Dear Sir/Madam,

A meeting of the PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL will be held in Committee Room 'A', Town Hall, Nuneaton on Thursday 23rd October, 2014 at 5.00 p.m.

Public Consultation will commence at 5.00 p.m.

Yours faithfully,

ALAN FRANKS
Managing Director

To: All Members of the
Planning and Environment
Overview and Scrutiny Panel

(Councillors J. Sheppard (Chair), J. Foster (Vice Chair), C. Bennett, S. Doughty, J. Glass, N. Grant, W.J. Hancox, D.C. Navarro, T.E. Sheppard, Mr. G. Cartern and Ms. D. Ross).
A G E N D A

PART 1 – PUBLIC BUSINESS

1. EVACUATION PROCEDURE

A fire drill is not expected, so if the alarm sounds please evacuate the building quickly and calmly. Please use the stairs and do not use the lifts. Once out of the building, please gather outside the Yorkshire Bank on the opposite side of the road.

Exit by the door by which you entered the room or by the fire exits which are clearly indicated by the standard green fire exit signs.

If you need any assistance in evacuating the building, please make yourself known to a member of staff.

Please also make sure all your mobile phones are turned off or set to silent.

2. APOLOGIES - To receive apologies for absence from the meeting.

3. MINUTES - To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Panel held on 4th September, 2014. (Page 5).

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST/Party Whip - To receive declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other interests in accordance with the Members’ Code of Conduct and of the Party Whip in accordance with the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules 4E, Paragraph 16(b).

Note (1): Following the adoption of the new Code of Conduct, members are reminded that they should declare the existence and nature of their personal interests at the commencement of the relevant item (or as soon as the interest becomes apparent). If that interest is a Disclosable Pecuniary or a Deemed Disclosable Pecuniary Interest, the Member must withdraw from the room.

Where a Member has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest but has received a dispensation from Standards Committee, that Member may vote and/or speak on the matter (as the case may be) and must disclose the existence of the dispensation and any restrictions placed on it at the time the interest is declared.

Where a Member has a Deemed Disclosable Interest as defined in the Code of Conduct, the Member may address the meeting as a member of the public as set out in the Code.

N.B. Council Procedure Rules require Members with Disclosable Pecuniary Interests to withdraw from the meeting unless a dispensation allows them to remain to vote and/or speak on the business giving rise to the interest.
Where a Member has a Deemed Disclosable Interest, the Council’s Code of Conduct permits public speaking on the item, after which the Member is required by Council Procedure Rules to withdraw from the meeting.

Note (2): Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules 4E, Paragraph 16(b) states "when considering any matter in respect of which a Member must declare the existence of the whip, and the nature of it before the commencement of the OSP's deliberations on the matter".

5. **PUBLIC CONSULTATION** - Members of the public will be given the opportunity to speak on specific agenda items if notice has been received.

6. **SATISFACTION WITH THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION SERVICE** – report of the Director of the Director - Regeneration and Public Protection attached. *(Page 8) (Scrutiny)*

7. **CEMETERY LAND PROVISION** - report of the Parks and Countryside Officer attached. *(Page 11) (Overview)*

8. **WORK PROGRAMME 2014/15** – attached. *(Page 19)*

9. **ANY OTHER ITEMS** which in the opinion of the Chair of the meeting should be considered as a matter of urgency because of special circumstances (which must be specified).

**N.B Agenda Item Descriptors**

**Scrutiny** = Members to consider the evidence presented in detail (e.g. service delivery, value for money, performance, customer satisfaction, social outcomes) and make recommendations for any necessary changes/improvements to service provision or resources and/or request further information.

**Overview** = Members to consider the information presented and make observations, comments and/or recommend further considerations to be taken into account and any additions or amendments required.
CORPORATE PLAN AIMS AND PRIORITIES

**Aim 1**
- To improve the quality of life and social justice for residents so it is much closer to that enjoyed by the rest of Warwickshire.

**Priority 1**
- To provide a choice of housing to meet the needs of the residents of the Borough.

**Priority 2**
- To create a healthy, diverse and robust economy which provides employment opportunities for local people.

**Priority 3**
- To work in partnership to improve health and reduce health inequalities for residents in the Borough.

**Priority 4**
- To develop a confident, cohesive and diverse community.

**Aim 2**
- To work in partnership to reduce the level of crime and disorder so that the community is and feels safer.

**Priority 1**
- Dealing with anti-social behaviour by working in partnership and provide diversionary activities to engage with youngsters.

**Priority 2**
- Environmental improvements and support for selective CCTV to reduce fear of crime.

**Priority 3**
- Use of the Council's enforcement powers to support community safety initiatives.

**Aim 3**
- To provide a pleasant environment for those living, working and visiting the Borough.

**Priority 1**
- To create a greener and cleaner environment.

**Priority 2**
- To lead in environmental issues addressing climate change and protection of the environment.

**Aim 4**
- To provide quality services which represent value for money.

**Priority 1**
- To continue to improve the performance and quality of key services.

**Priority 2**
- To improve access arrangements for all Council services and the way that those who use them are treated.

**Priority 3**
- To use value for money procedures to test the way all services are delivered.
A meeting of the Planning and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Panel was held at the Town Hall, Nuneaton, on Thursday 4th September, 2014.

Present

Councillor J. Sheppard – Chair

Councillors C. Bennett, S. Doughty, J. Foster, J. Glass, W.J. Hancox, K.A. Kondakor (substituting for N. Grant), T. Sheppard and Ms. D. Ross.

Apologies for absence from the meeting were received from Councillor N. Grant and D.C. Navarro.

PE 9 Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on the 3rd July, 2014, be confirmed.

PE 10 Declarations of Interest

Councillor S. Doughty declared an Other Interest in any relevant item by reason of her being a Member of Warwickshire County Council, and in Item 7, by reason of her employment with People in Action.

Councillor J. Foster declared an Other Interest in Item, by reason of him being an unpaid Non Executive Director of Nuneaton Signs.

Councillor K.A. Kondaker declared an Other Interest in any relevant item by reason of him being a Member of Warwickshire County Council.

PE 11 Integrated Performance Report – First Quarter 2014/15

The Director - Finance and Procurement and Governance and Performance Officer submitted a joint report seeking to provide appropriate performance measures and financial budget information for service areas within the scope of this Panel. The report also provided the Panel with appropriate information to monitor performance and finance information in order to address issues arising.

RESOLVED that the Integrated Performance Report for the first quarter be noted.
PE12 Allotment Action Plan

The Director – Governance and Recreation submitted a report asking the panel to evaluate the current delivery of the Allotment Strategy Action Plan, against the target dates agreed by Cabinet on 24th July 2013.

Members raised the following points:

(a). whether Allotment Associations are informed of matters relating to them, when allotments are discussed at Overview and Scrutiny Panels;
(b). concern was expressed about how much allotment space will be available in the future and the demand for this land from the public;
(c). interest was shown by Members in growing exotic fruit and vegetables in visible public places to promote the take up of allotments.

RESOLVED that the Allotment Action plan be noted by Members.

PE13 Street Signs

The Senior Engineer, submitted a report on Street Name Plates asking the panel to explore the process by which streets are named.

RESOLVED that the report be noted and that the Principal Planning Officer find out whether the Council actively look for signs that are damaged or broken to repair, or whether they wait for Councillors or Members of the Public to inform them before they are replaced.

PE14 Response from Cabinet – 23rd July 2014

The Cabinet responses from a number of recommendations put forward by this panel were discussed and noted. Members were informed that an action plan is in place to ensure outstanding Personal Development Reviews are being chased up and completed.

PE15 Work Programme 2014/15

The Work Programme for 2014/15 was presented to the Panel.

RESOLVED that the work programme be amended as follows:-

(a) Events/Open Space be added to the work programme to be discussed in November 2014;

(b). NSL Contractor for CPE be included;

(c). the Tree Officer attend the November meeting to introduce himself to Members and explain his role.
PE 16  Any Other Items

None

____________________________

Chair
AGENDA ITEM 6
Satisfaction with the Environmental Protection Service
Report of the Director – Regeneration & Public Protection

Background

Monitoring customer satisfaction with the handling of Environmental Protection complaints and service requests covers the following 3 services within Environmental Protection:

- Pest Control
- Animal Warden Service
- Environmental Protection (pollution complaints – noise, refuse, nuisance bonfires etc)

The service deals with the more reactive aspects of work within Environmental Health and had generally maintained an overall satisfaction rate above 80% in the years 2008-13 inclusive.

More recently the measured satisfaction level had reduced noticeably and by June 2014 it was just 71%.

At the meeting of the Planning & Environment OSP on 3rd July 2014 the Director – Regeneration & Public Protection explained that the reported reduction in customer satisfaction was misleading. Although a detailed analysis had not been undertaken, the Director was satisfied that the reduction arose from a reduced number of responses for the Pest Control part of the service, which is a very popular service. Other parts of the service were known to have lower levels of satisfaction. He also reported that a review of this performance measure had concluded that it was not adding any value to the management of service performance and had therefore been dropped, in consultation with the portfolio holder.

Members were concerned about dropping this measure and asked for a detailed analysis to be undertaken. This report sets out the results of that analysis.

Analysis

All customer satisfaction survey responses have been analysed for 2012/13 and 2013/14. The survey was stopped in April 2014. The reported satisfaction levels are a combination of responses for the three main services delivered by Environmental Protection, namely Pest Control, Animal Wardens and the rest of Environmental Protection.

In April 2013 two significant changes occurred in the Pest Control service. A nominal charge was introduced for rodent treatments (apart from concessions) and the satisfaction survey forms were delivered in person at the end of a treatment instead of by post after the treatment with a reply paid envelope for return. In 2013/14 the number of survey responses for Pest Control fell by nearly 80%. This is explained in part due to a 20% reduction in pest control treatments caused by a combination of annual fluctuation in pest numbers and some resistance to the new charge. The other 60% reduction is presumed to be a combination of annual variation and response to the change in survey method.
Table 1 shows the number of responses for each part of the service. It demonstrates the extent of the reduction in Pest Control survey responses. There is also a significant increase in the number of responses for the rest of Environmental Protection, while Animal Warden responses remained the same. The reason for the increase in responses for the rest of Environmental Protection is unknown.

Table 1. Number of returned customer satisfaction forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pest Control</th>
<th>Animal Wardens</th>
<th>Environmental Protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 2 and 3 show the number and percentage of responses that were negative, i.e. customers rated their experience of the service as dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. It is striking that there was not a single negative response for Pest Control in either year. Hence the significant fall in responses for this service were bound to have a negative effect on the overall satisfaction rating, as previously reported. The significant increase in the number of survey responses for Environmental Protection might have added to this, but the significant reduction in the proportion of negative responses will have counteracted this effect.

Table 2. Number of negative ratings (dissatisfied or very dissatisfied)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pest Control</th>
<th>Animal Wardens</th>
<th>Environmental Protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Percentage of responders who gave negative ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pest Control</th>
<th>Animal Wardens</th>
<th>Environmental Protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The causes of dissatisfaction expressed by respondents have been examined. The results are given in Table 4. In many cases the dissatisfaction arose from the actions, or perceived lack of actions, of other agencies whether internal (e.g. Housing, Parks) or external (e.g. RSPCA, Police) or by limitations imposed by Council policy (e.g. policy on the number or location of dog fouling bins). The most common source of dissatisfaction was limitations relating to law or evidence. For example the law of Statutory Nuisance being different to people’s common perception about what is a nuisance, or the need to call off a dog fouling investigation after several monitoring visits had failed to produce any evidence for the service of a fixed penalty notice.
The small number of faults in the service itself related mainly to occasions where the customer felt they had not been given a full enough explanation of why the service was being withdrawn before they were entirely satisfied. These cases represent 4% of all survey responses for Animal Wardens and Environmental Health combined.

Table 4. Reasons for dissatisfaction 2012/13 & 2013/14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Other Service/ Organisation/ Council Policy</th>
<th>Legal/ Evidence</th>
<th>Fault In Service</th>
<th>Not Specified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal Wardens</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Costs

The survey was undertaken on a monthly basis and involved running a number of computer reports to identify an appropriate and representative sample of complainants, the production of a standard letter and questionnaire that was sent out to these complainants with a pre-paid envelope, the collation of returned forms and entering details into an analysis package. The annual cost of conducting this survey was approximately £1000, including officer time. The team that undertook this work has been reduced in size by not filling vacant posts as part of the Council’s recent financial savings, and stopping the survey has helped to adapt to the reduced staffing capacity.

Conclusions

Historically satisfaction levels were stable. Satisfaction levels between 2012/13 and 2013/14 did not reduce for either Pest Control or Animal Wardens, while satisfaction improved for Environmental Protection. The performance indicator was incorrectly suggesting a significant reduction in satisfaction as a result of the change in the proportion of pest control responses.

Most of the dissatisfaction arose from factors outside the control of the service itself. Only 4% of dissatisfaction arose from factors under management control within the service.

The decision to stop collecting this performance information was taken because of the low level of dissatisfaction under management control within the service, the way in which the performance indicator was creating misleading results, and the cost of collecting the information. The detailed analysis supports that decision.
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AGENDA ITEM 7

NUNEATON AND BEDWORTH BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to: Environment Scrutiny Panel

Date: 23\textsuperscript{rd} October 2014

From: Parks & Countryside Officer – Paul Daly

Subject: Cemetery Land Provision

Portfolio: Arts & Leisure – Cllr Ian Lloyd

Corporate Aim: Key Aim 1, priorities 3 and 4
               Key Aim 2, priorities 1 and 2
               Key Aim 3, priorities 1 and 2
               Key Aim 4, priorities 1 and 3

1. **OBJECTIVES OF SCRUTINY**

1.1 To provide the Panel with current burial land availability within our existing cemeteries and the options available for a new site within the Nuneaton area.

2. **WHAT IS THE PANEL BEING ASKED TO CONSIDER**

2.1 The Members of the Panel are being asked to consider the information relating to the necessary requirements/criteria to take into account for a new site, the varying land options that have been looked at and the options that are available.

3. **WHO CAN THE PANEL INFLUENCE?**

3.1 The Panel can examine the information, question and make appropriate recommendations to cabinet.

4. **BACKGROUND**

4.1 **Current Position**

4.1.1 An assessment was undertaken of the existing burial land availability during week commencing 25\textsuperscript{th} August and can confirm the position as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oaston Road</th>
<th>Stockingford</th>
<th>Marston Lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim Section</td>
<td>20/23</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C of E Section</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic Section</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graves (no denomination )</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremation plots</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This does not include an unallocated area of approximately 100 graves at Oaston Road and a section at Marston Lane Cemetery.

4.1.2 The number of burials undertaken at the cemeteries for the last two years are as follows:

**Oaston Road Cemetery**

2012-13 New Full Burials 44 (6 Muslim burials) New Cremated Remains 32
2013-14 New Full Burials 32 (14 Muslim burials) New Cremated Remains 25

**Stockingford Cemetery**

2012-13 New Full Burials 15 New Cremated Remains 15
2013-14 New Full Burials 23 New Cremated Remains 25

**Marston Lane Cemetery**

2012-13 New Full Burials 25 New Cremated Remains 21
2013-14 New Full Burials 27 New Cremated Remains 14

Therefore utilising the burial trends over the last two years it is estimated that we:

4.2 **Main requirements/Criteria to Consider With a New Cemetery Site**
Following the confirmation that the land at Eastboro Way is not suitable for burial, the following matters have to be fully considered and taken into account when looking at any potential site:

- The element of time is the most critical. Paragraph three above outlines the available space and the current burial rates.
- Irrespective of location, it is now stipulated by the EA that we undertake an assessment of the land.

This must take into account,

1. the sub-strata of the land
2. previous uses
3. flooding potential
4. where it lies in relation to an open water source
5. its location in relation to adjacent properties

It will be necessary therefore to undertake either a level 1 assessment which is desk based in the main, or Level 2 if the EA feel it warrants it for the required protection of water sources in the area. (This is the two year long testing process we undertook at Eastboro Way). Any testing under a Level 2 assessment would require at least one year of ground water monitoring.

- There will need to be for a full planning application, design and tendering exercise which is estimated at 40 weeks.
- We if we were to consider the Compulsory Purchase Order of a piece of land, there will be a significant time element to the purchase, together with the capital cost and then we would have to undertake the necessary assessments with the possibility that it may not be suitable.
- Privately owned pieces of land – sites will need to be located; owners asked to agree a land sale (which may not be forthcoming); and the associated land transaction that would have to follow.
- Look at options outside of The Borough with adjacent authorities.
- We proceed with one of our own existing sites that we believe is suitable, this would require a requisite piece of land being made
available if it is currently for recreational purposes. With the timescales diminishing, this may be the most likely outcome, subject to providing any necessary mitigation to any impacts arising from that use.

- That we utilise Marston Lane Cemetery going forward as a Borough wide Cemetery.

### 4.3 Land that has been considered

- Land at the end of Golf Drive – this is in private ownership, that was put forward into the SHLAA, for consideration for Housing potential. As it stands at doesn’t form part of the proposed allocation and we therefore wrote to the owners seeking their views on disposal. We did not receive a favourable response, as they may believe they have “hope value” going forward.

- Golf Club land off of Lutterworth Road – this is in private ownership and put forward within the SHLAA. This is a relatively small piece of land of 2.8 acres and on contacting the agents, we did not receive a favourable response, so again they may believe it has “hope value”.

- We have via colleagues in Estates contacted both Arbury Estates and Warwickshire County Council to request whether they have any land available for disposal, at this present time. To date they have not made any suggestions as to land holdings they may have which they are willing to put forward, but have intimated that they may be able to make a piece of land available for recreational use in lieu of land that we may consider from our own land holding.

- Green field sites within the Borough boundaries, as development is permissible for cemetery purposes. They would be subject to the full testing requirements. If not in our ownership then we default to the criteria set above, in relation to purchase etc. The possibility of “hope-value” for developers, particularly if the site is within one of the “preferred options”, is a major obstacle.

- Land at Willow Road. This is potentially contaminated land given that it was previous land fill and at the same time, it is part of the Barpool Valley flood zone, so is not suitable.

- Whittleford Park identified by forms part of the Barpool Valley flood area, so is not suitable.

- Land off of Weddington Road. Two large fields to the right of the Weddington Walk that go all the way up to the A5. This piece of land has also been considered for use as a “natural” or “green” burial area, thus ensuring limited change to the character.
This site were considered as part of the Borough Plan in terms of housing. However, it was ruled out because it is important in landscape terms. It was also considered from a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and there are some areas of flood risk associated with the watercourse crossing the land. There are areas of Flood Zones 2 and 3 crossing the site along the route of the unnamed watercourse. National Planning Policy aims to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding.

- We have taken a detailed look at the land within our own land holding, attempting to look at those that meet the criteria set above, has good access arrangements, good topography, a reasonable size to allow burials for at least 50 years and that may only require the Level 1 assessment given the time frame we have available to us. We would have to provide a piece of sports/recreational land of a similar size in the same locality.

This assessment has identified three sites:

- Attleborough Recreation Ground
- Kingswood Road Recreation Ground
- Stanley Road Recreation Ground

(Plans of the sites are attached for information as Appendices A-C.)

**Attleborough Recreation Ground** is the most favourable, given its location adjacent to an existing cemetery site, it only has existing properties on two of its boundaries, its overall size (in excess of 5 acres) existing infrastructure, its geographical location within the Town and its location relating to a watercourse.

Development of this site would require the re-siting of recreational land elsewhere within the Borough as recompense and the re-location of the playground equipment on the site, which could be housed on an existing site within the ward at Anker Mills.

Initial discussions with Development Control have indicated that they could see no reason in principle to why this site could not be utilised as a cemetery.

**Kingswood Recreation Ground** area of approximately 3.75 acres, it is currently utilised as recreational site but is vested as HRA land and would have to be appropriated for the General Fund if this option was followed.
It is surrounded by properties on three sides and the railway on the other. It would require a full infrastructure of roadways, fencing, water, landscaping etc. and would create an area for approximately 30 years burials. It has good access although there are speed humps within Kingswood Road itself.

It houses a Multi Use Games area, Teenage shelter and POD which would all require re-locating and the re-siting of the recreational land.

**Stanley Road Recreation Ground** area of approximately 3.25 acres, it currently house a football pitch and is bordered on two sides by property, the other boundaries are the railway and what was the school playing field of Manor Park School. The canal is located within 100m of the site so a full Stage 2 EA assessment would be required. The site has good access off of Vernons Lane and would require a full infrastructure of roadways, fencing, landscaping etc..

It would be necessary to relocate the recreational area and football pitch.

**Appendix A** – Attleborough Recreation Ground
**Appendix B – Kingswood Recreation Ground**

**Appendix C – Stanley Road**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>SCRUTINY TYPE</th>
<th>SUGGESTED MTG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Management</td>
<td>Scrutiny</td>
<td>Jan 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Plan</td>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring of Glendale Contract</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Nov 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Performance Reports</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Nov 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sustainability Strategy</td>
<td>Scrutiny</td>
<td>Jan 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerbside Recycling &amp; Refuse Collection</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Nov 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Control Orders</td>
<td>Scrutiny</td>
<td>Jan 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Plastics Recycling &amp; Disposal</td>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>Nov 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Tree Officer Remit</td>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>Nov 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotment Association Update</td>
<td>Scrutiny</td>
<td>Mar 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New CPE Contract – NSL</td>
<td>Scrutiny</td>
<td>Jan 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events in Open Space</td>
<td>Scrutiny</td>
<td>Nov 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>