment of the proposed combined authority. The same approach applies for economic prosperity boards. In short, the opportunity to establish a combined authority or economic prosperity board is an important element of the Government’s policies for growth.

¹ Government’s response to the Heseltine Review, HM Treasury
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/221902/PU1465_Govt_response_to_Heseltine_review.pdf

² Chapter 2.42, page 47, Government’s Response to the Heseltine Review

³ These are combined authorities in the four areas of Durham, Northumberland, and Tyne and Wear; Greater Merseyside; South Yorkshire; and West Yorkshire.

The statutory conditions set out in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the Act)

The Secretary of State must consider whether establishing a combined authority or economic prosperity board is likely to improve:

- a. the exercise of statutory functions relating to transport in the area;**
- b. the effectiveness and efficiency of transport in the area;**
- c. the exercise of statutory functions relating to economic development and regeneration in the area; and**
- d. economic conditions in the area.**

Only c) and d) apply to the establishment of an economic prosperity board.

Further requirements of the Act

The Act also requires the Secretary of State to have regard to the need to reflect the identities and interests of local communities and to secure effective and convenient local government.

4. However, the existing legislation does not enable the policy as described above to be brought fully into effect. There are circumstances where councils in a functional economic area might wish to collaborate through the mechanism of a combined authority or economic prosperity board, and which would meet the statutory tests, but where the legislation would not allow this to happen. For example where some of the councils in a functional economic area have established a combined authority and another such council wishes to collaborate with them and wants to do so by joining the combined authority, if this latter council does not have a contiguous boundary with at least one of the councils in the combined authority it cannot, under the provisions of the Act, join the combined authority even though the statutory tests above would be met. Accordingly, the Government committed in its response to the Heseltine review to seek at the next available opportunity, the legislative provision necessary to ensure that the legislation is capable of giving full effect to the Government's policies on combined authorities and economic prosperity boards.
5. This consultation paper invites comment on certain proposed changes to the primary legislation regarding combined authorities and economic prosperity boards, changes which the Government believes would fulfil its commitment to amend legislation as described above. The paper also invites views as to whether any further changes are necessary to deliver this aim.
6. These proposed changes to the legislation are as follows:
 - a. To allow councils with non-contiguous boundaries to join or form combined authorities or economic prosperity boards.

- b. To allow county councils to become a member of a combined authority or economic prosperity board with respect to part of its area, that area being the same area as that of those district councils that wish to join or form an economic prosperity board or combined authority.
- c. To allow combined authorities and economic prosperity boards to exercise their functions on a patchwork basis across their area.
- d. To simplify the process for amending the functions, changing the boundaries or dissolving a combined authority.
- e. To require combined authorities and economic prosperity boards to have one or more overview and scrutiny committees constituted with a membership reflecting the political balance of the councils concerned.

Who are we consulting?

7. We are consulting the following groups of people:
 - a. The Local Government Association
 - b. All existing combined authorities
 - c. All principal Local Authorities
 - d. All Local Enterprise Partnerships
 - e. The Confederation of British Industry
 - f. The Institute of Directors

This paper is also available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/proposals-to-amend-legislation-relating-to-combined-authorities-and-economic-prosperity-boards> and we welcome the views of any individual who wishes to comment.

How to respond

8. Your response must be received by 24th June 2014. It can be sent by email to collaborate@communities.gsi.gov.uk or in writing to:

Mariam Razak
Department for Communities and Local Government
Zone 3/J1 Eland House
Bressenden Place
London, SW1E 5DU

Please title your response 'Response to consultation on proposal to amend legislation relating to combined authorities and economic prosperity boards'

Confidentiality and data protection

9. Any responses to this consultation may be made public. If you do not want all or part of your response or name made public, please state this clearly in the response. Any confidentiality disclaimer that may be generated by your organisation's IT system or

included as a general statement in your fax cover sheet will be taken to apply only to information in your response for which confidentiality has been specifically requested.

10. Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes (these are primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Data Protection Act 1998 and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004). If you want other information that you provide to be treated as confidential, please be aware that, under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, there is a statutory Code of Practice with which public authorities must comply and which deals, amongst other things, with obligations of confidence.
11. In view of this it would be helpful if you could explain to us why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. The Department will process your personal data in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998 and in the majority of circumstances this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

Chapter 2

Proposals relating to combined authority and economic prosperity board legislation

12. This chapter looks at five situations likely to arise when the Government's policies on combined authorities and economic prosperity boards are being pursued, but for which the existing provisions of the Act do not, or do not adequately, cater. The chapter considers proposed changes to the provisions of the Act on combined authorities and economic prosperity boards – that is to Part 6 of the Act – so that the legislation would adequately provide for these situations. Views are invited on these proposed changes, all requiring one or more amendments to Part 6 of the Act. Views are also invited on whether any other changes to the existing legislative provisions would be necessary in order for Part 6 of the Act to provide for the Government's policies on combined authorities and economic prosperity boards to be fully given effect. Finally, views are invited on a proposal to specify further the overview and scrutiny arrangements that combined authorities should follow.

Proposal 1 - To enable councils with non-contiguous boundaries to form or join combined authorities or economic prosperity boards.

13. This change would enable local authorities that are in the same functional economic area but which do not have contiguous boundaries, to form or join a combined authority or economic prosperity board. This change would remove a significant barrier to collaboration across a functional economic area – the area over which the local economy and its key markets operate – and which will not necessarily align with administrative boundaries. It would be important to ensure that that no council is forced into joining a combined authority or economic prosperity board. Equally, it would be important that there are safeguards against adverse effects from the establishment of the combined authority or economic prosperity board which may fall on councils which are not members of the combined authority or economic prosperity board, either by choice or because they are not in the functional economic area.

14. The Act currently requires that no part of the combined authority or economic prosperity board area is separated from the rest of it by one or more local government areas that are not within the area. Practically, this has the effect of requiring that the local authorities that make up the combined authority or economic prosperity board area have contiguous boundaries. The legislation also requires that there is no local government area that is surrounded by local government areas that are within the area, but that is not itself within the area (that is, forming a doughnut shape).

15. By removing these requirements local authorities would be able to collaborate and partner across their functional economic areas, and build their own collaborative structures to increase efficiency and enable growth and productivity to be maximised in their area. However, the Government recognises the potential this gives to increase the adverse impacts on other areas not within the combined authority or economic prosperity board which we consider would need to be mitigated and safeguarded.

Question 1: Do you agree with proposal 1?

a) What benefits, if any, do you see from making the change?

b) What risks, if any, do you see from the change and how can these be mitigated?

Proposal 2 - To enable a county council to become a member of a combined authority or economic prosperity board with respect to a defined part of its area

16. This change would enable a county council in a two-tier area to become a member of a combined authority or economic prosperity board in relation to a defined part of its area. The defined part of the county council would be the same area as that of the district councils that also wish to be members of the combined authority or economic prosperity board. This would reduce barriers to the formation of combined authorities and economic prosperity boards by allowing a county council to become a member of a combined authority or economic prosperity board with respect to part of its area, without requiring that each of the district authorities within the county area are members.

17. In its White Paper response to the Heseltine review, the Government set out that it envisages a future in which combined authorities and economic prosperity boards can be formed across functional economic areas or a Local Enterprise Partnership area. However, as many Local Enterprise Partnerships and functional economic areas do not align with county boundaries, the Act prevents this vision from becoming a reality, and as such, can be a barrier to effective collaboration. By removing this barrier, a county will be able to become a member of a combined authority or economic prosperity board for a part of its area, creating opportunities for greater collaboration and increased economic development.

18. Where councils come forward with a proposal for a combined authority or economic prosperity board for their area that consists of a part of a county council's area, it will be important for the areas concerned to demonstrate how this will impact upon the remaining area of the county council, and how the remaining area would operate the functions efficiently and effectively. This would inform the Secretary of State's consideration of the extent to which effective and convenient government is secured, as required by the Act.

Question 2: Do you agree with proposal 2?

a) What benefits, if any, do you see from making the change?

b) What risks, if any, do you see from the change and how can these be mitigated?

Proposal 3 - To enable a combined authority or economic prosperity board to deliver different services in different parts of its area

19. This change to the Act would allow a combined authority or economic prosperity board to exercise different functions in different parts of its area. The current legislation requires a combined authority to deliver economic development, regeneration and transport functions across the whole of its area; and requires economic prosperity boards to exercise economic development and regeneration functions across the whole of its area.
20. In a two-tier area, responsibility for functions relating to transport, economic development and regeneration are split between the district councils and the county council. Under current legislation, a combined authority must hold the same responsibilities relating to transport, regeneration and economic development across the whole of its area, and cannot provide transport services for one district area, and not another. This change would remove this inflexibility, by allowing a combined authority to deliver its functions on a patchwork basis, so that if a district council chooses to join a combined authority but the county does not, the county could retain control of transport functions and any other functions held at county level, and the combined authority would only take over functions relating to economic development and regeneration which are held at district level. Similarly, where a county in a two-tier area wishes to join a combined authority or economic prosperity board, but one or more of the district councils that sit within its area do not, the combined authority would only assume responsibility for those transport, economic development and regeneration functions that are held at county level with respect to the district areas that do not wish to join.
21. This change would remove inflexibilities in the legislation which prevent councils from realising the benefits of a combined authority or economic prosperity board through increasing efficiency, productivity and profitability across their functional economic area or local enterprise partnership area.

Question 3: Do you agree with proposal 3?

- a) **What benefits, if any, do you see from making the change?**
- b) **What risks, if any, do you see from the change and how can these be mitigated?**

Proposal 4 - To simplify the administrative processes involved in making changes to an existing combined authority or economic prosperity board

22. We are also seeking views on the processes currently in place for making changes to an existing combined authority or economic prosperity board. Simplifying these processes could reduce the administrative inconvenience of some of the procedural

requirements involved in making changes to existing combined authority or economic prosperity board schemes.

23. Before a combined authority or economic prosperity board can be established, the Act requires councils to carry out a governance review, and if they find that that the formation of a combined authority or economic prosperity board would be likely to meet the statutory conditions as set out in the Act, prepare and subsequently publish a scheme. The Government undertakes a statutory consultation which informs the Secretary of State's consideration of whether the establishment of the combined authority or economic prosperity board would be likely to meet the statutory conditions set out in the Act (see page 5). A draft Order is then laid and Parliamentary approval is required before the Order can be made, establishing the combined authority or economic prosperity board. The same process is required before changes can be made to combined authority or economic prosperity board, for example, in order to amend the functions, change the boundaries of, or dissolve a combined authority or economic prosperity board.
24. Reducing and simplifying these procedures when modifying an existing combined authority or economic prosperity board could enable more rapid change, and as a result, more effective and convenient government, greater efficiency and economic growth.

Question 4. Do you agree with proposal 4, and if so what procedural simplifications and changes would you wish to see?

a) What benefits do you see arising from such changes?

b) What risks, if any, do you see from such changes and how can these be mitigated?

Proposal 5 – clarify scrutiny arrangements in combined authorities and economic prosperity boards

25. Existing combined authorities and economic prosperity boards have one or more overview and scrutiny committees which are important mechanisms for holding members of a combined authority or economic prosperity board to account. Such overview and scrutiny committees, with members drawn from the constituent and non-constituent councils concerned, have an important role in scrutinising in an open and transparent way, decisions taken or to be taken by the combined authority or economic prosperity board, and considering wider issues of potential concern to the combined authority or economic prosperity board. The outputs of such a scrutiny committee are public reports and recommendations to the combined authority or economic prosperity board, to which the combined authority or economic prosperity board may have regard.
26. Following the establishment of four new combined authorities in April 2014, the Government wrote to the combined authorities setting out guidance on good practice with regards to overview and scrutiny committees. Such good practice recommends

that members of overview and scrutiny committees are drawn from both constituent and non-constituent member authorities, with the aim of achieving political balance across the councils involved and that preferably, the Chairman of an overview and scrutiny committee should not be a member of the majority political party represented in the body's decision making forum. It is also good practice that where the overview and scrutiny committees produce recommendations and reports, these are considered and taken into account by the combined authority or economic prosperity board's decision making forum, so that the committee is able to provide oversight and hold the body to account for past decisions, as well as take an active role in influencing its future policy.

27. Whilst current evidence suggests that existing combined authorities are following this good practice, the Government believes that it would reinforce the confidence all have in the effectiveness and accountability of combined authorities and economic prosperity boards, if the following of this good practice was guaranteed. Accordingly, the Government believes that for the combined authority and economic prosperity board legislation fully to give effect to current Government policies as described above, it should be amended to require that every combined authority or economic prosperity board has one or more overview and scrutiny committees, which would be constituted and operate in accordance with the good practice described above. The Government is proposing to change legislation to ensure this requirement will in future apply to every combined authority and economic prosperity board, including those already established.

Question 5. Do you agree with this proposal to change legislation?

Other proposed changes

28. The aim of the proposed changes is to amend the Act so we can be confident that it will give full effect to the Government's localist policy described above. The proposed changes described in this chapter are those that the Government believes are necessary to achieve this. But we would welcome views on any other changes that may be necessary to give full effect to the Government's policies for combined authority and economic prosperity board.

Question 6: Do you have any further changes that you would like to see made to combined authority and economic prosperity board legislation, in particular to ensure that current policy as described in this document can be given full effect? If yes, please explain what these are and why you think they are necessary.

Summary of questions

Please answer each question below with respect to combined authorities and/or economic prosperity boards

Question 1: Do you agree with the proposal to enable councils with non-contiguous boundaries to form or join a combined authority or economic prosperity board?

- a) What benefits, if any, do you see from making the change?
- b) What risks, if any, do you see from the change and how can these be mitigated?

Question 2: Do you agree with the proposal to enable a county council to become a member of a combined authority or economic prosperity board with respect to a defined part of its area?

- a) What benefits, if any, do you see from making the change?
- b) What risks, if any, do you see from the change and how can these be mitigated?

Question 3: Do you agree with the proposal to enable a combined authority or economic prosperity board to deliver services on a patchwork basis?

- a) What benefits, if any, do you see from making the change?
- b) What risks, if any, do you see from the change and how can these be mitigated?

Question 4: Do you agree with the proposal to simplify the administrative processes involved in making changes to an existing combined authority or economic prosperity board?

- a) What benefits, if any, do you see from making the change?
- b) What risks, if any, do you see from the change and how can these be mitigated?

Question 5. Do you agree with this proposal to change legislation?

Question 6: Do you have any further changes that you would like to see made to combined authority and economic prosperity board legislation, in particular to ensure that current policy as described in this document can be given full effect? If yes, please explain what these are and why you think they are necessary.

Chapter 3

Next Steps

29. Following consultation, the Government will consider whether, and if so how, to proceed with seeking to change to the Act. It currently envisages that it may be possible to effect some of the proposed changes through a Legislative Reform Order, subject to satisfactorily completing the procedural requirements and the approval of Parliament. In considering responses, consultees may wish to have regard to this.
30. A Legislative Reform Order is a statutory instrument which can, under the powers of the Legislative and Regulatory Reform Act 2006, amend primary legislation independently of a Parliamentary Bill. A Legislative Reform Order can be used to enact deregulatory provisions, as well as to reduce or remove any burdens to which any person is subject as a result of any legislation. In the context of the Legislative and Regulatory Reform Act 2006, a burden is defined as: a financial cost; an administrative inconvenience; an obstacle to efficiency, productivity or profitability; or a sanction, criminal or otherwise, which affects the carrying on of any lawful activity.
31. If following this policy consultation the Government decides to seek a Legislative Reform Order to effect the changes to the Act, the first step will be a statutory consultation under the Legislative and Regulatory Reform Act 2006 on the proposed Order. Following and subject to that consultation, a draft Legislative Reform Order and explanatory documents would be laid before Parliament for scrutiny by each House through a Committee. Legislative Reform Orders need to be approved by both Houses of Parliament before they can be made. Legislative Reform Orders can take between six and eleven months, depending on the Parliamentary procedure, recess dates and other factors, from the point of the statutory consultation.

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR OF THE ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND HEALTH
COMMITTEE****REVISION OF THE SAFEGUARDING ADULTS PROCEDURES AND
GUIDANCE****Purpose of the Report**

1. This report asks Policy Committee to approve the revised Safeguarding Adults procedures and guidance which were endorsed by Adult Social Care and Health Committee on 12th May 2014.

Information and Advice

2. The Nottinghamshire safeguarding adults procedures were last revised in 2010. Since that time there have been some significant developments in this area of work. In addition to the Care Bill, which will make it a legal requirement for local authorities to 'make enquiries', the Local Government Association (LGA) and Association of Directors of Adult Social Services (ADASS) have begun shifting the focus of adult safeguarding work towards a person centred approach in recent years.
3. The development of the Making Safeguarding Personal agenda was '*drawn up in response to feedback from people using safeguarding services, stakeholders and practitioners that the focus of safeguarding work was on process and procedure. People using safeguarding services wanted a focus on a resolution of their circumstances, with more engagement and control*' (Making Safeguarding Personal, Sector Led Improvement, LGA ADASS, April 2013).
4. Additionally, Nottinghamshire participated in national research to identify best practice around Making Safeguarding Personal which explored the best ways of working with people in this way.
5. Taking account of the Care Bill and the making safeguarding personal agenda, a Lean Plus approach was taken to inform the review. This involved extensive consultation with a full range of staff, partner agencies and service users which has resulted in a less bureaucratic system (both in terms of the procedure & guidance and the Framework-i process).
6. In practice, this will mean:
 - Working towards outcomes that the person wants to help them manage the risk of abuse and/or neglect;

- Greater emphasis on ensuring that the person is fully involved with all decisions;
- Greater autonomy for practitioners to determine the best approach;
- More tools to help provide the relevant response;
- A proportionate response to allegations of abuse, meaning gathering evidence to ascertain whether abuse has occurred or not will be required less frequently;
- Where investigative work is required, there is greater clarity around partner agency roles and responsibilities;
- Better recording of safeguarding work;
- A process that is easier to navigate, making it easier to complete appropriately and within timescales.

7. This has been done by making the following key changes and additions to the procedures and guidance:

- A new 'initial discussion' section to determine if it is possible to meet with the adult at risk at the very beginning of the process;
- Shifting the focus of the process to consider a 'safeguarding plan' to manage future risk to individuals at the start rather than the end;
- Providing specific guidance on when an investigation should take place, and what type of investigation this should be, for example a disciplinary or criminal investigation;
- The creation of a root cause analysis tool and information sharing tool to help staff provide a proportionate response to concerns;
- Replacing the role of 'investigating officer' with the role of 'safeguarding officer' to reflect the changing approach to the procedures;
- Replacing the 'safeguarding plan' meeting with a 'case conference' to reflect the changing approach to the procedures;
- Changing terminology from 'vulnerable adult' to 'adult at risk' to reflect the term used in the Care Bill;
- A complete overhaul of the associated social care electronic records system (framework-i) to reflect the changes and aid staff who are required to record cases.

8. Feedback from the consultation along with the working group of managers and practitioners has been extremely positive.

9. The revised procedures and guidance are listed as background papers to the report, and can be viewed on the County Council website on this link:

<http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/dms/Meetings/tabid/70/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/397/Meeting/3317/Committee/475/SelectedTab/Documents/Default.aspx>

Other Options Considered

10. Consideration was given to a less robust review of the procedures and retaining much of the same process. However, revising the procedures in line with the Making Safeguarding Personal agenda better serves those vulnerable individuals who have been subjected to abuse.

Reason/s for Recommendation/s

11. The recommendations are as a result of the Care Bill, and the LGA ADASS work stream in relation to Making Safeguarding Personal.

Statutory and Policy Implications

12. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of crime and disorder, finance, human resources, human rights, the NHS Constitution (Public Health only), the public sector equality duty, safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults, service users, sustainability and the environment and ways of working and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

Crime and Disorder Implications

13. Adult abuse is often a crime and this proposal strengthens our approach to allegations of abuse.

Financial Implications

14. Implementation of this process will be done by existing staff and replaces the existing system. Therefore, there are no financial implications to agreeing the revised procedures and guidance.

Human Resources Implications

15. Guidance has been produced to support staff to use the revised procedures. There will be an implementation plan which will include supporting staff in a variety of ways including new development opportunities.

Human Rights Implications

16. Adult abuse is an infringement of an individual's human rights. This proposal strengthens our approach to allegations of abuse, ensuring that the person is always at the centre of all the work we do.

Public Sector Equality Duty implications

17. Please see the Equality Impact Assessment for 'Updating the Adults Multi-Agency Safeguarding Policy, Procedures and Guidance'.

Safeguarding of Children and Vulnerable Adults Implications

18. By its very nature, this procedure and guidance aims to reduce the risk to vulnerable adults. It also makes reference to the safeguarding of children and informs staff of their duties in respect to this.

Implications for Service Users

19. This procedure and guidance aims to have a positive impact on service users as it changes the emphasis of the approach staff will take in relation to dealing with safeguarding concerns. This will result in an approach which focuses on the views of the service user throughout the process and works towards outcomes identified by them, enabling them to manage the risk of future abuse and/or neglect.

RECOMMENDATION/S

Policy Committee is asked to:

- 1) Approve the changes to the multi-agency safeguarding adults' procedures and guidance which were endorsed by Adult Social Care and Health Committee on 12th May 2014.

Muriel Weisz

Chair of Adult Social Care and Health Committee

For any enquiries about this report please contact: Stuart Sale, 0115 977 4594.

Constitutional Comments (SLB 21/05/2014)

20. Policy Committee is the appropriate body to consider the content of this report.

Financial Comments (KAS 20/05/14)

21. The financial implications are contained within paragraph 14 of the report.

Background Papers and Published Documents

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

The following documents can be viewed on the County Council website at:

<http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/dms/Meetings/tabid/70/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/397/Meeting/3317/Committee/475/SelectedTab/Documents/Default.aspx>

- Nottinghamshire Safeguarding Adults at Risk Procedures - FINAL DRAFT
- Nottinghamshire Safeguarding Adults at Risk Procedural Guidance - FINAL DRAFT
- Making Safeguarding Personal, Sector Led Improvements (*LGA ADASS, April 2013*)
- Making Safeguarding Personal 2013-14 – Executive Summary (*LGA ADASS, April 2014*)

Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected

- All

4 June 2014

Agenda Item: 9

REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMITTEE

POLICIES FOR SAFETY AT SPORTS GROUNDS

Purpose of the Report

1. To seek Policy Committee approval of proposed policy documents for Safety at Sports Grounds in Nottinghamshire.

Information and Advice

Background

2. The safety of spectators attending events at UK sports grounds is regulated by law. In Nottinghamshire, the County Council's emergency planning team is responsible for enforcing this legislation, and works with sports grounds to promote and encourage a proactive safety culture. In accordance with recommendations from Lord Justice Taylor following the Hillsborough disaster, the team chairs regular meetings of Safety Advisory Groups for each relevant sports ground. These bring together the emergency services, local authorities and representatives of the sports club to discuss safety matters.
3. Under the Safety of Sports Grounds Act 1975, a General Safety Certificate is required for each ground with a capacity of 10,000 or more (5,000 if the club is in the football league) and which have been designated by the relevant Secretary of State. Also, under the Fire Safety and Safety of Places of Sport Act, 1987, a General Safety Certificate is required for grounds with covered stands of a capacity of 500 or more according to a specific calculation. These are known as "regulated" stands. Responsibilities under the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 require the County Council to monitor and enforce fire safety at sports grounds.
4. A General Safety Certificate includes whatever conditions are deemed necessary to ensure the reasonable safety of spectators. It also includes a capacity for the ground or stand, and a list of activities that the club or ground is permitted to hold. A breach of a Safety Certificate is a criminal offence.
5. The designated grounds in Nottinghamshire are:
 - The City Ground (Nottingham Forest Football Club)

- Trent Bridge Cricket Ground (Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club)
 - The One Call Stadium - formerly known as Field Mill (Mansfield Town Football Club).
6. The regulated stands in the County are:
 - Grandstand and Tatts Stand at Southwell Racecourse
 - The Main Stand at Watnall Road, home of Hucknall Town Football Club.
 - The East and West Stands at Coronation Park, Eastwood, previously the home of Eastwood Town Football Club (not currently in use).
 7. The emergency planning team also has powers to issue a Special Safety Certificate if one of the grounds applies to hold an event not specified in their General Safety Certificate.
 8. The team monitors clubs and grounds regularly to ensure they are adhering to the conditions of their safety certificate. This includes match day or race day inspections.

Safety at Sports Grounds Policies

9. Good practice guidance from the Sports Grounds Safety Authority requires that local authorities record their policies for safety at sports grounds, and that these are agreed by the appropriate committee. Accordingly, this report provides the Policy Committee with two policy documents for consideration. These were endorsed by the Community Safety Committee at a meeting on 29th April 2014:
 - Safety at Sports Grounds Policy (attached as Appendix A)
 - Safety at Sports Grounds Enforcement Policy (Appendix B)
10. The draft Safety at Sports Grounds Policy proposes that the County Council seeks to ensure the reasonable safety of spectators attending sports grounds within the County. The draft Enforcement Policy proposes that the County Council seeks to ensure compliance with all relevant safety at sports grounds legislation, and that any necessary enforcement action is proportionate, open, consistent and clear.
11. If approved, these will be added to the County Council's Policy Library.

Other Options Considered

12. The content of the policies attached to this report describe the processes required to enable the County Council to meet the legal requirements in respect of safety at sports grounds.

Reason/s for Recommendation/s

13. The report provides the Policy Committee with the opportunity to consider in detail the policies required to ensure safety at sports grounds. The recommendation that these are approved by this Committee is made to conform to the good practice guidance of the Sports Grounds Safety Authority.

Statutory and Policy Implications

14. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of crime and disorder, finance, human resources, human rights, the NHS Constitution (Public Health only), the public sector equality duty, safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults, service users, sustainability and the environment and ways of working and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required:

Crime and Disorder Implications

15. Nottinghamshire Police are represented at Safety Advisory Group meetings and are closely involved in decision-making in respect of any implications a sporting event may have for crime and disorder.

Financial Implications

16. There are no financial implications.

RECOMMENDATION/S

- 1) It is recommended that the Policy Committee approves the proposed policies for Safety at Sports Grounds in Nottinghamshire.

Councillor Glynn Gilfoyle
Chairman, Community Safety Committee

For any enquiries about this report please contact:

Robert Fisher
Group Manager, Emergency Management and Registration
Tel: 0115 977 3681, Email: Robert.fisher@nottscc.gov.uk

Constitutional Comments

Financial Comments (KAS 20/05/14)

There are no financial implications contained within this report

Background Papers and Published Documents

None, the legislation cited in this report is publically available.

Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected

The content of this report will be of interest to all Members as their constituents may attend sporting events as spectators. It will be of particular interest to Members who have relevant sports ground in their areas. These relate to the following Electoral Divisions:

West Bridgford Central & South - Nottingham Forest and Trent Bridge

South Mansfield - Mansfield Town Football Club

Eastwood – Coronation Park, Eastwood

Hucknall - Hucknall Town Football Club

Southwell and Caunton - Southwell Racecourse



(Draft) Safety at Sports Grounds Policy

Policy

It is the policy of Nottinghamshire County Council to seek to ensure the reasonable safety of spectators attending sports grounds within the County. In undertaking this duty the Council works in partnership with sports clubs and grounds, the emergency services, other local authorities and the Sports Grounds Safety Authority to promote a culture of safety at sports grounds.

Context

Nottinghamshire County Council recognises its statutory duty for the safety certification of sports grounds under the Safety of Sports Grounds Act 1975 (as amended) (1975 Act) and the Fire Safety and Safety of Places of Sport Act 1987 (1987 Act), (hereafter referred to as 'the Acts') and its responsibilities for the monitoring and enforcement of the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 in respect of sports grounds. The Council also recognises its responsibilities for the safety of spectators at all sports grounds in the County.

Scope of this policy

Nottinghamshire County Council has the statutory duty under the Safety of Sports Grounds Act 1975 (as amended):

- To issue a General Safety Certificate for each designated sports ground within the County, containing "such terms and conditions as the local authority consider necessary or expedient to secure reasonable safety at the sports ground"
- To serve a prohibition notice in respect of a sports ground if the Authority considers that "the admission of spectators to a sports ground involves or will involve a risk to them so serious that, until steps have been taken to reduce it to a reasonable level, admission of spectators to the ground or that part of the ground ought to be prohibited or restricted". It is important to note that this duty applies to any sports ground, not just those which are designated or have a regulated stand.
- To issue a Special Safety Certificate where required.

Fire Safety and Safety at Places of Sports Act 1987:

- To issue a General Safety Certificate for each regulated stand within the County, containing “such terms and conditions as the local authority consider necessary or expedient to secure the reasonable safety in the Stand when it is in use for viewing the specified activity or activities at the Ground”.

Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005

- To enforce the order and regulations made under it, in relation to designated sports grounds and regulated stands.
- Under the Licensing Act 2003, where applications for, or variations to, premises licences are made by a designated sports ground or one with a regulated stand, Nottinghamshire County Council will be consulted as the responsible authority for fire safety.

The sports grounds covered by this policy are:

- Designated grounds for Nottingham Forest Football Club (the City Ground), Mansfield Town Football Club (One Call Stadium) and Nottinghamshire County Cricket Club (Trent Bridge);
- Regulated stands at Coronation Park (Eastwood), Watnall Road (Hucknall) and Southwell Racecourse;
- Any sports grounds in the County of Nottinghamshire which gives rise to serious concerns about spectator safety.

Principles and Commitments

Nottinghamshire County Council, working in conjunction with partner agencies, endeavours to ensure the reasonable safety of spectators attending any sports ground determined by the Acts in Nottinghamshire.

In undertaking its role in respect of safety at sports grounds, the Council will:

- Seek to ensure that a reasonable standard of spectator safety is maintained at all sports grounds but particularly those, which are designated or have regulated stands within the County of Nottinghamshire
- Encourage and promote a safety culture within sports grounds in the County of Nottinghamshire
- Delegate its power to take and implement decisions on safety certification to a designated council officer
- Appoint a lead council officer to chair the Safety Advisory Group (SAG) for each sports ground subject to a safety certificate

- Provide for adequate resources and appoint appropriate council officers as necessary to assist the council in carrying out its statutory duties relating to the safety of spectators at sports grounds under the 1975 and 1987 Acts, and the 2005 Order
- Convene regular SAG meetings to assist in its statutory duty to sports grounds, whose membership will include representatives of the police, fire service, ambulance service, building control, relevant certificate holder and invite the Sports Grounds Safety Authority where applicable
- Determine if any sports grounds contain regulated stands and expediently process and issue safety certificates in respect of those stands and any sports grounds designated by the secretary of state under the provisions of the 1975 Act
- Put in place policies and procedures for monitoring, by inspection and audit, compliance with the terms and conditions of any safety certificate issued and taking appropriate and proportional action in response to any identified defect or incident compromising spectator safety
- Provide prompt advice on spectator safety on request from sports ground venue operators, and
- Keep under review its procedures and arrangements in pursuit of ensuring the reasonable safety of spectators at sports grounds within its responsibility.

Key actions to meet the commitments set out in the policy

Delegated powers

The Council has delegated its powers for the safety certification of sports grounds and the appointment of inspectors under the 1975 Act and 1987 Act and the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 to the:

Service Director for Access and Public Protection

The Service Director has delegated day to day responsibility to the Group Manager for Emergency Planning and Registration, who is nominated as the designated officer for safety at sports grounds.

Day to day operational management of the process is devolved by the Group Manager to the Team Manager, Emergency Planning, who is nominated as the lead officer and chairs the Safety Advisory Groups.

Consultation

In imposing terms and conditions for spectator safety (such as when issuing or amending General or Special Safety Certificates), Nottinghamshire County Council is legally required to consult with Nottinghamshire Police, Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service and the relevant building authority (district or borough council).

East Midlands Ambulance Service, although not a statutory consultee, is in practice also consulted.

Suitably trained and competent staff

Individual officers who are responsible for the issue and review of safety certificates and the undertaking of inspection and enforcement duties under the 1975 and 1987 Acts will be suitably trained and qualified to ensure their competency.

The Council will ensure that:

Duties are specified in job descriptions and experience is built up over time with provision made in individual appraisals for monitoring progress.

All officers undertaking the above duties have professional qualifications, experience in other sectors and are on CPD cycles as well as regular participation in sports grounds work and SAGs, and appropriate succession planning is in place to ensure that staff have the necessary training and experience to carry out the roles they may be expected to undertake.

Officers involved in safety at sports grounds will be given the opportunity to share information with, and learn from, others through participation in the East Midlands Chairs of SAGs Group, the Test Cricket Grounds Chairs of SAGs Group and the Core Cities Sports Grounds and Public Events Safety Group.

Related documents

- Safety at Sports Grounds Enforcement Policy
- Safety at Sports Grounds Framework
- Safety at Sports Grounds Financial Framework



(Draft) Safety at Sports Grounds Enforcement Policy

Policy

It is the policy of Nottinghamshire County Council to ensure compliance with all relevant safety at sports grounds legislation. In undertaking this duty it is the Council's aim to ensure that any enforcement action taken is proportionate, open, consistent and clear.

Context

Nottinghamshire County Council has a statutory duty for the safety certification of sports grounds under the Safety of Sports Grounds Act 1975 (as amended) (1975 Act) and the Fire Safety and Safety of Places of Sport Act 1987 (1987 Act), (hereafter referred to as 'the Acts') and its responsibilities for the monitoring and enforcement of the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 in respect of sports grounds. The Council also recognises its responsibilities for the safety of spectators at all sports grounds in the County.

Scope of this policy

The Council seeks to ensure that in enforcement and regulation the interests of the public are protected.

The purpose of this policy is to ensure that the law is applied in a fair, equitable and consistent manner and to guide officers into taking the appropriate action.

In general and where appropriate, consideration will be given to alternatives to prosecution, for example giving advice and assistance, or obtaining assurances about future conduct.

Before formal action is taken, officers will normally provide an opportunity to discuss the circumstances of the case and, if possible, resolve points of difference, unless immediate action is required (for example, in the interests of spectator safety, health and safety or to prevent evidence being destroyed).

All decisions will be impartial and will not be influenced by race, politics, gender, disability, age, sexual orientation, religious beliefs or any other belief or status of the alleged offender.

Officers will have due regard to the principles contained within the Enforcement Concordat, and any other published and relevant guidance and legislation including compliance with the Council's public sector equality duty.

The Council will take into account the comments of any victim, injured party or other relevant person to establish:

- His or her views about the circumstances in which enforcement action is deemed appropriate; and
- The nature and extent of any harm or loss, and its significance relative to the individual circumstances.

Principles and Commitments

The Council will seek to ensure that enforcement is fairly applied by committing to the following principles of fairness:

Proportionate – Any action taken by the Council, to achieve compliance or to bring regulated entities to account for non-compliance, will be proportionate to the risk to public safety, or to the severity of non-compliance, which includes any actual or potential harm arising from the failure under the law. We will seek to minimise the costs of compliance by ensuring that any action we require is in proportion to the risk.

Consistency – There will be a consistent approach from the Council in relation to any advice given, enforcement action, prosecutions and in response to incidents and complaints. The Council will discuss and compare enforcement decisions and policies amongst our own officers, and where appropriate, with other authorities and enforcement bodies.

Targeted – By adopting a risk based system for prioritising regulatory action the Council aims to make sure, through targeting, that the direction of regulatory effort takes account the level of risk and ensures action will be targeted at those situations that give rise to the more serious risks or the least well controlled risks.

Transparent – The Council will be open about how we set about our work and will provide information and advice in plain language. We will ensure we help those we regulate to understand the standards expected from them and the standards that they should expect from the local authority.

Accountable – The Council will be able to justify all enforcement decisions and be accountable for the efficiency, effectiveness and cost. Consultation and feedback opportunities are given to stakeholders. The emergency planning team reports regularly to the Community Safety Committee, including any pertinent developments and the outcomes of annual audits.

Key actions to meet the commitments set out in the policy are set out in the Safety at Sports Grounds Framework.

For further information on Nottinghamshire County Council's Safety at Sports Grounds work, please see www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk



REPORT OF THE LEADER

COUNTY COUNCIL CIVIC SERVICE, 20 JULY 2014

Purpose of the Report

1. To seek approval for hospitality at the County Council Civic Service at St Paul's Church, Daybrook on Sunday, 20 July 2014 at 3.00 pm.

Information and Advice

2. This year, the County Council's Civic Service will take place at St Paul's Church, Daybrook, where the Vicar is the Chairman's Chaplain, Rev. Sally Baylis.
3. The service will be on a smaller scale than in previous years, when the venue was Southwell Minster. The guest list will include the Lord Lieutenant, High Sheriff, County Coroner, Civic Heads, County Council members and representatives of District and Borough Councils.
4. Hospitality is provided at the discretion of the Chairman, and will take the form of tea and sparkling wine to be served at St Paul's Church Hall after the service. The estimated cost of this is £700. In addition, there are the costs of printing the order of service and flowers, estimated at £300, which gives a total estimated cost of £1,000 to be met from the County Hospitality budget. This represents a considerable saving compared with previous years. For example, the cost of the 2013 Civic Service was £2,587.

Other Options Considered

5. Consideration has been given to not providing hospitality at the Civic Service, and of not holding a Civic Service at all. It is felt appropriate that the County Council should continue the tradition of hosting such an event where this is the Chairman's wish.

Reason/s for Recommendation/s

6. To provide hospitality for guests at the Civic Service.

Statutory and Policy Implications

7. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of crime and disorder, finance, human resources, human rights, the NHS Constitution (Public Health only), the public sector equality duty, safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults, service users, sustainability and the environment and ways of working and where such implications

are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

Financial Implications

The estimated cost of £1,000 outlined in paragraph 4 can be met from the County Hospitality budget.

RECOMMENDATION/S

- 1) That approval be given to the estimated costs of £1,000 in connection with the Civic Service on 27 July 2014 at St Paul’s Church, Daybrook being met from the County Hospitality budget.

**Councillor Alan Rhodes
Leader of the County Council**

For any enquiries about this report please contact:

Martin Gately, Democratic Services

Constitutional Comments (SLB 14/05/2014)

8. Policy Committee is the appropriate body to consider the content of this report.

Financial Comments (SEM 14/05/14)

9. The financial implications are set out in the report.

Background Papers and Published Documents

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

- None

Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected

- All

REPORT OF THE LEADER

RURAL SERVICES NETWORK – PROPOSED MEMBERSHIP

Purpose of the Report

1. To seek approval for the County Council to join the recently established Rural Services Network.

Information and Advice

2. In previous years, the County Council has been a member Rural Commission of the Local Government Association (LGA). Following structural changes at the LGA, the Rural Commission no longer exists. The Rural Services Network is a special interest group for local authorities which cover a rural area to join together to campaign on behalf of rural areas, share best practice and improve rural services.
3. The Network operates through two sub-groups: the Sparse Rural special interest group, and the Rural Assembly. Each sub-group will meet three times per year, in London. There will be an annual conference each September, held in partnership with the LGA.
4. As an example of its achievements in arguing the rural financial case with the Department for Communities and Local Government, in 2013/14 allocation discussions, the Network achieved a greater weighting to the sparsity factor, which brought an additional £94,379 to Nottinghamshire. The Network is keen for authorities covering rural areas to become members and strengthen its position in discussions on the 2015/16 budget allocation.
5. It is proposed that the Leader of the County Council be the representative on the Network, and that membership be reviewed in a year's time.

Other Options Considered

6. The authority could decide not to join the Rural Services Network, but would thereby lose the opportunity to influence debate or share good practice.

Reason/s for Recommendation/s

7. To enable the County Council's participation in the Rural Services Network special interest group.

Statutory and Policy Implications

8. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of crime and disorder, finance, human resources, human rights, the NHS Constitution (Public Health only), the public sector equality duty, safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults, service users, sustainability and the environment and ways of working and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

Financial Implications

9. The initial cost of joining the Network is £495 for 2014/15. This would increase to £1,800 per year (for a minimum of three years) if the Network's efforts achieve additional grant funding of £8,000 or more for the County Council. The cost of membership can be met from the budget for membership subscriptions.

RECOMMENDATION/S

- 1) That the County Council become a member of the Rural Services Network special interest group.
- 2) That the Leader of the County Council be the authority's representative on the Network.
- 3) That membership be reviewed after twelve months.

Councillor Alan Rhodes
Leader of the County Council

For any enquiries about this report please contact:

Paul Davies, Democratic Services

Constitutional Comments (GR 27/05/14)

10. Pursuant to Section 2(5) of the County Council's Constitution, the Policy Committee has the delegated authority to consider and approve the recommendations contained within this report.

Financial Comments (SEM 19/05/14)

11. The financial implications are set out in the report.

Background Papers and Published Documents

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

- Letter dated 9 April 2014 from Chair of Rural Services Network to Leader of the County Council

Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected - All



**REPORT OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR, POLICY, PLANNING AND
CORPORATE SERVICES**

WORK PROGRAMME

Purpose of the Report

1. To review the Committee's work programme for 2014.

Information and Advice

2. The County Council requires each committee to maintain a work programme. The work programme will assist the management of the committee's agenda, the scheduling of the committee's business and forward planning. The work programme will be updated and reviewed at each pre-agenda meeting and committee meeting. Any member of the committee is able to suggest items for possible inclusion.
3. The attached work programme includes items which can be anticipated at the present time. Other items will be added to the programme as they are identified.
4. As part of the transparency introduced by the new committee arrangements, committees are expected to review day to day operational decisions made by officers using their delegated powers. Such decisions will be included in the work programme on an annual basis and as specific decisions of interest arise.
5. The Policy Committee will be asked to determine policies, strategies and statutory plans developed or reviewed by other Committees of the Council. Committee Chairmen are invited to advise the Policy Committee of any additional policy reviews that are being considered.

Other Options Considered

6. None.

Reason/s for Recommendation/s

7. To assist the committee in preparing and managing its work programme.

Statutory and Policy Implications

8. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of finance, the public sector equality duty, human resources, crime and disorder, human rights, the safeguarding of children, ways of working, sustainability and the environment and those using the service and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

RECOMMENDATION/S

- 1) That the Committee's work programme be noted, and consideration be given to any changes which the Committee wishes to make;

Jayne Francis-Ward
Corporate Director, Policy, Planning and Corporate Services

For any enquiries about this report please contact: Matthew Garrard, Team Manager, Policy, Performance and Research T: (0115) 9772892 E: matthew.garrard@nottscc.gov.uk

Constitutional Comments (SLB 30/04/2012)

9. The Committee has authority to consider the matters set out in this report by virtue of its terms of reference.

Financial Comments (PS 2/5/12)

10. There are no financial implications arising directly from this report.

Background Papers

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

None

Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected

All

POLICY COMMITTEE - WORK PROGRAMME

<u>Report Title</u>	<u>Brief summary of agenda item</u>	<u>For Decision or Information</u>	<u>Lead Officer</u>	<u>Report Author</u>
2 July 2014				
Redefining Your Council	Review of Redefining Your Council following consultation process	Decision	Anthony May	Paula Mullin
Transformation Programme – Performance	Quarterly report on the progress of the Council's Transformation Programme.	Information	Jayne Francis-Ward	Caroline Agnew
Community Strategy		Decision	Jayne Francis-Ward	Cathy Harvey
Leader Applications in Nottinghamshire			Celia Morris	Matthew Lockley
Intimate Relationships Policy	Revised sex and sexuality guidance for staff in adult social care	Decision	David Pearson	Sarah Hampton
10 September 2014				
Review of Emailme – the Council's Email Marketing System		Information	Martin Done	Martin Done
Improvement Programme – Annual Report 2013/14	Annual report of achievements for 2013-14.	Information	Jayne Francis-Ward	Caroline Agnew
8 October 2014				
Translation & Interpretation Service provision	Review of the new service provision	Information	Martin Done	Clare Yau
12 November 2014				
Improvement Programme – Performance	Quarterly report on the progress of the Council's Improvement Programme.	Information	Jayne Francis-Ward	Caroline Agnew
10 December 2014				
Economic Development Strategy	Progress Report	Information	Jayne Francis-Ward	Celia Morris

Digital Strategy	Progress Report	Information	Jayne Francis-Ward	Martin Done
7 January 2014				
11 February 2015				
Improvement Programme – Performance	Quarterly report on the progress of the Council’s Improvement Programme.	Information	Jayne Francis-Ward	
11 March 2015				
22 April 2015				
Economic Prosperity Committee	Annual report on the Economic Prosperity Committee which is a joint committee between the County Council, City Council and Borough/District Councils in Notts.	Information	Jayne Francis-Ward	Matt Lockley
Review of Annual Delivery Plan		Decision	Celia Morris	Matthew Garrard
20 May 2015				
17 June 2015				
15 July 2015				