

ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY PANEL

Venue: Council Chamber, Town Hall, Moorgate Street, Rotherham
Date: Thursday, 19 May 2005
Time: 9.30 a.m.

A G E N D A

1. To determine if the following matters are to be considered under the categories suggested in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972.
2. To determine any item which the Chairman is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency.
3. Questions from members of the public and the press.
4. Declarations of Interest.

FOR MONITORING

5. Neighbourhoods Restructure - Progress Report (Pages 1 - 3)
- report of HR Manager, Neighbourhoods
6. Flytipping Scrutiny Review Recommendations - Update Report (Pages 4 - 14)
- joint report of Executive Directors of Neighbourhoods and Economic and Development Services
7. Cabinet Member for Housing and Environmental Services (Pages 15 - 18)
- minutes of meeting held on 11th April, 2005 (attached)

MINUTES - FOR INFORMATION

8. Environment Scrutiny Panel (Pages 19 - 25)
- minutes of meeting held on 21st April, 2005 (attached)
9. Performance and Scrutiny Overview Committee (Pages 26 - 32)
- minutes of meeting held on 8th April, 2005 (attached)

**Date of Next Meeting:-
Date Not Specified**

Membership:-

Chairman – Councillor Atkin

Vice-Chairman – Councillor Hall

Councillors:-Burke, Clarke, Hodgkiss, Jackson, McNeely, Nightingale, Rushforth, P. A. Russell, Vines,
The Mayor (Councillor F. Wright), Mr. D. Alderson, Mr. D. Willoughby, Mr. J. Carr, Mr. S. Hawkins and
Scholey

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	Meeting:	Environment Scrutiny Panel
2.	Date:	19 May 2005
3.	Title:	Update on Progress of the Neighbourhoods Restructure
4.	Programme Area:	Neighbourhoods

5. Summary

To update Scrutiny on the status of the restructure of the Neighbourhoods Programme Area.

6. Recommendations

TO CONTINUE SUPPORT FOR THE FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW STRUCTURE.

7. Proposals and Details

A report was submitted on 6 August 2004 setting out new structures for the Programme area with a further update report given in January 2005. Appendix 1 sets out the final structures which have been subject to consultation with staff and trade unions on a continual basis. In the main the changes have been implemented to strengthen the front line services.

Recruitment to the new posts is almost complete. A total of 295 FTEs have been successful in obtaining a new post (62% of these appointments represent a promotion). In terms of job matches, a total of 162 FTE remaining the same principally within the Neighbourhood Services departments. Some posts were advertised externally and 12 new employees have joined the programme area.

As we are now in the latter stages of the restructure, some employees have been placed in posts using the redeployment procedures. This has resulted in 9 people having their salaries protected. There are still 9 members of staff who we are still to be placed and it is anticipated that this will be completed by the end of May.

8. Finance

The amendments made to the original structure strengthen the front line services whilst giving additional savings. Originally it was anticipated savings of £750,000 could be achieved, this has now risen to £1m. See Summary below.

	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Vacancy</u>	<u>Net Cost</u>
	<u>Top of Grade</u>	<u>Bottom of Grade</u>	<u>Factor 5%</u>	<u>at Scale max</u>
2010 Rotherham Ltd	£16,855,804	£15,247,364	842,790	16,013,014
Neighbourhood Services	£6,957,447	£6,477,446	347,872	6,609,575
Neighbourhood Development	£2,003,097	£1,813,815	100,155	1,902,942
Directorate	£514,296	£487,319	25,715	488,581
<u>Total</u>	£26,330,644	£24,025,944	1,316,532	25,014,112
Available Budget 2004/05	27,168,303			
Saving	- 837,659	- 3,142,359		

9. Risks and Uncertainties

A number of employees remain absent due to long term illness. As employees become fit to attend for interview they are being interviewed. Two employees have been offered posts when they return. Sickness Absence procedures are being followed throughout this process should any employees be unfit to return to work.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

11. Background Papers and Consultation

The Restructure was originally reported to this meeting in August 2004 and in January 2005.

**Contact Name: Odette Stringwell,
HR Manager,
odette.stringwell@rotherham.gov.uk**

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:	Environment Scrutiny Panel
2.	Date:	19th May 2005
3.	Title:	Fly Tipping Scrutiny Review Recommendations; Update Report
4.	Programme Area:	Neighbourhoods and Economic Development Services

5. Summary

Corporate Management Team was requested to report to the May meeting of the Environment Scrutiny Panel on the progress in implementing the findings of the Scrutiny Review of Fly Tipping (Cabinet minute 130/04 refers). This report provides analysis of the actions taken to implement recommendations arising from the Review.

6. Recommendations

- 1. Members note the progress on actions taken in response to the Fly Tipping Scrutiny Review Group's findings**

7. Proposals and Details

1. The Fly Tipping Scrutiny Review Group reported to the Cabinet on the 12th January 2005 and highlighted twelve recommendations that identified areas of potential service improvements, many of which had already been implemented. The report had previously been endorsed by the Environment Scrutiny Panel and considered by the Corporate Management Team who had their comments endorsed by the Performance and Scrutiny Overview Committee.
2. Progress taken to address the twelve recommendations has been further assessed and analysis of the recommendations, including those made by Corporate Management Team earlier, is provided in Appendix 1.

8. Finance

1. Several of the recommendations are already planned and within resource allocations made within either Streetpride or Neighbourhoods Service Plans. Opportunities to link to additional funding allocation in 2005/06 budgets eg sustainable waste agenda are available to address identified improvements in educational and publicity campaigns.
2. A review of Warden Services has been undertaken by an Environment Scrutiny Review team, and the report is awaited. This will inform proposals around the future direction and funding of Warden and Ranger services.
3. Development of IT compatibility and web sites require RBT engagement and firm costings agreed. No detail is available at this time.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

Failure to finance recommendations will result in reduced enforcement and education in relation to environmental crime in the borough, an area indicated by the Audit Commission Inspectors in the recent Waste Inspection as being best practice. Implications not to fund the Environmental Warden team will result in the loss of key strategic delivery to improve local environmental standards and also damage public confidence in the Council's commitment to cleaner and sustainable neighbourhoods.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The review presents recommendations directly relevant to the sustainable communities/neighbourhoods agenda and highlights the integrated nature of environmental crime across the Council's commitment to improving the quality of life for everyone. Issues raised will inform the current initiatives to develop Neighbourhood Partnership Teams which are being progressed as part of the implementation of the Neighbourhood Management and Policing agendas.

The issues addressed in the review directly relate to CPA and Best Value review of Waste Management. Fly tipping and many of the matters covered in the review and reflected in the recommendations were covered in the recent Waste Management inspection.

Several existing policies of the Council are challenged by the recommendations of the review e.g. subsidy of bulky item collection, removal of community skips provision. To vary current policy would have implications for the Council's sustainable waste management priority and significant financial requirements.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Scrutiny Review Group Report; Fly Tipping, August 2004

Contact Name : *Tom Cray, Executive Director, Neighbourhoods*
Adam Wilkinson, Economic Development Services

Scrutiny Review Fly Tipping Report; Update Statement May 2005

	Recommendations	Comments
13.1	<p>Joint working arrangements</p> <p>a) Consider through the Neighbourhood Management Strategy the creation of one team per neighbourhood area to deal with all environmental related issues.</p>	<p>a) Actioned – ongoing. The first Neighbourhood Partnership Team is currently being developed with a focus on antisocial behaviour and enviro-crime. This joint initiative with SY Police will enable the neighbourhood focus required of the Scrutiny Review Group's recommendation. Greater use of local intelligence and quicker deployment to address problems in the neighbourhood will be achieved. However, original concerns reported to the Scrutiny Review remain, particularly in terms of current resource and working arrangements which would cause difficulty in deployment to local teams undertaking solely environmental work:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The total number of Council staff working on purely environmental maintenance is limited. Much of this resource is concentrated in specific areas (e.g. both the Neighbourhood Wardens and Green/Clean teams operate in Rawmarsh). Having regard to this and that specialist cleansing operations could not be included in area teams, there is unlikely to be sufficient critical mass in each of 7 neighbourhood areas to cover for absences or workload peaks. o There is a significant number of specialist operations in environmental maintenance, e.g. graffiti removal, gully cleansing, mechanical road sweeping and fly tip removal etc, each utilising specialist plant /skills. o Currently in the Streetpride Service most maintenance work (i.e. both street cleansing and basic highway maintenance) is carried out in 3 area teams based on the parliamentary constituencies. The appointment of the Strategic Partner for Streetpride Services (Grounds Maintenance) will now enable better integration of grounds maintenance work with street cleansing. It is proposed that the Strategic Partner will in the future fully integrate street cleansing, grounds maintenance and highway maintenance activities (with an element of multi-skilling) into 7 area based teams covering all maintenance activities and not just environmental issues. Other environmental improvement resources (such as Community Caretakers) could be brought into this arrangement at the time.

	<p>b) Develop procedures between Programme Areas to stipulate how fly tipping reports are to be dealt with and to ensure an audit trail exists for each service request.</p> <p>c) Create a Streetpride Accord between Programme Areas that gives ownership of the Streetpride concept to all contributing parties. The document would set out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Roles and responsibilities o Financial commitments o Service Standards o Identify a Streetpride co-ordinator within each Programme Area. 	<p>b) Actioned - completed. Recommendation already implemented in July 2004 through a change request to RBT.</p> <p>c) To be actioned. To be accommodated within service plan commitment to marketing of Streetpride. To be developed during the introduction of Neighbourhood Partnership Teams where all Council services, including Streetpride, will need agreement to deliver to local neighbourhood charters.</p>
<p>13.2</p>	<p>RBT</p> <p>a) Consider setting up a dedicated Environmental Streetpride Team to process all service requests relating to environmental issues such as fly tipping, fly posting, graffiti, dog fouling and street littering.</p>	<p>a) Not actioned - completed As previously reported by CMT the recommendation was not feasible to practically implement because:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o There are currently 6 staff in Rotherham Connect dedicated to handling Streetpride calls and this will increase to about 9 staff by March 2006 when the full range of 155 Streetpride processes are taken into the Contact Centre. If a separate team was set up dedicated to environmental issues only then this would not have the resilience necessary to cope with absences or peaks in workload. In addition, in quiet periods there would be insufficient calls to keep one member of staff fully employed on purely environmental issues. o The vision behind Streetpride is that a dedicated team would deal with all street/maintenance issues on a single golden number without passing the caller on. The proposal for a separate environmental team would necessitate either a separate golden number or the passing on of callers. o Customers often have multi issue service requests concerning both the condition of the built environment and environmental issues such as fly tipping and graffiti. Contact Centre staff need to be skilled in the full range of Streetpride issues to be able to provide the public with a joined up service.

	<p>b) Create one Service Level Agreement between RBT and the 'Streetpride' function.</p> <p>c) Review IT systems to create compatibility with Fly Capture and Flare.</p>	<p>Consideration of the development of a "Neighbourhood" golden number for issues such as Anti-Social Behaviour and other neighbourhood problems will require business case development and service integration priorities to be assessed.</p> <p>b) Actioned - completed. A detailed set of Service Level Agreement between RBT and RMBC (incorporating Streetpride) has been in existence since August 2003. This includes a range of service measures such as the time to answer calls, caller satisfaction, etc and provides for improved targets in future years.</p> <p>c) To be actioned. To be reviewed as part of overall I.T. compatibility review as part of Streetpride Connect Phase 2 (implementation scheduled for Autumn 2005). Requires detailed scoping and assessment by RBT. Integration with other I.T. systems utilised by services in Neighbourhood Partnership Teams will also be required.</p>
<p>13.3</p>	<p>Budget</p> <p>a) Urgently review how Environmental Wardens will be funded in the financial year 05/06 and in future years.</p> <p>b) Resolve outstanding financial commitments to RBT in relation to Streetpride.</p>	<p>a) Actioned – ongoing. Part exit from NRF funding for 2005/06 was achieved via use of Commutation Fund monies. Identification of the £104,000 funding gap for 2006/07 and thereafter for the current Environmental Warden team is critical to ensure environmental crime continues to be addressed strongly in the Borough. A further Scrutiny Review Group report on "Warden Services" is expected to be reported shortly (May/June) which will enable the whole Warden and Ranger services of the Council, in a Neighbourhood context to be strategically reviewed.</p> <p>b) Actioned – completed. Financial commitment agreed in principle July 2004.</p>

<p>13.4</p>	<p>Enforcement</p> <p>a) Increase the number of prosecutions</p> <p>b) Increase the number of fixed penalty fines issued for littering and small scale fly tippers</p>	<p>a) Actioned – completed. Number of prosecutions increased in 2004/5 to 22, the highest recorded. The enforcement strategy for fly tipping and other environmental crime is being reviewed. This review is being informed by the recently published LGA/Environment Agency revised Protocol on Fly Tipping and the new Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment act 2005. Wherever possible prosecutions will be taken and maximum publicity taken to name and shame offenders. The emphasis will also be effective partnership with other agencies such as the Environment Agency and South Yorkshire Police. It is recommended that member dialogue with Rotherham Magistrates' Court takes place to make the case for the environment and higher sentencing</p> <p>b) Actioned – completed. Over the past year the use of fixed penalty notices (396 issued in 2004/5) has increased over an existing high level of performance. New initiatives to expand both evidence gathering and the scope of officers who can directly issue fixed penalty notices will be developed further e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 300 staff from across Rotherham Streetpride now attended “Eyes and Ears” training and providing evidence for legal proceedings • Close cooperation between Environmental Wardens and Fly Tipping removal operatives resulting in evidence discovered by operatives in the fly tipping debris being used in legal proceedings. • Proposals to extend council staff with powers to issue F.P.N's (e.g. Neighbourhood Wardens, Parking Attendants, rangers etc). • Development within Neighbourhood Partnership Teams with other bodies eg Police Community Support Officers and Police Officers
<p>13.5</p>	<p>Marketing and Publicity</p> <p>a) Increase the publicity relating to the legal penalties for fly tipping and the environmental damage caused by it.</p>	<p>a) Actioned – ongoing. A phased publicity campaign has been planned for Spring/Summer 2005 with a budget estimate of £7,000. It commences with an article in Rotherham Council Matters in March and includes advertising on back of buses, press releases about the campaign/exceptional fly tipping reports/control barrier schemes, etc and a proposed “sting” operation with the Police and Environment Agency.</p>

	<p>b) Increase publicity for the Household Waste Recycling Centres including opening hours and access arrangements.</p> <p>c) Arrange a leaflet drop to all households in the Borough on the Recycling Waste and Fly Tipping subjects.</p> <p>d) Produce a 'Householders Waste Pack' offering a range of information on the recycling services provided by RMBC.</p> <p>e) Produce a 'Commercial Waste Pack' advising businesses on all aspects of waste disposal including the Councils own Commercial waste Collections Service.</p> <p>f) Organise an annual public exhibition of Waste Management</p>	<p>b) Actioned - completed. A new leaflet was issued in Spring 2004, outlining the summer and winter opening hours of the Household Waste Recycling Centres and the criteria for permit/non permit access to the sites.</p> <p>The leaflet has been distributed to all housing offices, libraries and Household Waste Recycling Centres. The supply of these leaflets is regularly replenished.</p> <p>c) Actioned - ongoing. Proposed as part of publicity campaign in 13.5(a) above.</p> <p>d) Actioned – ongoing. Currently developing envelope file as householders waste pack for placement in office receptions etc. Information on recycling has been included within the “Welcome Pack” issued to new Council tenancies.</p> <p>e) To be actioned To be developed this year when the Waste Minimisation Team has been established.</p> <p>f) Actioned - ongoing. The Rotherham Show provides the opportunity to promote the full range of Waste Management services provided by the Council.</p> <p>The Waste Management Unit exhibition vehicle currently undertakes roadshows/local galas throughout the year.</p>
<p>13.6</p>	<p>Strategy</p> <p>a) Update the Environmental Action Strategy to reflect a more robust approach to tackling fly tipping and other environmental crime in the light of the Governments direction and recent legislation.</p>	<p>a) To be actioned. Issue to be addressed in development of revised Environment Action Strategy. Scope of the Action strategy requires transparency as to whether an internal environmental performance strategy or impact that Council services can have on the wider environment.</p>

	<p>b) Ensure that the Anti Social Behaviour Action Plan details how the powers set out in the 2003 Act will become operational with particular reference to the stop and search powers.</p> <p>c) The Anti-Social Behaviour Strategy and the Crime and Disorder Strategy need to align to reflect the councils commitment to Environmental Crime and the Streetpride concept</p> <p>d) Develop stronger strategic links with the Police through the Strategic Police Authority and the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit.</p>	<p>b+c) Actioned - ongoing. Enviro-crime will be taken into account within the Safer Rotherham Partnership's Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy (required by new Clean Neighbourhood and Environment Act)</p> <p>The SRP Anti Social Behaviour Strategy is currently under review and will be reported to the SRP and Council in June/July. The Strategy recognises the wide use of the range of enforcement interventions and these will be further expanded upon in the development of an Enviro-Crime Enforcement Strategy during 2005.</p> <p>d) Actioned – ongoing. Commenced via co-ordination in the development of Neighbourhood Standards and the Neighbourhood Partnership Team approach.</p>
<p>13.7</p>	<p>RMBC Website</p> <p>a) Develop further the website to contain detail on how the council tackles all environmental issues.</p> <p>b) Provide concise information on all services relating to waste, environment and Streetpride.</p> <p>c) Enhance the links between sites dedicated to different Programme Area's</p> <p>d) Complete existing 'headings' that contain no information</p> <p>e) Provide on line reporting to the Rotherham Connect Streetpride Team</p>	<p>a-d) Actioned - completed. All completed June 2004 in joint improvement made by Streetpride Service and Neighbourhood Services.</p> <p>e) Actioned – ongoing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o On line reporting to Rotherham Streetpride (www.rotherham.gov.uk/streetpride which is handled by staff in the Streetpride Service) has been in existence since June 2004. Currently this only receives about 10 reports per week compared with about 750 calls per week to the Streetpride golden number. o The financial viability of the website reports being handled by the

	<p>Provide online service requests for collection services e.g. Bulky Items and Commercial Waste Collections.</p> <p>Community Skips</p> <p>a) Reinstate the provision of Community Skips until the Landfill Site at Thurcroft is opened in September 2005.</p>	<p>Rotherham Connect Centre will be examined when the outstanding Streetpride Connect phase 2 processes have been brought into the Connect Centre later this year.</p> <p>Actioned – ongoing. To be investigated as part of the development of Streetpride 2 into the RBT Connect call centre. Service users can currently pay for commercial waste and bulky items using debit cards.</p>
<p>13.8</p>		<p>a) Not actioned. The cessation of the community skip service has been agreed by Members as a consequence of legislative changes limiting the types of waste that will be accepted at landfill sites.</p> <p>Items such as refrigerators, tyres and asbestos are subject to strict re-processing procedures or disposal in specific “hazardous waste” landfill sites.</p> <p>The Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment Regulations and Batteries Directive will provide further legislative burdens on what can be landfilled.</p> <p>It is considered that the location of the landfill site does not have any significance on the provision of the service. There are local private and council Waste Management facilities within the Rotherham area for householders to dispose of waste.</p> <p>Also bulky item service prices have been held at 2003/04 rates .</p>
<p>13.9</p>	<p>Bulky Waste Collection Service</p> <p>a) Review the cost of this service with a view to providing a free collection service for all users.</p> <p>b) Provide appointment times for householders so that they know when to put out the item of rubbish out for collection</p> <p>c) Explore ways of utilising the services of Rotherham Services Plus particularly with</p>	<p>a) Actioned – completed. The cost for the bulky item collection service is reviewed on an annual basis and reported to Members for approval. Free collection service is not supported.</p> <p>b) Actioned - completed. The Waste Management Unit contacts the customer to provide details of the day and date of collection upon receipt of payment for the service.</p> <p>Actioned – completed. Rotherham Furniture Plus service is offered to individuals when they request the removal of furniture. White goods are</p>

	regard to the recycling of white goods	separated for recycling by the bulky item collection crew through our HWRC's.
13.10	<p>Blue Bag/Box/Green Bin Recycling Scheme Review the timing of collections and rationalise these so that householders do not have numerous days to remember for each collection.</p>	<p>a) Actioned – completed Service operates from 7:00am to ensure we can meet the closing times for facilities where high participation occurs. The kerbside collection of recyclables operates on the same day as the refuse collection service.</p>
13.11	<p>Education and Schools a) Progress the work being undertaken with CLLL and produce an action plan to ensure implementation of educational activities in schools and adult education are progressed</p>	<p>a) Actioned - ongoing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o education campaign for secondary schools developed and gained ECAMS innovation commendation award ("Toxic" campaign) o Streetpride and environmental issues have been included in a Council wide environmental education booklet produced in September 2004 for all teachers. o Production of a Strategy and Resource Plan for education is a key step within the Streetpride Service Action Plan with a completion target of June 2005. <p>The provision of education activities on waste issues has initially been addressed through external funding bids.</p> <p>Resources provided in 2005/06 budget (Commutation Fund) for the Waste Service Improvement Plan will in part address programmes to deliver greater involvement in sustainable waste management. The requirement for implementing education activities and adult education regarding environmental crime will be integrated to this initiative.</p>
13.12	<p>Scrutiny Review a) Waste Management Review – look at waste minimisation and recycling. b) Review how RBT services are delivered to Programme Area's. Look at how Service Level Agreements are drawn up and how flexible these are in term of reflecting changing demands for service.</p>	<p>a+b) Actioned – ongoing. Programme for Scrutiny Panel Reviews in 2005/06 being developed</p>

CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
Monday, 11th April, 2005

Present:- Councillor Ellis (in the Chair); Councillors Hall (Environment Scrutiny Panel), N. Hamilton and Kaye (Policy Advisors).

198. BLACK AND MINORITY ETHNIC HOUSING STRATEGY 2005-07

The Head of Neighbourhood Development and the Equalities and Diversity Officer submitted the Black and Minority Ethnic Housing Strategy 2005-07 which had been developed in partnership with customers and stakeholders.

The aim of the Strategy was to explain and set out what the Authority and its partner organisations were seeking to achieve in terms of race equality in housing. It would also address the main recommendations of the recent Audit Commission inspections including the Indicative ALMO Inspection.

The Strategy and Action Plan focussed around 3 key objectives:-

- Leadership – providing an effective framework for the inclusion of BME communities and a reduction in inequalities across all housing services
- Policies and Procedures – to eliminate inequalities and unlawful discrimination, promote community cohesion and equal opportunities through the development of policies and procedures which embrace equalities and diversity
- Service Delivery – services were provided that met the needs and aspirations of diverse communities.

The introduction of a specific BME Strategy also assisted the Council to:-

- Provide a framework for tackling racial discrimination and disadvantage
- Provide clarity to the Authority, its partners and service users on what they were seeking to achieve in the field of race equality
- Demonstrate to BME communities the Authority's commitment to race equality
- Set out a number of measurable objectives and performance targets that could be monitored in order to determine how far progress had been made
- Set up a BME Housing Strategy and Monitoring Group, involving stakeholders and BME tenants, to scrutinise the Housing Strategy and provide a forum for consultation
- Set up monitoring systems to identify customers in terms of ethnicity, age, disability and gender
- Participate in the Equip scheme and commitment towards 2 placements within the Programme Area
- Deliver training around cultural awareness via Mosque visits.

The Action Plan set out targets against performance for the Local Authority and some of its key partners. This was Rotherham's first BME Housing Strategy and would continue to evolve and further developed over time in response to the changing needs of BME communities.

In order to expand and develop the Council's approach with all housing providers across the Borough, the Strategic Housing Partnership had commissioned a Neighbourhood Renewal Adviser to assess and report on measures to promote equalities and diversity. This work would take place during April, 2005.

Discussion ensued on the report with the following points highlighted:-

- Linkages with Education, Culture and Leisure Services for the annual programme of events
- Inclusion of "signposting" in the Strategy to work that was taking place
- Discussions taking place regarding the reporting of racist incidents
- Discussions taking place regarding the provision of procurement opportunities for BME owned businesses and the increase in ethnic diversity of consultants and contractors.

Resolved:- (1) That the Black and Minority Ethnic Housing Strategy be supported.

(2) That the Black and Minority Ethnic Housing Strategy and action plan be forwarded to the Corporate Management Team.

199. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR THE "KEY CHOICES" CHOICE BASED LETTING SERVICE

In accordance with Minute No. 185 of 14th March, 2005, the Community Services Manager submitted a further report incorporating comments made by the Environment Scrutiny Panel at its meeting on 24th March, 2005.

The property previously identified as suitable premises for the Property Shop was no longer available. The "Key Choices" lettings service would operate initially from Norfolk House reception until suitable town centre premises were secured and fitted out.

It was proposed that current and future applicants will be given at least 1 month's notice prior to the commencement of the "Key Choices" letting service.

The report addressed issues raised at the Scrutiny Panel and also acknowledged the difficulties that customers in neighbouring authorities had encountered. These included:-

- Informing applicants how to access the Service
- Support for vulnerable people
- Customer feedback following an unsuccessful property request
- Preventing anti-social behaviour
- Property standards
- Out-of-Borough applicants with no local connection
- Priority Need versus Waiting Time
- Offering choice to individuals in priority need
- Multiple property requests causing delay in allocating

Resolved:- (1) That a Choice Based Lettings Scheme be introduced in Rotherham.

(2) That the Scheme and the Property Shop be branded as “Key Choices” and the shop be established at suitable town centre premises.

(3) That the “Key Choices” Letting Service operate initially from Norfolk House Reception if necessary until alternative suitable shop premises in the town centre are sought.

(4) That provision for the capital costs of the Property Shop be made within the 2005/06 Housing Investment Programme and that support for the revenue costs be made within the Housing Revenue Account budget.

(5) That the Audit Commission be contacted with regard to similar schemes operating in other authorities.

(6) That a letter and Frequently Asked Questions be supplied to all Members of the Council.

(7) That progress reports be submitted on a monthly basis.

200. HOUSING DISREPAIR CLAIMS

The Head of Housing Services submitted a report setting out the impact of the current management strategy for dealing with disrepair claims (Section 11.82).

As at 31st March, 2005, the number of cases had fallen during the 18 month period from an all time high of 267 live claims to 70. In the period 257 claims had been settled comprising:-

57 cases where payment was required (average £4,155.32 per claim)
 168 cases where no payment was required (potential saving of £698,093.76)
 32 cases where the Council would receive costs.

Of the 57 cases where payment was required, the amount paid up to 5th April, 2005, was £236,853.78 (£114,928.45 during 2003/04 financial year and £121,925.33 during 2004/05). However, costs remain to be paid on 2

of the cases. The estimated cost is a further £8,000 which would be paid in the 2005/06 financial year.

Of the 32 cases where the Council would receive costs, the total sum of £122,001.73 was due of which £115,798.73 had already been recovered during 2004/05 leaving costs on just 1 case of £6,203.00 outstanding. This should be recovered early in the 2005/06 financial year.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be noted.

(2) That the Head of Housing Services contact the Council's Press Office regarding an appropriate press release.

(3) That the Chair's thanks for the work carried out be conveyed to the staff concerned.

THE CHAIR AUTHORISED CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING ITEM TO ENABLE THE APPROPRIATE ARRANGEMENTS TO BE MADE.

201. SHELTERED HOUSING AND AGED PERSON'S ACCOMMODATION REVIEW

Further to Minute No. 196 of 21st March, 2005, the Head of Housing Services requested that the above item be referred to a special joint meeting of the Environment and Social and Community Support Scrutiny Panels for consideration.

It was noted that the Council, at its meeting on 6th April (Minute No. 93(3) refers), had referred the item back for further consideration.

Resolved:- That a joint meeting of the Environment and Social and Community Support Scrutiny Panels be convened to consider the issue together with a project plan proposing the way forward.

ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY PANEL
Thursday, 21st April, 2005

Present:- Councillor Hall (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor F. Wright); Councillors Burke, Clarke, Jackson, McNeely, Nightingale, Rushforth, P. A. Russell and The Mayor (Councillor F. Wright) together with Mr. D. Alderson (Housing Tenant Panel) and Mr. J. Carr (National Society for Clean Air)

Councillor Turner and Ms. J. Mullins were in attendance at the invitation of the Chairman.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Atkin, Hodgkiss, Vines, Mr. D. Willoughby and Scholey.

146. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS.

There were no members of the public and press present.

147. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

Councillor Burke declared a personal interest in Minute No. 149 (Member of the ALMO Board).

148. ROTHERHAM'S HOUSING STRATEGY 2004-07

The Housing Strategy Manager submitted Rotherham's Housing Strategy 2004-2007 which had been assessed by Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber and confirmed that it met the "Fit for Purpose" standard. This achievement would contribute positively to the Council's CPA score at the next assessment.

Production of a "Fit for Purpose" Housing Strategy must reach the Government's defined standard by demonstrating that it met the needs of Rotherham whilst at the same time addressing regional and national priorities. There were 10 specified criteria that must be met with a maximum score of 30 achieved in the Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber's assessment by scoring 3 for each element. The 10 specified criteria that must be met are:-

- Demonstrates a corporate context
- Contributes to wider priorities
- Evidence of partnership working
- Based on Needs analysis
- Resources identified and allocated
- Priorities identified
- Options considered
- Action Plan produced to deliver
- Information on previous progress
- Accessibility to a wider audience.

In addition, 3 key national, regional and local documents formed the background to shaping the Housing Strategy:-

- Sustainable Communities: Building for the Future
- Yorkshire and the Humber Regional Housing Strategy
- Rotherham's Community Strategy

These, together with the South Yorkshire Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder and the successful bid for ALMO status to achieve the Decent Homes target, had led to the setting of priorities and the development of the Housing Strategy.

Discussion ensued on the Strategy with the following points/issues raised:-

- As part of the process to achieve a 2* rating, the Excellence Plan had been updated to take account of the 2 separate assessments undertaken by the Audit Commission. At the end of the year, the audited Performance Indicators showed that approximately 94% had been achieved.
- The purpose of the Strategy was to try and set down what the needs were for the future and look at the availability of the current types of houses. There needed to be a greater range of choice and diversity in the type of housing and one that reflected the changing population of Rotherham. The Authority had an aging population and housing needs were changing in that area.
- The money that would be drawn down from the ALMO when the 2* status was achieved, would not only bring properties up to the Decent Homes Standard but improve the environment around the properties.
- The Decent Homes standard adopted by the Authority was higher than the standard set by Central Government. The standard set in the Investment Plan for the ALMO would be higher again.
- The Audit Commission would only assess an ALMO when it had been operational for a minimum of 6 months in order for a proper judgement to be given on its management capabilities, delivery and overall governance arrangements.
- The Programme Area had a total Capital Programme in excess of £43M for improving homes not just in the public sector. Part of that was money that would not come in until later in the year as part of the Decent Homes Programmes because it could not be committed until confirmation was received from the Government. In reality it would be January, 2006, but that did not mean there was no investment being made currently.
- Very clear information had been received from the Housing Needs Survey that there was no demand for certain types of accommodation in the Borough particularly 1 bedroom accommodation. It had been identified as a key issue in the Strategy. The ALMO's Investment Plan would look at innovative

schemes such as turning a 2 bedroomed bungalow into a 1 bedroom or using roof space.

- The Strategy was not set in stone and would be reviewed in conjunction with a number of other strategies and plans. The role of Housing was 1 element of tackling issues such anti-social behaviour in partnership with other agencies.

Resolved:- That the achievement of a Fit for Purpose Strategy, a first for Rotherham, be noted.

149. **2010 ROTHERHAM LTD. PERFORMANCE REPORTING ARRANGEMENTS TO THE COUNCIL 2005/06**

The Head of Neighbourhood Development submitted a report proposing the model for performance monitoring and reporting arrangements to the Council by 2010 Rotherham Ltd.

A thorough benchmarking exercise had been undertaken involving a number of rounds 1 and 2 ALMOs whose performance reporting arrangements had matured over time and were considered by the Audit Commission to be effective.

The most recent ALMO Audit Commission Inspection Reports had been reviewed to ascertain current Housing Inspectorate thinking. The inspection methodology had changed since the first 3 rounds of ALMO inspections and had seen the launch of Key Lines of Enquiry . A detailed review of recent inspection reports had been undertaken including Sheffield Homes, Barnet Homes, Golden Gates – Warrington and Gateshead Housing Company.

Following benchmarking, 3 reporting models had been drawn up as follows:-

Model 1

- (a) The ALMO reports performance to the ALMO Board and Area Boards
- (b) Cabinet Member is involved in decision making by scrutinising the ALMO's performance at quarterly Cabinet Member meetings through reports from the ALMO's Chief Executive
- (c) Scrutiny Panel scrutinise decisions made by the ALMO Board and Council Officers (including Cabinet Member). Potentially overriding decisions already made by the ALMO Board.

Model 2

- (a) The ALMO reports performance to the ALMO Board and Area Boards.
- (b) Cabinet Member scrutinises performance of the ALMO at quarterly Cabinet meetings
- (c) Scrutiny not involved within the process and receives the performance report for information only. Neighbourhood's Audit

Commission Relationship Manager suggests that there was a Scrutiny role as the ALMO was set up to deliver the Council's housing objectives – the approach needed to be seamless in that it should follow on from the ALMO Board's role in managing performance.

Model 3

- (a) The ALMO reports performance to the ALMO Board and Area Boards.]
- (b) Head of Neighbourhood Development and Cabinet Member are involved in assessing the performance of the ALMO, issuing written notices to the ALMO for compliance. This is to be done through quarterly performance and financial reports from the ALMO's Chief Executive.
- (c) Scrutiny Panel scrutinises Council Officers (including Cabinet Member) over the performance of the ALMO (CPA issues only) and other retained housing functions. Scrutiny recommend actions to the ALMO - Council Officers were accountable for improving performance overall.

Model 3 combined the best aspects of both reporting models and was similar to the model used in Sheffield (3 Stars) and Gateshead (excellent CPA rating for performance management). Following discussion with other ALMOs, it had been identified as the preferred Model as it demonstrated arms-length. There was clearly defined and structured accountability with the ALMO Board in charge of performance and the Council's Scrutiny Panel adding value to the process by making recommendations for improvement. This Model also appeared to fit the Council's shared neighbourhood objectives thus ensuring that the ALMO was accountable to the Council through its contribution to the neighbourhood agenda. The Model would have a positive impact on both Council and ALMO inspection ratings.

Discussion ensued on the 3 models. The following points were raised/clarified:-

- Quarterly reports would be submitted to the Cabinet Member the minutes of which would be submitted to the Scrutiny Panel.
- Rotherham 2010 would be an independent organisation that would report twice yearly to the Scrutiny Panel.
- Rotherham 2010 would deliver functions on behalf of the Council, which were clearly set out in the Delegation Arrangements, and in accordance with the Delivery Plan. It would deliver its services over a period of 12 months. Scrutiny and Elected Members had an opportunity to see the Delivery Plan before it was agreed with the Company. If it decided to deviate from that Plan, it had to secure agreement from the Council.
- The balance had to be struck between allowing Rotherham 2010 to proceed and deliver the services but not make any major changes in the way it delivered services with reference back to the Council.

- It had to be demonstrated to the Audit Commission that it was allowed to get on with the management and that the Council had explained what it wanted from it.
- Rotherham 2010 Ltd. was a company limited by guarantee. The Members of the Board, including 5 Elected Members, 5 independent and 5 tenant representatives, were effectively directors of the Company. There was no personal liability although they were responsible for overseeing the activities of the ALMO.
- If Rotherham 2010 achieved a surplus, in the Management Arrangement it stated that it could use it for any purpose which had been agreed with the Council in the Delivery Plan. If it was not in the Delivery Plan a proposal had to be submitted to the Council. The Management Arrangements would ensure that there were no losses but if there was, it was the Council that made the loss as it owned the Company.
- The ALMO was being created out of existing services and utilising existing service mechanisms. There would be a detailed legal contract, clear Management Agreement, financial management arrangements agreed with the Head of Corporate Finance and Performance Management Framework. A team of officers would monitor the day-to-day performance together with close and effective monitoring of the Service Level Agreements to ensure both parties were achieving value for money.
- The Area Boards, made up of Elected Members and tenant representatives, would be responsible for overseeing performance and service delivery in their area.

Resolved:- That, subject to any legal advice necessary, it be noted that the Scrutiny Panel supports Model 3 as the model by which 2010 Rotherham Ltd. will report to the Council.

150. BULKY ITEMS AND SPECIAL COLLECTIONS: PRICE REVIEW 200506

In accordance with Minute No. 194 of 21st March, 2005, the Waste Strategy Manager submitted proposed revised prices for the collection and disposal of bulky items and special collections from households.

This was the first review of charges made for bulky items and special collections since 1st May, 2003. The effects of inflation and the Government increasing Landfill Tax from £14 per tonne to £18 per tonne during the 2 year period also demanded a review of the pricing structure.

It was proposed that the price charged to the customer for the collection of a standard bulky item, including refrigerators, be increased by £2.00 to £10.00. This price meant that a standard bulky item collection was subsidised by the Council by £9.49 (52% of the cost).

A discounted price would be offered to Rothercard holders of 50% of the normal rate.

It was also proposed that the prices charged for the collection of larger orders and DIY items be increased in line with movement in inflation and Landfill Tax since the last review (Appendix 1 of the report submitted).

Discussion ensued on the report with the following comments made:-

- Those that were going to flytip would do so regardless of the charge.
- The charge was consistent with other authorities.
- The price increase should be publicised as well as the discount for Rothercard holders.
- Concern that flytipping had increased because of the charges for bulky item collection.
- Was collected flytipping segregated or taken straight to landfill?

Resolved:- That the above comments be passed to the Cabinet Member for Housing and Environmental Services.

151. CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

The Panel noted the decisions made under delegated powers by the Cabinet Member for Housing and Environmental Services held on 14th and 21st March, 2005.

152. CONFERENCE REPORT

The Scrutiny Adviser submitted a report on the LGA Fly Tipping Enforcement Conference, held on 2nd March, 2005, attended by Councillors McNeely (representing the Scrutiny Panel) and Swift (representing the Regeneration Scrutiny Panel).

The aim of the conference was to gather nationwide support for robust action against flytipping and looked at existing enforcement powers and the new powers proposed in Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Bill.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be noted.

(2) That a themed meeting be held on the subject of Fly Tipping Enforcement.

153. ASYLUM SEEKERS TEAM

The Scrutiny Adviser informed the Panel that arrangements had been made for interested Members to visit the Asylum Team on 9th May, 2005.

154. ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY PANEL

The minutes of the meeting held on 24th March, 2005, were noted.

It was noted that the first meeting was to be held of the Anti-Social Behaviour Clients Review on 28th April, 2005 (Minute No. 141 refers).

155. PERFORMANCE AND SCRUTINY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE

The minutes of the Performance and Scrutiny Overview Committee held on 11th March, 2005, were noted.

Resolved:- That the Head of Neighbourhood Development ascertain when an update would be submitted to the Panel on the development of the CPA framework particularly with regard to key lines of enquiry.

156. ASYLUM SEEKERS WORKING PARTY

The Panel noted the minutes of the Asylum Seekers Working party held on 30th March, 2005, attended by Councillors Sharman (in the Chair), Boyes and Ellis.

157. WARDENS AND CARETAKERS' REVIEW

It was noted that the draft report would be issued to officers for their comments.

158. WATER METERS

In response to a question raised by a Member, the Head of Housing Services reported that the decision to have a water meter fitted in a property was one for the tenant. It was a decision for the Council as to whether the utility company was allowed to install them in all properties.

PERFORMANCE AND SCRUTINY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE
Friday, 8th April, 2005

Present:- Councillor Stonebridge (in the Chair); Councillors Clarke, Hall, R. S. Russell, St.John, Sangster and Whelbourn.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Doyle, Hussain and G. A. Russell.

129. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

130. RACE EQUALITY SCHEME 2

Further to Minute No. 188 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 22nd March, 2005, Janet Spurling, Equalities and Diversity Officer introduced the report relating to a review of the Race Equality Scheme 2.

It was reported that, in line with the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 and the Statutory Code of Practice on the Duty to Promote Race Equality by May, 2005, the Council must carry out a full review of its Race Equality Scheme and the list of functions and policies which were assessed as relevant to the general duty to promote race equality.

The revised scheme must set out how the Council would meet the general duty to promote race equality and state Rotherham MBC's arrangements for meeting the specific duties. It should also include a clear, timetabled action plan and clear race equality priorities for the next three years.

A copy of the updated scheme was submitted.

Other specific duties were as listed below and the Council's arrangements for meeting these would be key areas of work for programme areas in the coming three years:-

- (a) Assess all functions and policies for relevance to the general duty to promote race equality and publish the list in the scheme.
- (b) Assess and consult on the likely impact of proposed policies on the promotion of race equality.
- (c) Monitor policies for any negative or adverse impact on race equality.
- (d) Publish the results of any assessments, consultation and monitoring.
- (e) Make sure there was public access to services and information.

2F PERFORMANCE AND SCRUTINY OVERVIEW COMMITTEE - 08/04/05

- (f) Provide training for staff in relation to the duties required by the Act.
- (g) Carry out detailed employment monitoring by ethnic group and publish the results each year.

As this was a revision of the existing scheme, it was proposed to publish the revised scheme in April, 2005 on the Council's website and invite comments and feedback on it. Hard copies of the scheme and summaries in other languages and formats would be available in the new financial year. It was planned to use various methods of internal and external communication to publicise the scheme widely.

A question and answer session ensued and the following issues were covered:-

- reporting arrangements.
- building on partnerships with voluntary community organisations.
- need for all scrutiny panels to challenge.
- need for clear statements on the website explaining the scheme.
- need to translate the proposed leaflet and put on the website.
- need to liaise with the Local Strategic Partnership and partners for commonality.

Resolved:- (1) That the information be noted.

(2) That quarterly monitoring reports be submitted to the Democratic and Resources Scrutiny Panel.

(3) That six monthly reports on progress and compliance issues be submitted to the Performance and Scrutiny Overview Committee.

(4) That the proposal to consult on the forthcoming action plan within the revised Race Equality Scheme by the end of April, 2005 and to publish the final action plan by 1st May, 2005 be noted.

131. AUDIT AND INSPECTION RECOMMENDATIONS - PROGRESS

Michael Walker, Performance and Quality Manager, presented the submitted report indicating that the Council's initial report in October, 2004 reviewed progress on recommendations arising from inspections and audits made since the 2002 Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA).

The submitted report identified that good progress had been made across a number of programme areas. Overall, 42 out of 536 recommendations had slipped target but there had been corrective action taken on most of those.

To maintain the corporate improvement agenda, sound progress must be made across a range of areas. In particular, the following key reports

would be subject to external scrutiny over the next twelve months:-

- Closedown of accounts – improved project management but needs close attention.
- Culture and leisure – forthcoming inspection in 2005/06.
- ALMO inspection – good progress but will continue to demand extensive management and monitoring eg repairs and maintenance.
- RBT governance – fundamental review of management arrangements – progress evident but still scope for improvement.
- Internal audit – some slippage.
- Policy into practice – stronger focus on financial management.
- Use of resources – significant challenge for the Council.
- Children services – new Children's Service will require significant investment and preparation for the joint area review.
- Financial management – draft report highlights significant issues.
- Procurement – follow up as part of CPA direction of travel assessment.

Submitted at Appendix 1 was an analysis on specific areas of slippage which related to:-

- Reviewing budget allocation.
- Assess unmet need and develop commissioning strategy.
- Increase administrative support to support managers and frontline staff.
- The Council should reconsider the organisational restructure.

Submitted at Appendix 2 was an overview of all external audit and inspection recommendations received over the last two years. Overall, there was strong evidence that the Council was addressing many of the recommendations.

Ongoing monitoring had highlighted several areas of inconsistency in how the Council handled recommendations. These were:-

- The way in which recommendations are presented through the Council's decision making processes. Some reports are presented to Corporate Management, Cabinet and scrutiny. Others by-pass part or whole of the process.
- Some progress reports fail to highlight slippage of targets or corrective action taken.
- In some cases recommendations from different audits are incorporated with larger service improvement plans. In some cases targets have been changed to fit into the larger plan. Where this is the case, it is essential the Council maintains focus on the key recommendations.

It was proposed that (a) all recommendations arising from external inspection/audit be considered at corporate management, Cabinet (or Cabinet Member) and Performance and Scrutiny Overview Committee level.

(b) Service Improvement Plans identify where there had been areas of slippage from previous targets indicating the reason and proposed corrective action.

A question and answer session ensued and the following issues were covered:-

- Policy into Practice..
- progress on policy review
- corporate governance.
- need for clear protocols and process for reports being submitted to Audit Committee, Performance and Scrutiny Overview Committee and the Scrutiny Panels.

Resolved:- (1) That the analysis undertaken by the Chief Executive's Office and response from programme areas action on specific issues raised as indicated in Appendix 1, be noted.

(2) That the issue relating to Policy into Practice be clarified and be reported to the Democratic and Resources Scrutiny Panel.

(3) That the Chief Executive be requested to ensure compliance and report back on progress.

132. MINUTES

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 11th March, 2005 be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

133. MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE MEMBERS CONSULTATION ADVISORY GROUP HELD ON 2ND MARCH, 2005

Resolved:- That the minutes of the above meeting be noted.

134. WORK IN PROGRESS

Members of the Committee reported on the following issues:-

(a) Councillor Whelbourn and Sioned-Mair Richards reported:-

- completion of the citizenship review.
- consideration of discussion papers from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister relating to Vibrant Local Leadership and Neighbourhood Working.
- the wish of the Democratic and Resources Scrutiny Panel to move to a six weeks cycle of meetings.

- work had begun on preparations for this year's Local Democracy Week in October, 2005.
- consideration of the pilot scheme for Area Assembly working. Consideration of whether or not to undertake a scrutiny review of area assemblies was deferred pending submission of a report from the Executive Director, Neighbourhoods on the vision of how area assemblies will work.

(b) Councillor R. S. Russell reported:-

- the Panel placed on record its thanks to all staff within the Streetpride Service and acknowledged the national awards that the Service had attained.
- the Panel affirmed its view that the Streetpride budget should be increased to continue the excellent work.
- the Panel expressed concern regarding insufficient resources in highways maintenance and the long term implications of this.
- concerns were expressed that some matters did not appear on the Forward Plan of Key Decisions.
- concerns raised regarding the call-in process and apparent lack of influence of scrutiny as far as Cabinet Members were concerned.
- the wish for the Regeneration Scrutiny Panel meetings to remain on a monthly cycle.

(c) Councillor Hall reported:-

- that the Wardens/Caretakers/Rangers review would be submitted shortly to this Committee.
- the Anti-Social Behaviour review was underway.
- that the frequency of Environment Scrutiny Panel meetings should remain on a monthly basis.
- that the Child Obesity Group had held its third meeting.

(d) Councillor Sangster reported:-

- that the Estates Regeneration Review was progressing.
- that the Health Scrutiny Working Group was considering joint scrutiny protocols next week.
- that the Chief Executive of the Ambulance Service was addressing the

Health Scrutiny Working Group next week.

- that the Chief Executive of the PCT was addressing the Health Scrutiny Working Group meeting on 22nd April, 2005.

(e) Councillor Stonebridge reported:-

- that the LSP Group had almost completed Phase 1 of the review.
- that the Local Government Association report regarding the Fire Service dispute was available.

135. CALL IN

There were no formal call-in requests.

(THE CHAIRMAN AUTHORISED CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS TO PREVENT ANY UNNECESSARY DELAY IN PROCESSING THE MATTERS REFERRED TO)

136. THE AUDIT COMMITTEE

The Committee noted the report considered by Cabinet at its meeting on 6th April, 2005 proposing that the Audit Committee should comprise five non-executive Members of the Council with effect from the Annual Council Meeting, 2005.

137. CABINET PORTFOLIOS

The Committee considered the report submitted to Cabinet at its meeting on 6th April, 2005 proposing revised portfolios for Cabinet Members to take effect from 20th May, 2005.

The Committee considered the submitted proposals.

Resolved:- (1) That the Committee's comments be as follows:-

- the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources should have responsibility for Internal Audit and Gershon savings.
- the Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration and Development Services should have responsibility for Health, Welfare and Safety issues.
- the Cabinet Member for Customer Services and Innovation should have responsibility for the Marketing Strategy.
- the Cabinet Member for Community Cohesion should have responsibility for Community Safety.

- clarification needs to be sought regarding the responsibility for Consultation Strategy between the Cabinet Member for Customer Services and Innovation and the Cabinet Member for Community Cohesion.
- the Notes 1 Section should also reflect a responsibility for sustainability and fairness.

(2) That a Special Meeting of this Committee be held on Friday, 15th April, 2005 to consider the organisation of scrutiny in light of the proposed Cabinet Portfolios. (All scrutiny panel members to be invited to the meeting)