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 21st January, 2016 at 5.00 p.m.

Public Consultation will commence at 5.00 p.m.

Please note that meetings may be recorded for future broadcast.

Yours faithfully,

ALAN FRANKS

Managing Director

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

(Councillors J.B. Beaumont, C. Bennett, T. Doherty, J. Foster (Vice-Chair), N.G. Grant, S. Margrave, C.S. Phillips, J. Sheppard (Chair) and T.E. Sheppard, Ms. I. Klabisz 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. Chair to advise the meeting if all or part of the meeting will be recorded for future broadcast.

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 12th November, 2015. (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. **AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT** - a report by the Principal Officer – Environmental Protection (Page 8) (Scrutiny)

7. **INTEGRATED PERFORMANCE REPORT Q3** a report by the Audit and Governance Manager and Governance and Performance Officer (Page 18) (Scrutiny)

8. **KERBSIDE RECYCLING & REFUSE COLLECTION MONITORING REPORT** – a presentation by the Waste Reduction and Compliance Officer (Overview)

9. **RECYCLING CONTRACT REVIEW REPORT** a report presented by Councillor J. Sheppard (Scrutiny) (Report to follow)

10. **PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE OFF STREET PARKING PLACES ORDER: CALL IN – BUDGET AND POLICY PROCEDURE RULES** a report by the Director – Governance and Recreation and Director of Finance and Procurement (Page 56)

11. **RESPONSE FROM CABINET** – None

12. **PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT OSP WORK PROGRAMME 2015/16** – attached (Page 59)

13. **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.
NUNEATON AND BEDWORTH BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY PANEL

12th November, 2015

A meeting of the Planning and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Panel was held at the Town Hall, Nuneaton, on Thursday 12th November, 2015.

Present

Councillor J. Sheppard – Chair


Apologies for absence from the meeting were received from Councillors C. Bennett, T. Doherty, S.J. Margrave and T.E. Sheppard.

PE22 Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on the 17th September, 2015 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

PE23 Declarations of Interest

Councillors J.B. Beaumont and C.S. Phillips declared an Other Interest in any relevant item by reason of them being Members of Warwickshire County Council.

PE24 Monitoring of the Grounds Maintenance Contract

A report from the Parks and Countryside Officer gave the Panel information on the performance of the grounds maintenance contract provided by Glendale Industries Ltd.

RESOLVED that

(a) the report be noted;

(b) further information would be made available to the Members regarding the number of rectification notices on Contract 3; and

(c) the Panel looked forward to the improvements being made in the coming year with the introduction of Glendale Live, a new Compliance Administrator being in post.
PE25 **Cumulative Impact Zones**

A report from the Principal Planning Policy and Economic Development Officer and Councillor Danny Aldington, requested by Members, in relation to the Cumulative Impact Zones associated with the Council’s Borough Plan submission on controlling use classes and the Health Impact Assessment was considered

**RESOLVED** that

(a) the report be noted; and

(b) further information requested from Public Health and Licensing be made available.

PE 26 **Allotment Strategy Action Plan**

A report from the Director – Governance and Recreation provided information to members of the Panel on the annual progress made against the actions and target dates within the Council’s adopted as an integral part of the Allotment Strategy 2012-2022.

**RESOLVED** that

(a) the report be noted;

(b) progress be made in moving Bedworth Allotment Associations on to signing their leases as a matter of urgency, as the process has moved very slowly; and

(c) a report on the possibility of woodland development be brought to a future meeting of the Panel.

PE27 **Integrated Performance Report – Second Quarter 2015/16**

The Audit and Governance Manager and the Governance and Performance Officer provided the integrated performance monitoring report for consideration of the appropriate measures, budgets and risks relating to the scope of the Panel.

**RESOLVED** that

(a) the report be noted;

(b) the further information requested on waste recycling, public transport spend, abandoned vehicles, cemetery land and sundry debt be provided; and
(c) a target be identified in regard to planning applications alongside the trend data shown.

PE28  Work Programme 2015/16

The Work Programme for 2015/16 was presented to the Panel.

RESOLVED that

(a) the Work Programme be agreed;

(b) the email from Councillor Tromans regarding an item on Security of Borough Play Parks be transferred to a Work Programme Suggestion Form for consideration at the next meeting; and

(c) an additional meeting of the Panel be arranged for February 2016 to consider the responses to the Borough Plan consultation;

____________________________
Chair
1. **OBJECTIVES OF SCRUTINY**

To scrutinise the air quality management undertaken by Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council.

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

Members are asked to note the information provided.

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

The Panel’s considerations will influence the Council’s air quality management undertakings.

4. **INFORMATION TO BE PRESENTED TO THE PANEL**

4.1 A briefing note was sent to all councillors on 25th November 2015, and is attached as an appendix. This report discusses the briefing note and considers whether any further update is warranted since it was sent.

4.2 Since the dissemination of the attached briefing; officers attended a Public Health England (PHE) Conference in December 2015. There was little new technical content at this conference as PHE are aiming to create a resource pack that can be utilised by local authorities. The exact content of these packs is yet to be determined but a further briefing/conference is being planned by PHE. Until the content of the pack is confirmed we are unable to comment at present on how useful it will prove for Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council.

4.3 In December 2015 officers also met with colleagues from across Coventry and Warwickshire, led by Public Health Warwickshire (PHW).
This new sub-regional group (the Coventry and Warwickshire Air Quality Alliance) comprised officers responsible for air quality duties from the district authorities within Warwickshire and from Coventry along with development control planners, transport planners and highways teams from Warwickshire County Council and Coventry, and other parties interested in air quality. The aim of the Alliance is to provide a means for parties interested in air quality to consider how air quality can be addressed in a co-ordinated manner. Again this group is very much in its infancy and it is too early to know what the group will produce.

4.4 DEFRA have recently released a consultation on the Local Air Quality Management framework. Officers have reviewed this and although there are some changes, particularly in the type and amount of reporting, there is deemed to be little impact on Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council by any of the changes proposed and being consulted on. It is also of note that DEFRA commission The Committee on the Medical Effects of Air Pollutants (COMEAP) and that COMEAP are due in their work plan to review Particulate Matter within the next 2 years. There are no plans at present to review or revise any of the Limit or Objective values for pollutant concentrations relating to air quality.

5. **Summary/Conclusion**

5.1 Officers are actively engaged with Public Health England looking at air quality on a national scale and will continue to work with them in the creation and utilisation, if appropriate, of any resource pack.

5.2 Officers are actively engaged on a sub-regional basis with Public Health Warwickshire, Warwickshire County Council and Coventry City Council to work on air quality locally.

5.3 Officers have reviewed the latest DEFRA consultation and have noted that at present there are no plans to alter any of the Limit or Objective values for pollutant concentrations relating to air quality.

5.4 After attending the recent regional air quality conference organised by Public Health England and also considering the current DEFRA consultation there are no changes required to the previously disseminated briefing note.

6. **Recommendations**

6.1 It is recommended that the contents of this report and the attached briefing note are noted by the Panel.
Appendix

MEMBER BRIEFING ON AIR QUALITY IN NUNEATON AND BEDWORTH,
WITH PARTICULAR ATTENTION TO THE EFFECTS OF PM2.5

INTRODUCTION
Members will be aware of current debate about the effects on health in the
Borough of a pollutant known as PM2.5, which is extremely fine particles with
a diameter less than 2.5 microns (PM standing for Particulate Matter).
Awareness of PM2.5 has been significantly increased by the publication of a
This briefing note describes:
• the sources of PM2.5, coarse particulate matter (PM10) and nitrogen
dioxide (NO2)
• the Council’s role in monitoring these
• wider monitoring of PM2.5 and the results of this monitoring that are
relevant to the Borough.

It also describes the national framework for assessing the health implications
of air pollutants and for setting the air quality objectives against which local air
quality levels are compared.

Finally it gives an evaluation of how to interpret the Public Health England report
so that Members can form a balanced view of its significance.

NATIONAL AIR QUALITY STRATEGY

Oxides of nitrogen (NOx).
All combustion processes in air produce oxides of nitrogen (NOx). Nitrogen
dioxide (NO2) and nitric oxide (NO) are both oxides of nitrogen and together
are referred to as NOx. Road transport is the main source, followed by the
electricity supply industry and other industrial and commercial sectors. NO2 is
associated with adverse effects on human health. At high levels NO2 causes
inflammation of the airways. Long-term exposure may affect lung function and
respiratory symptoms. NO2 also enhances the response to allergens in
sensitive individuals. NOx also contributes to the formation of secondary
particles and ground level ozone, both of which are associated with ill-health
effects.

Particulate Matter (PM10 and PM2.5).
PM comprises primary particles emitted directly into the atmosphere from
combustion sources and secondary particles formed by chemical reactions in
the air. PM derives from both man-made and natural sources (such as sea salt,
spores, pollen and Saharan dust). In the UK the biggest man-made sources are
stationary fuel combustion and transport. Road transport gives rise to primary
particles from exhaust emissions, tyre and brake wear and other non-exhaust
emissions. Other primary sources include quarrying and construction.
Secondary PM is formed from emissions of ammonia, sulphur dioxide and
oxides of nitrogen in the air and in reaction with ozone. Exposure to ambient levels of PM is associated with respiratory and cardiovascular illness and mortality as well as other ill-health effects.

Legislation and the Setting of Air Quality Objectives

These pollutants are subject to EU limit values and the UK Air Quality Strategy (AQS) objectives. Local Authorities have a duty to review and assess pollutant levels against the AQS objectives within their area. UK Government (Defra) is subject to the EU Limit values. The levels, set by a panel of experts (The Air Quality Expert Group), are the threshold below which there should be no observed health effects.

The Air Quality Expert Group (AQEG) is an Expert Committee to Defra that provides independent scientific advice on air quality, in particular the air pollutants contained in the Air Quality Strategy (AQS) for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland and those covered by the EU Directives on Ambient Air Quality. Specifically AQEG gives advice on levels, sources and characteristics of air pollutants in the UK. It does not advise on health impacts or air quality standards. Details of membership of the group can be found via this link;


The Committee on the Medical Effects of Air Pollutants (COMEAP) provides independent advice to government departments and agencies on how air pollution impacts on health. Its members come from a range of specialist fields such as air quality science, atmospheric chemistry, toxicology, physiology, epidemiology, statistics, paediatrics and cardiology. There is also a lay member, who helps ensure that the general public can access and understand the committee’s work. COMEAP is the acknowledged body of multi-disciplinary scientific expertise on this subject, and is extensively referenced as such in the recent report from Public Health England. Details of membership of the group can be found via this link;

https://www.gov.uk/government/groups/committee-on-the-medical-effects-of-air-pollutants-comeap#membership

Recent reviews by the World Health Organisation (WHO) and COMEAP have suggested exposure to the finer fraction of particles (PM2.5, which typically make up around half to two thirds of PM10 concentrations) give a stronger association with the observed ill-health effects. They say that currently there is insufficient evidence from which to determine a PM2.5 threshold concentration below which there are no effects on the whole population’s health.

The effect of this is that the current air quality limit for PM2.5 will need to be reassessed at a European/governmental level as new evidence emerges. It does not mean that there is no safe level.
**Diffusion Tubes for Monitoring Nitrogen Dioxide**

Diffusive samplers are widely used for monitoring of ambient NO2 in the context of Review and Assessment. They are cost effective for monitoring across the whole of the Borough’s roads. We currently have 40 tubes spread across the area.

Diffusion tubes are an indicative monitoring technique; they do not provide the same level of accuracy as automatic monitoring instruments. The uncertainty of diffusion tube measurements is typically quoted as around ± 25%. In particular, diffusion tubes are affected by several sources of interference which can affect accuracy – hence the need to check accuracy by co-location with the chemiluminescent analyser (the EU reference method for this pollutant). Diffusion tube bias varies from year to year, possibly due to changes in laboratory procedures and meteorological conditions. For this reason, bias adjustment factors are calculated specifically for the calendar year being reviewed.

To validate the diffusion tube data, diffusion tubes are exposed in triplicate at the automatic monitoring station on Leicester Road, using the same monthly exposure periods as the other sites. The monthly averages from the three NO2 tubes and the automatic analyser are compared, and at the end of the year a bias adjustment factor is calculated. This is applied to the annual mean diffusion tube results from the other sites, to correct for any systematic bias. In the absence of a locally derived bias adjustment factor, a suitable nationally derived bias factor can be obtained from the LAQM helpdesk website.

Defra Technical Guidance LAQM.TG(09) is the reference work for all LAQM monitoring and reporting that is used across the UK. It details the way that we must operate our monitoring network to gain valid results and all parts of our assessments are carried out in accordance with these requirements.

**Monitoring Particulate Matter (PM)**

Particulate matter is defined for air quality purposes by its aerodynamic diameter and the fraction that is below a given size.

- **PM10**, this is the concentration of all particles less than 10 microns in size, often referred to as ‘inhalable’, with an annual mean objective of 40 micrograms per cubic metre of air. It will include the smaller PM2.5 fraction.

- **PM2.5**, this is the concentration of particles less than 2.5 microns in size, referred to as ‘respirable’ with an ambient annual mean limit of 25 micrograms per cubic metre of air. These particles can penetrate further into the lungs. Note that because these are annual mean values they are relevant only to ambient backgrounds. Roadside monitoring would therefore not be meaningful against this prescribed limit value, as it would not be a measure of ambient background. Monitoring of ambient background levels is done at a point away from the roadside where concentrations will be lower due to dispersion.
NBBC operated a (TEOM) PM10 particulate monitor for six years at the roadside in Avenue Road until the end of 2008. The results, as reported in our annual air quality reports, are summarised in the table below. The World Health Organisation (WHO) in their study, ‘Air quality guidelines for particulate matter, ozone, nitrogen dioxide and sulfur dioxide (Global Update 2005)’ use a factor for converting the PM 2.5 guideline values to the corresponding PM10 guideline values by applying a PM2.5/PM10 ratio of 0.5 - 0.8. i.e. the smaller fraction of PM is between 50% and 80% of the total. The ratio of 0.8 is typical of developed country urban areas. An estimated PM2.5 based upon this is included in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM10 annual mean ug/m3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated PM2.5 annual mean (0.8 factor used)</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that the PM10 concentration was about half of the 40ug objective value and the PM2.5 concentration was between 54% and 74% of the 25ug objective value (based on the 0.8 factor). Even if 100% of the PM10 that was measured was the smaller PM2.5 fraction, it would still not exceed the 25ug objective for PM2.5. Of the 66 Air Quality Management Area declarations in the UK (see appended table) for PM10 there are 29 in London Boroughs and the rest are mostly in large city centre locations including Birmingham, Wolverhampton, Walsall, Bristol and Derby. There are no PM10 declarations in Coventry and Warwickshire.

The limit for PM2.5 is not included in the local authority air quality regime and hence there is no obligation upon local authorities to review and assess against this. Measurement of particles is not carried out in the Borough, but under our duty of care officers do monitor the emerging scientific debate and guidance about it, and the ambient concentrations are modelled and measured continuously by Defra. Key pollutant concentrations are modelled on 1km x 1km grid squares and this is supported by and validated against real-time monitoring. Ambient levels and exceedences (current and historical) for all pollutants are available from the Defra Data Archive.

The nearest of these monitoring sites, known as Automatic Urban and Rural Network (AURN) sites, is at Allesley Park in Coventry. The AURN is the main network used by Defra for compliance reporting against the Ambient Air Quality Directives. It includes automatic air quality monitoring stations measuring oxides of nitrogen (NOx), sulphur dioxide (SO2), ozone (O3), carbon monoxide (CO) and particles (PM10, PM2.5). There are currently 122 sites in operation in the UK.
For monitoring and reporting air pollution to the EU, the UK has been divided into 43 zones. The Borough has parts that fall into EU Zones 32 and 35. One is the ‘Coventry/Bedworth’ (agglomeration) zone whilst the rest of the Borough is within the ‘West Midlands Region’. The pollutant concentrations for PM2.5 are similar in both zones.

The PM2.5 measure is used by Government to report ambient background concentrations of PM2.5 across the UK zones to the EU on an annual basis.

Annual PM2.5 concentrations from the Coventry AURN site for recent years are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015 (not yet ratified)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ambient PM2.5 ug/m3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/data/

It can be seen that the results are less than half of the ambient annual mean limit of 25 micrograms per cubic metre of air.

On this evidence we do not consider that the Borough is exceeding either the objective or limit for particulates, nor do we consider that the Borough is close enough to either to justify the cost of monitoring PM10 or PM2.5.

PM2.5 and PM10 Measurement Methods

The UK objectives are based upon measurements being carried out using the European Reference Sampler; this is a gravimetric device, where the particle mass is collected onto a filter and subsequently weighed. Any instrument used must comply with equivalence tests when compared with the European reference sampler. For this reason there is no inexpensive alternative method (like with diffusion tubes) that would give an accurate or meaningful PM concentration.

A number of instruments on the market meet the equivalence criteria including Partisol, FIDAS and BAM (beta attenuation monitor). The purchase price ranges from £20,000 to £23,000 with an annual service and running cost of about £10,000. The instrument would need to be housed in an air conditioned enclosure with a power supply, and data modem. Potentially this would cost around a further £10,000.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH ENGLAND REPORT

Public Health England (PHE) has made air quality one of their priorities in the latest Public Health Outcomes Framework for England. They regard it as an important Public Heath Initiative.

PHE commissioned a report, PHE-CRCE-010, ‘Estimating Local Mortality Burdens associated with Particulate Air Pollution’. Using methodology approved by COMEAP, the report presents estimates of the size of the effect on mortality in local authority areas based on modelled concentrations of
PM2.5. The number of ‘attributable deaths’ (age 25+) in 2010 for Nuneaton and Bedworth is reported as 64. The ‘associated life years lost’ is 676. The report acknowledges the uncertainty associated with the data and its sources that has been utilised in the modelling exercise, see section 2.3 of the PHE document and the actual burdens could range from 1/6th to double the calculated figure.

COMEAP stressed that a calculated figure of ‘attributable deaths’ does not represent the number of individuals whose length of life has been shortened by air pollution. This view is repeated in the PHE report. Long-term exposure to air pollution is understood to be a contributory factor to deaths from respiratory and, particularly, cardiovascular disease, i.e. unlikely to be the sole cause of deaths of individuals. This means that it is likely that air pollution contributes a small amount to the deaths of a larger number of exposed individuals rather than being solely responsible for a number of deaths equivalent to the calculated figure of ‘attributable deaths’.

For this reason it is easy for the public or the media to misunderstand the concept of ‘attributable deaths’ and to misrepresent the findings in the PHE report.

The PHE report states:
“Thus, the estimate of mortality burdens in this report can be viewed primarily as a tool for communication about the importance of good air quality for public health, and for raising awareness of the need to consider air pollution – alongside other public health concerns – when establishing priorities for coherent action to improve public health locally”.

Therefore, Members attention is drawn in particular to the PHE report’s own advice, as quoted, on how to use the report findings, when considering how to respond to any questions about it.

CONCLUSION

Members and officers in this borough, and the Director of Public Health for Warwickshire, are already aware of the importance of good air quality for public health, and already do consider, monitor, review and scrutinise air pollution. The Borough Council does already meet its obligations regarding the monitoring and reporting of air quality and the development of related action plans locally, in line with COMEAP guidelines as expressed through the National Air Quality Strategy.

Officers already keep the emerging debates about air quality under review, and the findings reported in the PHE report came as no surprise. They added a useful metric with which to make more objective comparisons with other public health issues but did not change the balance of the debate, nor the requirements upon local authorities within the National Air Quality Strategy. If in the future emerging evidence about PM2.5 should lead to changes in the obligations upon local authorities, a report will be brought to the Cabinet Member for Planning & Environment to address those changes as appropriate.
## Appendix

Table of local authorities with current AQMA declarations for Particulate Matter (PM10) – *note that some may have more than one declaration*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>London Area</th>
<th>Other LAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnett</td>
<td>Belfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexley</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartford</td>
<td>Bolton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>Broxbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>Derby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulham</td>
<td>Dundee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>Gravesham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havering</td>
<td>Kings Lynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea</td>
<td>Kirklees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston upon Thames</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>Mid-Devon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>North Lincolnshire (Immingham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbridge</td>
<td>Oldham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Tonbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>Thameside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>Thurrock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth</td>
<td>Runnymede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>Sefton Metropolitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>Scarborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surrey Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three Rivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walsall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winchester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report to: Planning and Environment Overview and Scrutiny Panel, 21st January 2016

From: Audit and Governance Manager and Governance and Performance Officer

Subject: INTEGRATED PERFORMANCE REPORT - THIRD QUARTER 2015-16

1. Purpose of Report

1.1 This integrated report seeks to provide appropriate performance measures, budget information and risk data for service areas within the scope of this Panel.

1.2 The report is designed to provide the Panel with sufficient information to monitor results in order to address issues arising.

2. Format of Report

The report consists of three parts:

2.1 Appendix A shows the latest results available at the end of the quarter. The new format of reporting agreed by all three scrutiny panels in March 2015 shows the following key changes:

- The first page provides a summary of financial, performance and risk register data;
- The second page gives a breakdown of the budget into service areas and the key ones are highlighted in bold text;
- Page three onwards provides more detailed information on performance in these key areas. Charts have been introduced for each indicator and "smiley faces" for trend direction rather than arrows;
- The last page provides an overall conclusion for the key areas and, when necessary, performance information for other non-key areas if it is felt that members need to be made aware of a particular issue or problem.

2.2 The Strategic Risk Register then follows and has been downsized to only include a description of the risk, the mitigating controls in place and the net risk status; Only risks relevant to this Panel will be provided for the first three quarters of the year —with the full register being provided at the end of the fourth quarter to each Panel to raise awareness of the key risks facing the Council as a whole.

2.3 Finally, the latest Strategic Performance report is provided. The Strategic Performance has been developed to provide an overview of the council's position under a number of key categories and consists of:

- Finance and Resources
- People and Service Delivery
- Processes
- Prospects for Improvement

The Strategic performance report uses a “trend system” comparing results over the latest three periods (month or quarter) and is supplemented by additional comments, where appropriate.
Exception reporting of under-performing areas on the summary sheet is the methodology applied.

The report is reviewed monthly by Management Team and quarterly by Cabinet.

2.4 This Integrated Performance Report shows the latest data available where the end of quarter information was not available in time for the committee report deadline.

3. Recommendation

The OSP is asked to scrutinise the performance information contained in this report and make any recommendations to the relevant Cabinet portfolio holder.

LINDA DOWNES
STEVE GORE
Third Quarter 2015/16 – Summary

**Planning & Environment OSP Financial Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Outturn 2014/15</th>
<th>Current Budget 2015/16</th>
<th>Forecast Outturn 2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Expenditure £'000's</td>
<td>£6,942</td>
<td>£7,607</td>
<td>£7,403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2015/16 Quarterly Forecast Outturn Tracker**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Forecast Outturn</th>
<th>Current Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>£7,765</td>
<td>£7,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>£7,568</td>
<td>£7,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>£7,403</td>
<td>£7,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>£7,403</td>
<td>£7,607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Indicators / Measures Summary**

- Declined: 6
- Same: 2
- Improved: 1

**Strategic Risk Register Summary for this OSP**

- Red: 1
- Amber: 3
- Green: 4
## PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT O.S.P. FINANCIAL SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Outturn 2014/15</th>
<th>Current Budget 2015/16</th>
<th>Forecast Outturn 2015/16</th>
<th>Forecast Variance 2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned vehicles</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>2,116</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>2,137</td>
<td>(53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Conveniences</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Parks</td>
<td>(594)</td>
<td>(445)</td>
<td>(476)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Control</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>(174)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Projects</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sustainability</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Occupational safety</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footway Lighting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Drainage Works</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Policy</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Passenger Transport</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse, Cleansing &amp; Recycling</td>
<td>2,990</td>
<td>3,072</td>
<td>3,218</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Nameplates</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>£ 6,942</strong></td>
<td><strong>£7,607</strong></td>
<td><strong>£7,413</strong></td>
<td><strong>(£194)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Abandoned Vehicles are shown as part of Car Parks from 2015/16
**Introduction:**

The budgetary position and performance measures for key services are shown below (please note that the end of November 2015 data has been used due to the Committee report deadline). Data is also shown for comparison purposes to the previous quarter/year as appropriate. The key services represent the most significant budgets or are highlighted as exceptional items from a budget perspective. The dashboard shows that the forecast outturn for services falling within the responsibility of this OSP is £7,413k against a budget of £7,607k. This represents an underspend of £194k.

The main services and variances are shown below with appropriate performance and measures.
## Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2015/16 £’000</th>
<th>Quarter 3 Outturn Position £’000</th>
<th>End of Year Forecast Outturn £’000</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>2,137</td>
<td>Reduced contract costs - plus savings from mothballing certain cricket and football pitch maintenance.</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Main measures of performance: Contract Monitoring and Satisfaction

![Graph showing contract monitoring and satisfaction](image)

- **Parks Contract Monitoring and Satisfaction**
  - **Satisfaction Level**
    - End of November 2014/15: 73%
    - End of November 2015/16: 84%
    - Target 2015/16: 81%
  - **Monitoring Standard (Formal Areas)**
    - End of November 2014/15: 80%
    - End of November 2015/16: 81%
    - Target 2015/16: 80%
  - **Monitoring Standard (Informal Areas)**
    - End of November 2014/15: 56%
    - End of November 2015/16: 64%
    - Target 2015/16: 70%

### Comments

Satisfaction is up by 5% and monitoring of informal areas by 8% compared to the end of November 2014/15. Monitoring of formal areas is down by 3% compared to the end of November 2014/15. The trend reflects the overall situation relating to these three measures. ☺

---

**Planning and Environment OSP**

Thursday 21st January

---
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Car Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget 2015/16 £'000</th>
<th>Quarter 3 Outturn Position £'000</th>
<th>End of Year Forecast Outturn £'000</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(445)</td>
<td>(346)</td>
<td>(476)</td>
<td>Increased car park income after additional maintenance costs.</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main measures of performance: **Car Park Ticket Sales**

![Bar chart showing Car Park Ticket Sales for 2014/15 and 2015/16]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure details</th>
<th>End of November Performance</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,057,879</td>
<td>Relates to the number of tickets sold in the borough. Sales slightly up compared to the comparative period last year.</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,065,117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning and Environment OSP
Thursday 21st January
## Development Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget 2015/16 £'000</th>
<th>Quarter 3 Outturn Position £'000</th>
<th>End of Year Forecast Outturn £'000</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Increased planning fee and pre-application advice income with some significant applications having been received recently.</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Main measure of performance: Average Time to Process Planning Applications (Days)*

### Average Time to Process Planning Applications

![Average Time to Process Planning Applications](chart.png)

#### Measure details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure details</th>
<th>End of Third Quarter Performance</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January – December 2014</td>
<td>78.01 days</td>
<td>Data is collated using the latest rolling 12 month periods available (in this case, January – December). Trend indicator relates to the comparison to the previous period.</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January – December 2015</td>
<td>69.30 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Economic Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget 2015/16 £'000</th>
<th>Quarter 3 Outturn Position £'000</th>
<th>End of Year Forecast Outturn £’000</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>Small salary related saving.</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main measure of performance:** *Percentage of People in Employment*

**Measure details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure details</th>
<th>End of Third Quarter Performance</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>91.90% (58,800 / 64,000)</td>
<td>Source: Office of National Statistics. Please note that, as requested, the data now relates to those people of working age in employment aged 16-64 as a percentage of those who are registered as economically active.</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Environmental Protection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget 2015/16 £'000</th>
<th>Quarter 3 Outturn Position £'000</th>
<th>End of Year Forecast Outturn £'000</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>547</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>Reduced salary costs due to vacancies within the section.</td>
<td>😊</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Main measure of performance: Response to Service Requests within Target Times*

![Bar chart showing response to service requests](chart.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure details</th>
<th>End of November Performance</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
<td>😊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td></td>
<td>😊</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Food safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget 2015/16 £’000</th>
<th>Quarter 3 Outturn Position £’000</th>
<th>End of Year Forecast Outturn £’000</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>Lower salary costs due to staff working reduced hours.</td>
<td>😊</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main measure of performance: The Percentage of Food Establishments with a National Food Rating of 3 or Higher

Measure details | End of November Performance | Comments | Trend |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>Ratings are 0 to 5. A rating of 3, 4 or 5 is satisfactory, good and very good, respectively. Please note that the Council’s catering service based at the Civic Hall has a “5” rating.</td>
<td>😊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget 2015/16 £'000</th>
<th>Quarter 3 Outturn Position £'000</th>
<th>End of Year Forecast Outturn £'000</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>Increased income on Street naming plus reduced shared service costs for conservation &amp; listed buildings.</td>
<td>😊</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main measures of performance: **Borough Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure details</th>
<th>End of Third Quarter Performance</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>Public consultation completed</td>
<td>Updated Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in progress.</td>
<td>😞</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Refuse & Street Cleansing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget 2015/16 £'000</th>
<th>Quarter 3 Outturn Position £’000</th>
<th>End of Year Forecast Outturn £’000</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,470</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>Increased recycling costs due to :-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Increased contract costs due to the drop in value of recyclable materials,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Reduced recycling levels reducing credits received per tonne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced income from the trade refuse service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased requirement for new bins and caddies due to additional properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased salary &amp; agency costs due in part to the level of overtime.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main measure of performance:** *Kg of Household Waste Collected per Household*

![Graph showing Kg of Household Waste Collected per Household](image)

**Trend**

- Increased recycling costs due to :-
  - Increased contract costs due to the drop in value of recyclable materials,
  - Reduced recycling levels reducing credits received per tonne.
- Reduced income from the trade refuse service.
- Increased requirement for new bins and caddies due to additional properties.
- Increased salary & agency costs due in part to the level of overtime.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure details</th>
<th>End of September performance (profiled target)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>483Kg (487Kg)</td>
<td>Low is good performance. One month in arrears of other performance information, but October data not available in time for this report. Trend relates to the comparison to the same time last year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>499Kg (487Kg)</td>
<td>We have seen an overall increase in household waste. This could be down to a number of reasons including residents are starting to buy more luxury items. We are also finding that the increase of properties in the Borough has had an impact. Although additional households are taken into consideration, most are family homes where small children are residing and thus causing more waste (e.g. nappies). We have also reduced the amount of materials accepted in the recycling bin which will have impacted on the amount of waste going into the black bin.</td>
<td>😞</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recycling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget 2015/16 £’000</th>
<th>Quarter 3 Outturn Position £’000</th>
<th>End of Year Forecast Outturn £’000</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>Increased recycling contract costs due to sharp drop in the price of recycling collected. Reduced recycling credits. Increased net salary and agency cost of service.</td>
<td>😞</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main measure of performance: **Percentage of Total Waste Recycled and Composted**

![Graph showing percentage of total waste recycled and composted](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure details</th>
<th>End of September performance (profiled target)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>51.36% (46-48%)</td>
<td>Within profiled target range for September 2015. Trend relates to the comparison to the same time last year.</td>
<td>😞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>48.62% (47-53%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion / Exception Reporting:
The key services show that the forecast outturn is £194k below the budget. The forecast may be subject to change if further issues emerge during the remainder of the financial year.

The performance results for the key services shows that 6 have improved, 2 declined and 1 stayed the same (as was also the case at the end of the last quarter).

Exceptions: -

Building Control – Increased income from external insulation works.
The other services are generally on or under budget.
NBBC Strategic Risk Register

This Version:
16th December 2015

Planning and Environment
Overview and Scrutiny Panel
Likelihood

6: **Very High** – occurrence is most likely or has already happened and will do so again if control measures are not introduced
5: **High** – occurrence is anticipated within the next 12 months
4: **Significant** – occurrence is probable in the next 3 years
3: **Low** – limited likelihood of occurrence in the next 3 years
2: **Very Low** – not likely to occur in the next 3 years
1: **Almost Impossible** - only anticipated in the most exceptional circumstances
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Impact</th>
<th>Service Delivery</th>
<th>Financial</th>
<th>Reputation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4 Major         | • A service delivery failure causes significant hardship to vulnerable people (impact: over 7 days) or failure to meet a nationally-mandated deadline.  
• Loss of major stakeholder/partner.  
• Adverse outcome of a serious regulatory enquiry. | • Financial loss over £400,000.  
• Serious risk of legal challenge with substantial implications  
• Multiple loss of life | • Sustained adverse TV/radio coverage.  
• Borough wide loss of public confidence  
• Major damage to local environment. |
| 3 Serious       | • A service delivery failure causes significant hardship to vulnerable people (3-7 day impact).  
• Formal regulatory investigation.  
• Loss of a key partner or other partners. | • Financial loss between £200K and £400K.  
• High risk of successful legal challenge with serious implications  
• Extensive or multiple injuries &/or a fatality | • Significant adverse coverage in national press or equivalent low national TV coverage.  
• Serious damage to local environment. |
| 2 Moderate      | • A service delivery failure causes significant hardship to vulnerable people (1-2 day impact).  
• Loss of a significant non-key partner.  
• Legal concerns raised.  
• Suspension of employees has moderate effect on service provision. | • Financial loss between £50K and £200K  
• Informal regulatory enquiry  
• Moderate injuries to an individual | • Significant adverse coverage in local press or regional TV.  
• Large number of customer complaints.  
• Moderate damage to local environment. |
| 1 Low           | • Minor disruption to internal services only.  
• Minor legal implications.  
• Disciplinary action not significantly affecting service provision. | • Financial loss up to £50K  
• One or more minor injuries to an individual. | • Minor adverse media coverage.  
• Minor environmental damage.  
• Minor increase in number of customer complaints. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Ref</th>
<th>Risk Description (Cause &amp; Consequence)</th>
<th>Mitigation Control</th>
<th>Net Risk/STATUS</th>
<th>Date of Last Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| R29      | Risk of planning by appeal due to delays in the delivery of Borough Plan leading to:  
1. Threat to the delivery of the vision and objectives in the emerging Borough Plan.  
2. Reduction in the choice of options for the Borough Plan.  
3. Development in an uncoordinated and piecemeal way leading to lost opportunity to address infrastructure issues in a comprehensive way.  
4. Unavoidable extra pressure on existing infrastructure leading to negative impact on local communities.  
5. Damage to reputation of the Council with Government bodies and the public.  
6. Financial cost associated with lost s106 monies.  
7. Pressure on housing needs due to lack of new homes coming on-stream.  
**Identifiable Cost Areas:**  
As at 12 10 2015: None identified. | (Existing)  
3. Leaders Prosperity Board to address strategic planning issues  
4. Effects of sub regional Strategic Housing Market Assessment evaluated in co-operation with other Councils.  
5. Submission version of Borough Plan approved by Cabinet for consultation.  
(Planned)  
P1. Deliver Borough Plan as fast as possible, next steps: test of duty to co-operate, Examination, publication.  
P2. Joint Green Belt Study (Coventry & Warwickshire Councils). Alignment of SHLAA methodology across sub-region | Very High – Major (RED) | 12 10 2015 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Ref</th>
<th>Risk Description (Cause &amp; Consequence)</th>
<th>Mitigation Control</th>
<th>Net Risk / STATUS</th>
<th>Date of Last Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R9</td>
<td>Failure to effectively: 1. Manage operational risks, 2. Produce, test or update Business Continuity Plans, or 3. Prepare for acts of terrorism, flu pandemic or other civil emergencies Resulting in: 4. Service disruption not avoided or minimised &amp;/or 5. Damage, injury, illness &amp;/or possible death.</td>
<td><strong>(Existing / On-going):</strong> 1. Obligation to produce and manage Risk Register. Risk Registers are in place and updated periodically. 2. Quarterly Service Unit reviews of Operation Risk Registers. 3. NBBC Major Emergency Plan / annual training exercises. Including updating of senior managers following the exercises at subsequent Senior Manager Days. 4. Following major incidents within the borough, normal practice is to review how dealt with &amp; how inter-agency liaison worked in practice. Reviews typically also address lessons to be learned. 5. IT infrastructure designed to be resilient. 6. Collaborative working with Local Resilience Forum (WLRF) (quarterly @ strategic &amp; operational levels, with joint training). 7. Each Service Unit has an auditable BCP. <strong>(Planned):</strong> 1. Each SU to complete their BCP. 2. SUs to interpret their individual BC plans to identify any additional supportive resources &amp; logistics needed in relation to the interim exposure until the IT solution is implemented. 3. Subsequent annual review of Business Continuity Plans by Corporate Governance Group. 4. Two separate server rooms in different towns to be connected by high-speed links.</td>
<td>Low – Serious (AMBER)</td>
<td>02 11 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As at 14 10 2015: Other than unavoidable natural happenings, none identified.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Ref</th>
<th>Risk Description (Cause &amp; Consequence)</th>
<th>Mitigation Control</th>
<th>Net Risk / Status</th>
<th>Date of Last Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. ORR review process via CGG to be implemented.</td>
<td>Low / Serious</td>
<td>27 10 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Identify the top corporate BC priorities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(AMBER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Prepare Corporate BC Strategy inc details of related training &amp; testing arrangements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Test BC Strategy priorities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R19</td>
<td>Lack of capacity &amp; skills amongst Members &amp; officers to:</td>
<td>(Existing / On-going):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Deliver the key elements of the Corporate Plan &amp;/or</td>
<td>1. Annual Member training and induction programme.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Achieve satisfactory levels of service.</td>
<td>2. Constitution reviews.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Identifiable cost areas:</strong></td>
<td>3. Reports to Cabinet &amp; Scrutiny Panels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None identified.</td>
<td>5. Competency Framework/ Job Evaluations &amp; Profiles for employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Management Development Programme.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Bi-annual Corp Governance training for Members &amp; officers (alternate years).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Memberships of professional bodies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14. Use of TEN system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15. Post-entry training scheme (specific to individual roles).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17. Continuing Professional Development (CPD) for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Ref</td>
<td>Risk Description (Cause &amp; Consequence)</td>
<td>Mitigation Control</td>
<td>Net Risk / STATUS</td>
<td>Date of Last Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| R23     | Continued effects of austerity measures & welfare reform on the customer base and in turn the performance of the Council. Impacts include – increased hardship, demand for services, revenue fall / income reduction. | **(Existing / On-going):**
1. Housing - increased support to fund vulnerable people, e.g. Additional Discretionary Housing Payment Grant from Department for Work & Pensions.  
2. Financial /budget planning.  
3. Housing – Increased resources for Tenancy Sustainment & Financial Inclusion.  
4. Housing – Additional preference for housing allocations for those affected by bedroom subsidy.  
5. Ad hoc additional funding received from Homelessness Directorate to assist people in maintaining ownership of homes and in sustaining tenancies.  
7. Shared services.  
8. Setting of risk-relevant priorities by Management Team.  
9. Adequate level of reserves held.  
10. (From Apr 2015) Combined Income Recovery Team in place to deliver increased capacity, knowledge & resilience.  
11. Relatively low car parking charges.  
12. All our town centre car parks are accredited with the 'Park Mark' quality & safety standard. | High – Moderate (AMBER) | 15 07 2015 |

Identifiable Cost Areas:

Reduced income streams have impacted (e.g.):

1. Reduced income collection rates (mainly council tax & business rates, also sundry debts);  
2. Reduced rent collection rates.  
3. Reduced Civic Hall income from shows.  
4. Reduced Building Control income.  
5. Reduced Markets income.  
6. Increased resources for debt, Council Tax & National Non - Domestic Rates (NNDR) recovery.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Ref</th>
<th>Risk Description (Cause &amp; Consequence)</th>
<th>Mitigation Control</th>
<th>Net Risk / STATUS</th>
<th>Date of Last Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R14 Aim 4</td>
<td>Failure of major partnerships to effectively fulfil their stated purposes resulting in service failure for residents &amp; businesses. Major partnerships are: - Warwickshire Safeguarding Children Board - Nuneaton and Bedworth Safer Communities Partnership.. - Pride in Camp Hill. - Home Improvement Agency. - Local Strategic Partnership. (Current / On-going): 1. Partnership agreements in place for majority of formal partnerships. 2. Partnership Framework adopted for all formal partnerships to work to. 3. Each partnership to produce its own risk assessment &amp; Annual Reports, if applicable &amp; performance management arrangements. 4. If applicable, formal partnerships are required to have business plans. 5. Corporate Governance training for partners (as required).</td>
<td>Low – Moderate (GREEN)</td>
<td>02 02 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Ref</td>
<td>Risk Description (Cause &amp; Consequence)</td>
<td>Mitigation Control</td>
<td>Net Risk / STATUS</td>
<td>Date of Last Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Ref</td>
<td>Risk Description (Cause &amp; Consequence)</td>
<td>Mitigation Control</td>
<td>Net Risk / STATUS</td>
<td>Date of Last Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R31</td>
<td>Failure to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases leading to negative publicity, global warming, increased costs, negative audit rating.</td>
<td>(Planned): P1: Extension of full recycling service to all flats &amp; communal living areas (in order to move to alternative weekly collections). (Existing): 1. Significant investment made in new, energy efficient, equipment [boilers, Combined Heat and Power (CHP’s), lighting, etc. in our corporate buildings. 2. New IT / communications equipment more energy efficient. 3. New vehicles more fuel efficient. 4. CO2 emissions from vehicles analysed on a yearly basis to assist in identifying high use areas and allow appropriate actions to be taken [Green fleet review with the Energy Saving Trust (EST)]. 5. Working to implement the Home Energy Conservation Act plan with external partners (various work programmes). On-going since March 2013. 6. SAP domestic energy cost ratings identify specific improvements to Council housing stock. External wall insulation, loft &amp; cavity wall insulation installed to improve energy efficiency levels in appropriate properties. 7. Sustainable development &amp; efficiency awareness promoted among developers, landowners &amp; agents to</td>
<td>Low – Moderate (GREEN)</td>
<td>07 05 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Ref</td>
<td>Risk Description (Cause &amp; Consequence)</td>
<td>Mitigation Control</td>
<td>Net Risk / STATUS</td>
<td>Date of Last Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R30</td>
<td>Failure to achieve public satisfaction with the borough as a place to live and work, due to poor management, development &amp;/or promotion of day-to-day Council services resulting in:</td>
<td>promote improved standards for new developments. 8. Carbon emission levels fully considered when acquiring new vehicles. 9. Procurement procedures take account of sustainability considerations. 10. Work to improve / enhance habitat biodiversity @ key wildlife sites/corridors &amp; parks. 11. Updated (2014-16) corporate Environment Sustainability Strategy. <strong>(Planned):</strong> N/A</td>
<td>Sig – Low (GREEN)</td>
<td>07 07 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Identifiable cost areas:**

As at 07/07/2015: None identified.

**In Place, Rolling Programme & As Required:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Ref</th>
<th>Risk Description (Cause &amp; Consequence)</th>
<th>Mitigation Control</th>
<th>Net Risk / STATUS</th>
<th>Date of Last Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix 1: Risks Outside the Council’s Control Because of External Factors

Currently: None.


"Risk of planning by appeal due to delays in the delivery of Borough Plan …” (R29):

There was an extensive programme of consultation on the Preferred Options. The success of the consultation is reflected in the scale of the response received both in terms of the volume and depth of feedback. The responses received from residents and other interested parties have been processed and properly investigated and considered. This took time. Further evidence has also been evaluated (including revised statistics for housing need) to inform the next stage of the Plan. Further consultation will happen in due course and a report is expected to be submitted to Cabinet on 30th September 2015 detailing the next steps.
Appendix 3: Deleted Risks.

R1 was “Failure to maintain/improve community cohesion

R2 was “Costs of new concessionary fares scheme exceeding budget (This became R26 and was subsequently deleted: see below).

R4 was “Potential failure to deliver continued improvements in Housing Services”.

R5 was “Potential failure to achieve the ‘Decent Homes’ standard for private sector housing” (This is now R28).

R10 was “failure to implement new legislation e.g. DDA, Civil Contingencies Act.

R16 was “Poor management resulting in failure to achieve satisfactory levels of service /deliver aims in Corporate Plan or Community Strategy” (Deleted June 2013 following consideration by Directors. Now combined with R19, with which it overlapped).

R18 was “Potential failure to achieve VFM savings from Cultural Services Improvement Plan”.

R20 was “Ineffective communication arrangements &/or failure to promote the borough”

R21 was “Potential failure to realistically prepare for major emergencies such as the impact of a possible flu pandemic with potential impact on ability to deliver services” (deleted Jan 2014 as instructed by Director – Gov & Rec and merged with R9).

R24: was “Loss or corruption of personal data on service users preventing delivery of services and/or breach of data protection legislation with consequent loss of reputation and/or prosecution”. (Deleted June 2014 as instructed by CGG / Aud & Gov Manager. With R25, replaced by R39).

R25 was “Loss of key data preventing accurate/any reporting of performance management”. (Deleted June 2014 as instructed by CGG / Aud & Gov Manager. With R24, replaced by R39).

R.26 was “Potential financial impact of the fare appeals for the Concessionary Travel Scheme affecting ability to afford to deliver key priorities.” (Deleted June 2013 on advice of C Pugh (Treasury & Technical Manager) that “our issues have been resolved”).
R.28 was Potential failure to remove Category 1 (Housing H&S Rating System) hazards from private sector housing with consequent impact on the lives of residents”. (Deleted June 2014 as instructed by Director (Housing & Communities). Is now considered an operational risk and is addressed by H&C’s ORR.

R32 deleted as duplicated another risk in the register.

R34 was “Planning appeal decisions going against the Council where refusal is deemed to have been unreasonable resulting in significant costs being awarded against the Council and damage to reputation”. Deleted 7/5/2015 as instructed by the Director (R&PP) as no longer considered a strategic risk. Now being monitored by R&PP’s Operational Risk Register.

R35 was “Failure to secure appropriate additional cemetery space …”(Deleted Dec 2015 as instructed by Dir – G&R as now in G&R ORR).

In 2006 there were also the following:

“Failure to deliver improvements in the benefits service (then numbered as R2).

“Ineffective implementation of the ‘E-Government’ agenda and benefits of Electronic Service Delivery (ESD) not achieved” (then numbered as R12).
Appendix 4: Abbreviations.

"AH- Affordable Housing
A&SS- Assets and Street Services (Directorate)"
"BPSG- Borough Plan Steering Group.
BCP- Business Continuity Plan
BFI- Benefits Fraud Inspectorate
BI- Business Improvement (Directorate)
BP- Borough Plan (or Business Plan)"
CAMT- Corporate Asset Management Team
CCEM- Communications & Civic Events Manager.
CGG- Corporate Governance Group
CIGG- Corporate Information Governance Group
CIL- Community Infrastructure Levy
CLG- Communities & Local Govt
CLIP- Corporate Library Information Point
CPO- Compulsory Purchase Order
CPR - Contract Procedure Rules
CSHG- Corporate Strategic Housing Group.
DHF- District Housing Forum (to which Registered Providers are invited).
E & CPO- Equality and Child Protection Officer
EPB- Economic Partnership Board
EST- Energy Saving Trust
F&P- Finance and Procurement (Directorate)
G&R- Governance and Recreation (Directorate)
GOWM- Government Officer for the West Midlands
"H of PP & ED - Head of Planning Policy & Economic Development
H of HR- Head of Human Resources
H&C- Housing and Communities (Directorate)
HASCOG- Health & Safety Co-ordinators’ Group
H of DC- Head of Development Control
HB/CTB- Housing Benefits/ Council Tax Benefits
HCA- Homes & Communities Agency
HSE- Health & Safety Executive
HSM- Health & Safety Manager"
"IDeA- Improvement & Development Agency
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IEG - Implementing Electronic Government
IIP - Investors in People
IMG- Information Management Group
JCoL- Joint Committee of Leaders
LRF - Local Resilience Forum (the primary liaison body linking Category 1 responders within the Warwickshire Police Boundary under the Civil Contingencies Act, 2004).
LSP - Local Strategic Partnership"
"MTFS- Medium Term Financial Strategy.
MWP- Member Working Party.
NABCEL- Nuneaton & Bedworth Community Enterprises Ltd
NABSCOP- Nuneaton & Bedworth Safer Communities Partnership
NNDR- National Non-Domestic Rates
OD&LM- Organisational Development & Learning Manager
ORR(s) - Operational Risk Register(s)
OSP- Overview & Scrutiny Panel"
"P&QM - Performance & Quality Manager
PAS- Planning Advisory Service
PDSO (O&S)- Principal Democratic Services Officer (Overview & Scrutiny)
PI - Performance Indicator
PID - Programme Initiation Document (IT)
PMF - Performance Management Framework
PSLF - Private Sector Landlords Forum
PSN - Public Service Network
PVP - Potentially Violent Persons.
"RPLG - Registered Providers Liaison Group (private housing provision).
R&PP - Regeneration and Public Protection (Directorate)
RR - Risk Register
RSL - Registered Social Landlord(s)
SCPM - Strategic Procurement and Creditors Manager
SDP - Service Delivery Plan"
"WAN - Wide Area Network
WIP - Warwickshire Investment Partnership.
WLRF - Warwickshire Local Resilience Forum.
WRAP - Waste & Resources Action Programme
WWP - Warwickshire Waste Partnership.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Finance and Resources</th>
<th>Good Performance</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>Current Month - November</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Forecast Outturn (surplus)/deficit</td>
<td>£0 - (£150k)</td>
<td>(346)</td>
<td>(342)</td>
<td>(419)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRA Revenue Outturn</td>
<td>£0 - (£250k)</td>
<td>(232)</td>
<td>(276)</td>
<td>(333)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF Capital Programme Spend</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,080)</td>
<td>(1,080)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harefield Road MSCP Pay on Foot – deferred to 2016/17 whilst the options available were evaluated following the outcome of a decision in the High Court. Bermuda Connectivity Project – deferred to 2016/17 as per the latest projections from WCC. DECC Scheme – partially deferred to 2016/17 as the deadline for the delivery of this project has been extended until September 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRA Capital Programme Spend</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(335)</td>
<td>(335)</td>
<td>(465)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry Debt Collection</td>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>63.67% (75 - 77%)</td>
<td>67.43% (80 - 82%)</td>
<td>72.07% (84 - 86%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trend is the correlation to the profiled monthly measure compared to the previous month. Profiled measure shown in brackets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax Collection</td>
<td>97.07% - 100%</td>
<td>57.86% (58.08 - 61.00%)</td>
<td>67.27% (67.53 - 71.00%)</td>
<td>76.72% (76.91 - 80.00%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trend is the correlation to the profiled monthly measure compared to the previous month. Profiled measure shown in brackets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Rates Collection</td>
<td>98.13% - 100%</td>
<td>57.16% (56.53 - 58.30%)</td>
<td>66.32% (66.27 - 67.85%)</td>
<td>74.94% (74.82 - 76.40%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trend is the correlation to the profiled monthly measure compared to the previous month. Profiled measure shown in brackets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Collection *</td>
<td>97.00%</td>
<td>97.04%</td>
<td>96.97%</td>
<td>96.97%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2. People and Service Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good Performance</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>Current Month - November</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customer feedback by channel (overall)</strong></td>
<td>Top quartile above 56%&lt;br&gt;Top 10 councils 73 - 86%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A new system for the telephone channel is currently in test and is planned to be implemented in January 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NI 192 – Percentage of total waste recycled and composted</strong></td>
<td>46.00%&lt;br&gt;(47 - 53%)</td>
<td>48.62%&lt;br&gt;(47 - 53%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One month in arrears of other indicators. Profiled measure shown in brackets. Trend is the correlation to the profiled monthly measure compared to the previous month. October data not available in time for this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCTV – Number of incidents captured that lead to, or assist in, police arrests</strong></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>Cumulative (year to date) data is shown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PULPI 16- Visits to and use of museums: all visits</strong>&lt;br&gt;*</td>
<td>87,250&lt;br&gt;(52,550)</td>
<td>51,179&lt;br&gt;(51,179)</td>
<td>58,504&lt;br&gt;(61,000)</td>
<td>63,128&lt;br&gt;(66,000)</td>
<td>Trend is the correlation to the profiled monthly measure compared to the previous month. Profiled measure shown in brackets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard of Grounds Maintenance work (informal areas)</strong>&lt;br&gt;*</td>
<td>65 - 75%&lt;br&gt;64%&lt;br&gt;64%</td>
<td>64%&lt;br&gt;64%&lt;br&gt;64%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Main failing - litter and path overhangs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STRATEGIC PERFORMANCE REPORT SUMMARY: DECEMBER 2015 (data at the end of November 2015)

3. Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good Performance</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>Current Month - November</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CELPI 14 - Working days lost to sickness absence</td>
<td>8 days</td>
<td>4.40 (4.00)</td>
<td>5.34 (4.67)</td>
<td>6.39 (5.33)</td>
<td>Trend is positive or negative performance compared to the previous month. Profiled measure shown in brackets. The result for November 2015 is 1.05 days/FTE (0.94 days/FTE last month). The cumulative April – November 2015 is 6.39 days/FTE against the profiled target for November of 5.33 days/FTE. The target for 2015/16 is 8 days/FTE. By comparison, the November 2014 result was 0.97 days/FTE and the cumulative April – November 2014 was 5.95 days/FTE.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Personal Development Reviews (annual) | 100% | 58% | | | Update shown is at the end of March 2015. End of October 2014 was also 88%. |

4. Prospects for Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good Performance</th>
<th>4th, 2014/15</th>
<th>1st, 2015/16</th>
<th>Current Quarter-2nd, 2015/16</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Corporate Plan Delivery Plan monitoring process</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Exception reporting. Exception reporting is deviation between actual occurrence and expectation which warrants management investigation.
AGENDA ITEM NO. 10

NUNEATON AND BEDWORTH BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report to: Planning & Environment Overview and Scrutiny Panel
(21 January 2016)

From: Director – Governance & Recreation & Director – Finance & Procurement

Subject: Proposed Changes to the Off Street Parking Places Order: Call in – Budget and Policy Procedure Rules

Portfolio: Planning & Development (Councillor D Aldington)

1. Purpose of Report
1.1. To comply with the Council’s Budget & Policy Procedure Rules

2. Recommendations
2.1. The report be noted.

3. Background
3.1. The Council’s Budget & Policy procedure Rules state:

Subject to the provisions of paragraph 4C.5 (virement) and 4C.6 (In-year adjustments) the Executive, may only take decisions, which are in line with the Budget and Policy Framework. If any of these bodies or persons wishes to make a decision which is contrary to the Policy Framework, or contrary to or not wholly in accordance with the Budget approved by Full Council, then that decision may only be taken by the Council, subject to paragraph 4C below.

3.2. If a Member of the relevant OSP together with any other 2 Members of the Council are of the opinion that an Executive Decision is, or if made would be, contrary to the Policy Framework, or contrary to or not wholly in accordance with the Council’s Budget, then they can request that the matter be called in. Upon receipt of the request, the Managing Director must seek the advice of the Monitoring Officer and/or Chief Financial Officer, as appropriate.

3.3. If the Monitoring Officer or the Chief Finance Officer conclude that the decision was not a departure (either in whole or part) from the approved Budget and Policy Framework, a report shall be submitted to the OSP, explaining the reasons for that conclusion.
3.4. This report is, therefore, a report by the Monitoring Officer and the Chief Finance Officer outlining the reasons why the challenged decision was not a departure from the Budget & Policy Procedure Rules.

3.5. On 2 December 2016, Cabinet considered a report in connection with the Revised Off-Street Parking Places Order 2016. The Purpose of the Report was to seek approval to introduce a revised Off-Street Parking Places Order 2016 and the primary recommendation was that:

“the revised Off-Street parking Places Order 2016 attached as Appendix 1 to this report be published for formal consultation and, as soon as possible after the end of the formal consultation period, the matter be referred back to Cabinet for it to consider any feedback or objections that may be received.”

3.6. On the 10th December, a request was submitted by Councillors Kondakor, Grant and Bonner to call in the decision on the basis that it was contrary to or not wholly in accordance with the Budget and Policy Framework. The request cited a number of reasons:

3.6.1. That the decision was a Key Decision and should have been in the Forward Plan; and
3.6.2. That the decision was contrary to Corporate Aims1.2 & 4.3 in that it does not create a healthy, diverse and robust economy providing employment opportunities for local people and did not represent value for money.

3.7. Following receipt of the Call-In request, the Managing Director consulted with both the Monitoring Officer and the Chief Finance Officer, both of whom expressed an opinion that the decision to consult did not impinge upon the Budget & Policy Procedures Rules.

3.8. As a result, a response was submitted to Councillor Kondakor on the 16th December 2015 stating that as the primary purpose of the report was to outline proposals which are to be the subject of formal consultation, the actual decision taken by Cabinet was to undertake consultation.

3.9. Dealing with the issue of the Forward Plan, the decision to undertake consultation cannot be a Key Decision. It has no direct and immediate effect on any ward, nor does it have any monetary value of any significance. On this basis, the call in was rejected. It should be noted, however, that the decision to make the new Parking Order following consultation will be a Key Decision. It is for this reason that the item appears in the Forward Plan for early 2016.
3.10. The second issue relating to the Corporate Aims is similar to the point made above. As no decision has yet been made that will either impact on the Council’s financial position or affect the value for money that the parking service provides, it cannot be said that the decision to consult falls foul of the Corporate Plan Aims. Importantly, as the actual content of the new Order is not yet known and won’t be known until Cabinet receive a further report, with recommendations, following the consultation exercise itself, there is no decision to challenge. Clearly, a further process needs to occur, which will have to include a proper analysis of the proposals in the light of public comments, as well as any views expressed by other consultees. Cabinet are required to have regard to all of these matters before making its final decision.

3.11. Until Cabinet’s final decision is actually known, it won’t be possible to frame a call-in request, as the final decision may be at odds with the draft proposals referred to in the 2nd December report. For this reason the call-in request was rejected.

4. Background Papers (if none, state none)

4.1. The call-in request dated 10th December submitted by Councillors Kondakor, Grant and Bonner.
4.2. The decision of the Monitoring Officer despatched to Councillor Kondakor dated 16th December 2015.
SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME SUGGESTION FORM

When suggesting a Work Programme item, consideration needs to be given to the following questions:

- Why is the issue being suggested for review?
- What difference could be made by looking at this item?
- Will the review contribute to the Council’s corporate priorities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Work Programme Item</th>
<th>Request for report - Additional Physical Security Measures for Borough Play Parks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What category of scrutiny does this fall within</th>
<th>Please tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Review &amp; Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributes to continuous improvement</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public concern</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding the executive to account</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale – the reason for suggesting the item e.g. high level of user dissatisfaction

There has been considerable media interest in recent months regarding the issue of traveller incursions on the Borough’s open space. The direct contact with residents and the extent of the feelings shown on social media by people across the Borough, make it clear that residents expect the Council to take measures against unauthorised encampments.

A report is required in order to give the Council a clear and detailed understanding of what would be required to secure play parks across the Borough to prevent this. We are all aware of the increasing prevalence of unauthorised Traveller encampments in the Borough, the damage these cause and the costs incurred, both to the Council and the wider community.

I am requesting that a report be produced by Officers which:

- Lists the various NBBC play parks.
- Outlines additional physical security options and their various costs, for each site.
- Suggests a suitable and objective rating / scoring system for prioritising the sites.
- To include funding options, including reference to Section 106 monies.

Clearly, some form of objective test also needs to be applied in deciding which parks receive the additional security measures as a priority.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence - Government legislation/ survey results/ Council policy/ poor performance against national or local PI’s/ BVR / media interest etc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There has been a lot local media interest in recent months regarding the issue of traveller encampments. Residents have shown their frustration on social media and made it clear that they expect the Council to include additional physical security measures as part of its response.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired outcome of the review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The reduction and ultimate elimination of vehicular access generally and unauthorised Traveller encampments specifically on Council open space and park land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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