

CABINET

**Venue: Town Hall, Moorgate
Street, Rotherham. S60
2TH**

Date: Wednesday, 18 July 2012

Time: 10.30 a.m.

A G E N D A

1. To consider questions from Members of the Public.
2. To determine if the following matters are to be considered under the categories suggested in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972.
3. To determine any item which the Chairman is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency.
4. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 4th July, 2012 (copy supplied separately)
5. Minutes of a meeting of the Members' Training and Development Panel held on Thursday, 21st June, 2012 (herewith) (Pages 1 - 5)
 - Strategic Director of Resources to report.
6. The Localisation of Business Rates - Statement of Intent May 2012 (report herewith) (Pages 6 - 11)
 - Strategic Director of Resources to report.
7. Discharge of Homelessness Statutory Duty (report herewith) (Pages 12 - 24)
 - Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods and Adult Services to report.
8. Yorkshire Highway Alliance Framework Agreement (report herewith) (Pages 25 - 28)
 - Strategic Director of Environment and Development Services to report.
9. Rotherham Development Demonstrator site for Early and Foundation Years (report herewith) (Pages 29 - 31)
 - Strategic Director of Children and Young People's Services to report.
10. Local Development Framework Spotlight Review (report herewith) (Pages 32 - 49)
 - Strategic Director of Environment and Development Services to report.

11. Local Government Pension Scheme Changes (report herewith) (Pages 50 - 54)
 - Strategic Director of Resources to report.
12. Exclusion of the Press and Public.

The following item is likely to be considered in the absence of the press and public as being exempt under Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended March 2006 – information relates to finance and business affairs).
13. New Discretionary Rate Relief Top Up Applications (report herewith) (Pages 55 - 57)
 - Strategic Director of Resources to report.

Extra Item:-

14. Review of Enabling Service (report herewith) (Pages 58 - 65)
 - Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods and Adult Services to report.

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	Meeting:	CABINET
2.	Date:	18TH JULY, 2012
3.	Title:	MEMBERS' TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PANEL MINUTES
4.	Directorate:	RESOURCES

5. Summary

To consider Members' training matters.

6. Recommendations

To receive the minutes of the meetings of the Members' Training and Development Panel held on 21st June, 2012.

7. Proposals and Details

To ensure implementation of the Council's Training and Development Policy in accordance with the meeting's Terms of Reference.

8. Finance

The Panel has its own training budget.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

Without proper training and support being in place there is a risk that Members' capacity to make decisions is not soundly based.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

To consider best practice in relation to Member training and development.

The aim is for every Elected Member to be given suitable opportunities for development and training to help support all aspects of their role.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

A copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Members' Training and Development Panel held on 21st June, 2012, are attached.

Contact Name : Caroline Webb, Senior Scrutiny Adviser, Resources Directorate –
Tel. 01709 822765 caroline.webb@rotherham.gov.uk

**MEMBERS' TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PANEL
THURSDAY, 21ST JUNE, 2012**

Present:- Councillor Akhtar (in the Chair); Councillors Dodson, Sharman, Smith, Steele, Whelbourn, Wootton and Mrs. C. Cockayne.

Apologies for Absence were received from Councillors Buckley, Gosling, Lakin, Pickering, Rushforth and G. A. Russell.

1. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 16TH FEBRUARY, 2012

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 16th February, 2012, were agreed as a correct record.

2. REQUESTS FOR TRAINING COURSES

Influential Audit Committee

Caroline Webb, Senior Scrutiny Advisor, reported on a request for attendance at the above CIPFA course to be held in Birmingham in September, 2012, at a cost of £295 + travel costs.

It was noted that there was a similar course being held in Bradford at a cost of £60.

Agreed:- (1) That the request for attendance at the CIPA course be not supported.

(2) That attendance at the Effective Audit Committees 2012 update to be held in Bradford be supported.

New Councillor Roadshow

Caroline Webb, Senior Scrutiny Advisor, reported that the above Roadshow, to be held in Leeds in September, was targeted at newly elected Councillors looking at LGA priorities, issues around the housing agenda, workforce issues etc.

Events on Community Budgeting are being offered at various locations, with the nearest being York.

Details would be circulated to Members.

The costs involved would be those of transport only.

Agreed:- (3) That attendance at the above be supported.

3. POLITICAL SKILLS FRAMEWORK

Tracey Parkin, HR Manager, reported on the new Political Skills Framework to support Member development published by the Local Government Association. The purpose of the Framework was to highlight the core knowledge and skills required of Councillors in the current climate so that development opportunities could be offered in the key areas.

The Members learning and development site on the intranet was currently being updated. It was the intention to use the themes in the Framework to group any learning and development opportunities. Members could also use the Framework individually to self-assess their skills to highlight where they might seek further development.

It was proposed that the Framework be adapted to be used in support of the Personal Development Planning and to categorise Member training. It was suggested that a working group be established to review the Framework consisting of a Member elected in 2011, a Cabinet Member and a Scrutiny Chair.

Following the review and design of Rotherham's Political Skills Framework, the model could be piloted with the Members elected in 2012 during September/October.

Agreed:- That the working group consist of Councillors Smith, Steele and 1 Member elected during 2011.

4. MEMBER DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES - JUNE ONWARDS

Consideration was given to the activities that had taken place and the planned programme for 2012/13 circulated by Caroline Webb, Senior Scrutiny Adviser highlighting:-

- A detailed programme had been put together as part of the induction for new Members
- Development of a generic programme based on issues emerging from earlier personal development plans and matters arising from the induction programme including
 - Community Leadership and use of social media
 - Public speaking
 - Updates on legislation and new Local Government agenda
 - Questioning skills for Scrutiny
 - Chairing skills
 - Handling the media
 - Equality and diversity
- Recent induction programme had included sessions on corporate parenting, safeguarding and emergency planning
- Development of e-learning resources

An evaluation would be undertaken of the recent induction sessions.

Carol Cockayne enquired as to whether the e-learning resource could be made available to Parish Councils.

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

(2) That Finance and Emergency Planning be included in the programme

(2) That a further report be submitted to the next meeting evaluating the induction programme

(3) That investigation take place into the feasibility of providing the e-learning induction courses to Parish Councils. A report to be presented back to the next meeting on a package for Members and Parish Councils.

5. SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS

Agreed:- That meetings for the 2012/2013 Municipal Year be held at 11.00 a.m. as follows:-

Monday, 10th September, 2012

17th December

11th March, 2013

10th June

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO CABINET

1	Meeting:	Cabinet
2	Date:	18 th July 2012
3	Title:	The Localisation of Business Rates – Statement of Intent May 2012
4	Directorate:	Resources

5 Summary

The report summarises five papers relating to the proposed Business Rates Retention Scheme published by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) on 17 May 2012.

6 Recommendations

Cabinet is asked to:

- **Note the contents of this report; and**
- **Approve the recommendation that the Council does not, at this stage, seek to participate in a Business Rates Pool.**

7 Proposals and Details

7.1 **Background** In July 2011 the DCLG published a Consultation Paper outlining Proposals for Business Rates Retention which would take effect from April 2013. This was followed by a series of 8 technical papers on 19th August 2011. Consultation on the proposals lasted until October last year. In December the Government issued its proposed scheme for Business Rates Retention and the legislative framework for the scheme which is part of the Local Government Finance Bill. On 17th May this year, five additional papers on the scheme were published.

7.2 The papers cover:

- Central and local shares of Business Rates;
- The safety net and levy arrangements;
- The treatment of renewable energy projects;
- The pooling prospectus; and
- The economic benefits of local Business Rates Retention.

7.3 **Central and Local Shares of Business Rates.** This is probably the most significant of the papers. It had always been intended that the Business Rates Retention scheme would operate within the spending control totals set out in the 2010 Spending Review (SR 2010). This was to support the Government's policy of deficit reduction. As business rates receipts were forecast to be higher than planned local authority spending, this was to have been achieved by the Government taking back the extra business rates receipts as this was a fixed sum all the risk of lower rates receipts fell on authorities. It is now proposed that a percentage of receipts will be retained centrally. This approach, in effect shares the risk of business rates receipts being lower than forecast, however authorities' reward for generating additional rates growth is reduced.

7.4 The Statement of Intent indicates that the Government's central share will be set at **50%** - and that this will be fixed until the system is reset. DCLG has indicated resets will occur every 10 years.

7.5 This percentage is significantly larger than had been assumed in the Council's original projections – in line with other authorities the assumption had been that it would be in the region of 15%. Setting the central share at 50% would mean that the amount retained by local authorities (the other 50%) would be below the level of local government spending set out for 2013/14 and 2014/15 in SR2010. **This will be addressed by the Government providing the remaining allocation by means of Revenue Support Grant (RSG).**

7.6 Such an approach will allow the DCLG greater flexibility with respect to the resources it provides to local government. It should be noted that the Chancellor's recent budget statement (21/03/2012) indicated a potential 3.8% real terms reduction in Departmental Expenditure Limits across central government. Given Government's announcements on protecting Schools and the NHS, it is likely that local government **will have to shoulder a greater burden** of these real term reductions.

7.7 The treatment of factors such as reliefs (mandatory and discretionary), costs of collection, losses on collection, payments to major precepting authorities (e.g.

Police and Fire) and tariffs and top ups is still being considered and further consultation over the summer is planned.

- 7.8 In addition a **number of specific grants will be rolled into RSG** – these include the 2011/12 Council Tax Freeze Grant and funding for Council Tax Support (benefits) as well as environmental and health grants, however the methodology for including these specific grants is not set out in the paper. A full list of these specific grants is included at **Appendix 1**.
- 7.14 RSG allocations for 2013/14 and 2014/15 will be published in the 2013/14 Local Government Finance Report which will be released in late November or early December this year. Allocations will be aligned with the 2012/13 distribution Formulae, updated for new data (e.g. from the 2011 Census) and possible formula changes. As a result, **in spite of the introduction of business rates retention, local authorities will continue to depend on the allocation of grant from central government for a substantial element of their funding.**
- 7.14 **Safety Net and Levy** – these are linked as the safety net will be funded by the levy.
- The safety net will be triggered if an authority sees its income drop below its baseline funding by more than a set percentage – this will be **7.5% to 10%**. (It is intended to discuss this range in the next few weeks with the threshold being published in the summer). The Council's current allocation from the national business rates pool is £113m and on the basis of 50% of this - the threshold proposals would suggest the loss of £4-6m before the safety net came into operation.
 - The levy will be proportional for every 1% increase in business rates an authority's income will increase by 1%. **For top up authorities, like Rotherham, this would mean no levy is payable.**
- 7.14 **Renewable Energy** - as indicated in the initial proposals all business rates revenue from new (post 01/04/2013) renewable energy projects will be retained in full by authorities. The potential implications for Rotherham are not known at this point.
- 7.14 **Pooling Prospectus** – the paper sets out the potential opportunities of pooling and the process for formally designating pools. Pooling is whereby local authorities across a geographical area e.g. South Yorkshire, sharing the benefits of economic growth investment across the wider area and managing volatility in business rates income levels. Pooling is voluntary, and:
- The geographic coverage of a pool will be determined by authorities as will pool governance;
 - Authorities can belong to only one pool;
 - One pool member will act as lead authority;
 - There will be no additional financial incentive for pooling (although this may be an option in future)
 - The Government may refuse to authorise pools if it is considered that their operation would affect the funding for the safety net.
 - The timetable requires that authorities submit expressions of interest in pooling by **27 July 2012**, the DCLG will then will then work with those

authorities to support the development of proposals for consultation in September and designations will be announced in **November this year**.

At present authorities in Yorkshire and Humberside have in general not expressed an interest in pooling. In light of this and given; the tight timescales for rates, localisation, the other changes to local authority funding being brought in from April 2013 and the additional complexity that pooling would introduce to the proposals, officers would recommend that the Council does not at this stage seek to participate in a Business Rates Pool.

- 7.13 **The Economic Benefits of Local Business rates Retention** – in order to gauge the likely economic impact of business rates retention a simulation exercise has been undertaken. A range of simulations showed that over a 7 year reset period a 50% rates localisation scheme would create an increase in Gross Domestic Product of between £1.7bn and £19.9bn with a middle case scenario of £10.1bn.
- 7.14 The analysis indicates that the incentive for councils would be larger if there were no central share – **in the LGA's view the Government has opted for control of local authority funding over the promotion of economic growth.**

8. Finance

The financial issues are discussed in section 7 above.

9 Risks and Uncertainties

- 9.1 The current proposals with respect to the central share of the rates pool are significantly different from the initial assumptions and given that, as yet, there remain some significant elements to be consulted upon and resolved, **the detailed implications of the new scheme for Rotherham (and other local authorities) will not be able to be fully assessed until the 2013/14 and 2014/15 settlements are announced this Winter.**
- 9.2 In addition to the localisation of business rates income, changes in formula grant calculations and data are also planned, which could generate variations in the allocations to authorities. Once fixed the proposals on resets (para 7.4 above) indicate that the pattern of grant allocations will not be reassessed until 2020.
- 9.3 In spite of the scale of the changes and the issues yet to be resolved, the timescale for implementing this major change is very tight – for example authorities have until July 27th to submit proposals for pooling.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Redistributed Business Rates from the National Pool currently comprise the largest element of Formula Grant funding received by the Council and their localisation is part of the most significant change in the funding of local government since the introduction of the Community Charge in 1990. Along with the transfer of responsibility for the funding of Council Tax Support (formerly Council Tax Benefit) and impact of other major welfare reforms the

resourcing of local government services will be altered radically. **As indicated throughout the report there is considerable uncertainty with respect to the implications of the proposal for local government and the timescales for the change are very tight.**

11. Background Papers and Consultation

- DCLG Papers – including Statement of Intent 17 May 2012
- Briefings from the Local Government Association and SIGOMA

Contact Name: *Anne Ellis, Financial Services - Finance Manager (Strategic Finance)*, anne.ellis@rotherham.gov.uk tel 22019.

APPENDIX 1

Specific Grants to be Rolled into Mainstream Funding

- Bus Service Operators Grant – London buses element only
- 2012/12 Council Tax Freeze Grant
- Council Tax Support Grant
- Early Intervention Grant
- GLA General Grant
- A proportion of GLA Transport Grant
- Homelessness Prevention Grant
- A proportion of Lead Local Flood Authority Grant
- Department of Health Learning Disability and Health Reform Grant
- A proportion of Sustainable Drainage Systems Maintenance Costs Grant.

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet
2.	Date:	18th July 2012
3.	Title:	Discharge of Homelessness Statutory Duty
4.	Programme Area:	Neighbourhoods and Adult Services

5. Summary

The purpose of this report is to seek approval to discharge homelessness duty through a suitable offer of private rented accommodation.

The Localism Act introduces a significant change to how local authorities can choose to discharge their duty to people for whom they have accepted responsibility under homelessness law. The Act gives the Council “the power” to fulfil their duty by an offer of rented accommodation from a private landlord. The private tenancy must be for a minimum term of twelve months and would need to meet the other requirements of suitability currently applied to offers of social housing, such as standards and number of bedrooms. If the applicant becomes unintentionally homeless again within two years of accepting a private rented sector offer, the main homelessness duty will recur regardless of priority need.

The Government has also published consultation on the draft Homelessness (Suitability of Accommodation) (England) Order 2012. This consultation runs for eight weeks from 31 May 2012 to 5pm on 26 July 2012. The Suitability Order will set out the circumstances in which accommodation used for the purposes of a private rented sector offer to end the main homelessness duty is not to be regarded as suitable.

The Localism Act will be brought into force, in stages, by commencement orders. The Government have indicated that the homelessness part of the Localism Act will come into force late summer; as yet there is no definite date but should start some time after the Suitability Order consultation period has ended.

It should be noted that a review of roles and responsibilities within the Housing Options team has been implemented in order to respond to changes to the Homelessness Legislation.

6. Recommendations

That Cabinet Agrees:

- **TO USE THE POWER TO DISCHARGE STATUTORY HOMELESSNESS DUTY THROUGH A SUITABLE OFFER IN THE PRIVATE RENTED SECTOR**

7. Proposals and Detail

7.1 People who experience a homelessness crisis need somewhere suitable to live. Councils have a duty to house people who are homeless, eligible, in priority need and unintentionally homeless. This is known as the main homelessness duty. Under the previous legislation, people who became homeless were able to refuse offers of accommodation in the private rented sector, and insist that they should be housed in expensive temporary accommodation until a long-term social home becomes available.

The Localism Act allows local authorities to meet their homelessness duty by providing good quality private rented homes. This option could provide an appropriate solution for people experiencing a homelessness crisis, at the same time as freeing up social homes for other people in need on the waiting list.

7.2. There is no definite commencement date but the Government have indicated that when the changes come into force they will 'apply only to new applications made on or after commencement, i.e., not to applications made before that date, even though a duty may still be owed to these households'.

The use of private sector offers (PRSO) will be optional but the Council will need to decide whether to take advantage of this power.

7.3 The Government consultation, **Homelessness (Suitability of Accommodation Order)** has recently been published. It sets out the circumstances in which a private rented sector offer (PRSO) cannot be used to end the main homelessness duty.

The consultation ends on 26th July 2012. It is proposed that the determination of suitability will be influenced by five factors:

1. Physical condition of the property
2. Health and safety matters (e.g. gas, electrical and fire safety)
3. Licensing for Houses in Multiple Occupation
4. Landlord behaviour; and
5. Elements of good management

The consultation contains 6 questions which are detailed in Appendix 1. Local authorities, agencies working with homeless households and private landlords are encouraged to respond. Rotherham's response from the Local Authority will be signed off at Overview and Scrutiny Management Board on 16th July 2012.

7.4 Rising Homelessness - Nationally there were 2,830 applicants that were accepted as owed a main homelessness duty between 1 October and 31 December 2011. This is 18 per cent higher than during the same quarter of 2010.

Homelessness in Rotherham is also rising after a long period during which both homeless acceptances and use of temporary accommodation fell.

During 2010/11, 645 households were prevented from becoming homeless. (170 were helped to remain in their home and 472 households received assistance in finding alternative accommodation.)

This is a considerable increase from 2009/10 when only 432 households were prevented from becoming homeless. (121 were helped to remain in their home and 310 households received assistance in finding alternative accommodation.)

7.5 Given the fact that homelessness is likely to continue to rise, and that the demand for social housing is extremely high (whilst provision may fall, because of issues such as the new Right to Buy scheme) we need to do all we can to offer support and advice throughout the whole homelessness process. But we will not be able to meet demand and consequently we will offer people a poorer service, unless we make use of the opportunities that the private rented sector provides.

This report addresses the policy options for delivering homelessness services post commencement date and then continues on to explain how we can deliver a customer focussed, modern, effective service through reconfiguring staff roles, systems and processes.

7.6 Suggested Approach Post Commencement Order

In preparation for the Localism Act, the Housing Options service has already started to make changes to the way customers are assisted in the Property Shop. The report summaries a potential new approach to dealing with homelessness that is both lawful and also maximizes the resources and options available to meet demand.

People presenting as homeless, could be offered the choice of two possible means to address their housing requirements:

7.7 The Prevention Route

In this option, applicants could:

- a) Remain on Rotherham's Housing Register. Their application category will be enhanced to the General plus group and the household will be able to continue to bid for Council or Housing Association tenancies like anyone else.
- b) Remain with relatives or friends and find PRS accommodation themselves in their own timescale. The Council would assist them by providing practical help from Rotherham's Rent in Advance or Bond guarantee schemes.
- c) Remain with relatives and friends, the Council would help by providing offers of private rented accommodation through the Key Choices Letting Scheme.

To encourage take up of the prevention route the limited supply of PRS accommodation available in Rotherham through the Key Choices scheme will be tailored to the needs of homeless households that choose the prevention option.

Homeless households may prefer this option due to a number of reasons:

- Private Rented accommodation would be available on the day of approaching the service which would immediately alleviate their homelessness and meet their needs.

- The prevention route could be a 6 month AST with a promise by the landlord to renew.
- There maybe little Council Stock in the areas of their choice
- They will have choice and control of their housing options
- If they choose not to take this route, and the council through its duty to investigate determines that the household is intentionally homeless, they will not be awarded any priority status for rehousing.

7.8 The Homelessness Application Route

Under this option, the council will be required to undertake a full assessment as to the applicability of the homelessness duty. It is important to remain robust for investigations into homelessness for those that proceed to an application. The target to conclude all homelessness decisions will be 33 working days, with a local target to resolve less complex cases within 48 hours.

An initial assessment at the first interview stage will consider whether or not all of the relevant information is available to undertake the homelessness assessment. Where the information is available to the front line team the target to conclude the homelessness decision will be 48 hours from the time of the initial interview. The initial interview will be structured to obtain all of the evidence at the interview itself followed by rapid inquiries to ensure that a 48 hours local target is met. The customer will be advised at the initial interview the date when the homelessness decision will be concluded.

In more complex cases where more information is required and isn't available within the 48 hour target, such as Mortgage Rescue, work to gather the information will commence as quickly as possible. The Government target to conclude decisions is 33 working days; this will also be the local target for complex cases. The customer will be advised at the initial interview the date when the homelessness decision will be made.

Where households are in need of temporary accommodation the homeless application route must be taken. The household can remain in temporary accommodation until the homelessness enquiries are concluded. If a homelessness duty is owed, the temporary accommodation will remain available until a suitable offer is made at this point the statutory duty will be discharged.

Where it is concluded that the applicant meets all the homelessness criteria the successful applicant will be offered one suitable tenancy offer (which maybe a 12 month tenancy in the PRS) or a council or housing association tenancy. At this point the Council will have met its responsibilities under homelessness legislation and the full homelessness duty will be discharged. If the 12 month PRSO was accepted and if the applicant subsequently becomes unintentionally homeless again within two years of accepting the private rented sector offer, the main homelessness duty will recur regardless of priority need.

Cases that are not accepted as being owed the full homeless duty will have to make their own arrangements, but will be given advice and assistance to do so, through other routes in the Allocation Policy.

In short the prevention route option would give an applicant more choice of area and is therefore likely to be chosen as the default option. The applicant may be given several offers for prevention but only one offer under the homeless application route and then only if the case is accepted as passing all the statutory legal homelessness tests.

Homeless households may prefer to take up the application route due to a number of reasons:

- If there is little stock of private rented accommodation in their area of choice
- No PRSO available
- Affordability of PRSO which is dependent on their circumstances and income

It should be explained to those that reject the prevention option and continue to a homeless application that there is a risk as there will be no guarantee that the case will be accepted as homeless, in priority need and unintentionally homeless and that if the case fails on one or more of those tests no accommodation help through homelessness assistance will be given. (Depending on the customer's circumstances their application will be assisted through the Housing Register)

7.9 Existing accepted Homeless Cases including those in temporary accommodation

By the date of commencement of the homelessness clauses in the Localism Act Rotherham will still have cases that are accepted as homeless and in temporary accommodation. These households will be protected under the current legislative rules.

7.10 Delivering the Housing Options Service in the future

The result of new legislation is likely to be that more of the total staff resource in Housing options will need to be deployed on the prevention of homelessness and accessing the PRS functions as opposed to undertaking homelessness decisions. If the local authority adopts the power to end the duty in the PRS, and is able to ensure that there is sufficient PRS supply available to meet this power, it is likely that homelessness applications/investigations will fall considerably and homelessness preventions will increase. This is because households will be encouraged to take up the opportunities in the private rented sector. We have currently got the right staffing resources in place to deal with homelessness advice requests but staff will need to be deployed to either the fast track team or complex case load team, both will be supported with the correct prevention tools. The teams will continue to offer a supportive role for customers in terms of financial advice, disrepair issues, social care etc.

This has four key implications for how the Housing Options service is delivered in Rotherham.

- 1) There will be the opportunity to deliver homelessness assessments and decisions faster, whilst remaining robust, at the front end of the service without the requirement for long investigations.

- 2) Although households at risk of homelessness are likely not to seek to access the service through the statutory homelessness route they will still be in need of prevention and options help to stay in their home or to find alternative accommodation.
- 3) There will be more opportunities to improve the standards of private sector homes. Current processes ensure that before an offer of private rented accommodation is made the property is inspected to identify any Health and Safety Hazards, this is to ensure the property is decent and of good quality. This process is already in place where applicants require a loan for rent in advance a bond. Consideration will need to be made to the terms of the new suitability order which may include assessing the landlord aswell as the property. Following the consultation of the Suitability Order, guidance will be issued by Government but it is anticipated that the assessment of a “Fit and Proper Landlord” will be through a self assessment process.
- 4) For Rotherham to make new legislation work effectively in reducing statutory homelessness, accessing the PRS will become the ‘business critical’ part of the Housing Options service. PRS accommodation will be needed at the ‘front end’ of the service where officers need to be able to sell the PRS prevention option on the basis that accommodation is available now.

Put simply, if there is insufficient suitable PRS accommodation available the ‘prevention option’ and front end staffing advice resources prevention options cannot be negotiated and the duty cannot be ended, resulting in social housing remaining the fall back default option and households continuing to access social housing through that route. This will require the Housing Options Service to deploy sufficient staff resources to provide a front end generic fast track decision making team, dovetailed by a complex decision making team and PRS procurement and landlord support functions to bring in a sufficient supply of PRS accommodation.

There are distinct work streams to deliver the modernised service which is detailed in appendix 2.

8. Finance

8.1 Increased usage of temporary accommodation will present a significant financial cost to the council, if the use of private sector accommodation is not utilized. The cost of dealing with 1 homeless application placed in temporary accommodation as defined by Government ranges from £3k to £5k; by using the private rented sector more widely will prevent any pressure on the general fund.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

9.1 Without adopting the power to discharge the Authorities duty by use of a 12 month private rented sector offer there is a risk that the use of temporary accommodation will increase and the number of homeless acceptances will

continue to rise. Any change to the Policy must ensure that the needs of vulnerable and hard to reach groups are addressed, and the Council's statutory obligations are met. The Policy must be delivered in a transparent way to ensure it is fair, and seen to be fair.

9.2 The changes need to make sure that we continue to fulfil our statutory duties in terms of the Housing Act and Homelessness provisions. To ensure that the changes we are proposing to introduce under the Localism Act meet our already existing statutory requirements, we are continuing to work very closely with Government Advisors, staff are attending homelessness legislation training, the managers are liaising with National Housing Advice Service and meet quarterly with other Local Authorities at the Sub Regional Homelessness Forum.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

10.1 The Policy is delivered at a local level and via the Key Choices Property Shop, which supports the Council's commitment to providing greater accessibility to services, meeting social needs by helping to ensure a better quality of life, improving fair access and choice, protecting, keeping safe vulnerable people and specifically addresses the diversity agenda, by tailoring services to the needs of hard to reach groups.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

11.1 The proposed changes have been informed by the Localism Act 2011, with Elected Members, Legal Services, Supporting People and the Private Sector Officer have also been consulted on these proposed changes. Background papers are; the Homelessness Act 2002, Housing Act 1996, Parts VI and VII, Localism Act 2011, Performance and Quality Homelessness Service Review.

Contact Name:

*Sandra Tolley, Housing Options Manager, Housing and Neighbourhood Services,
Tel: 01709 255619, Email sandra.tolley@rotherham.gov.uk*

Appendix 1

Homelessness (Suitability of Accommodation) (England) Order 2012 – Consultation

The proposed Suitability Order focuses specifically on physical and management standards.

A summary of the questions are:

- Question 1:** Do you agree that these five areas should be important in determining whether accommodation is to be regarded as not suitable?
- Question 2:** Do you agree with the proposed requirements as set out in detail above? Please give details and reasons.
- Question 3:** Are there any additional elements that should form part of the Order or any other comments you wish to make?
- Question 4:** Do you agree that the existing provisions on location and suitability should be strengthened so that homeless households are placed nearer to home wherever possible?
- Question 5:** Do you agree that regulations should specify the factors in relation to location which authorities should take into account when considering the suitability of accommodation?
- Question 6:** Do you agree that those factors listed above are the ones local authorities should take into account when considering location?

Appendix 2

Roles of Housing Advice and Homelessness team

There are 2 distinct work streams to deliver the modernised service Homelessness and Advice Service

Work stream 1 –The front end same day contact. The aim is to deliver the functions for homelessness prevention, housing options and housing applications and homelessness assistance through a Property Shop team front facing that would be responsible for delivering advice and actions for the cases at the first point of contact. **The case load will be fast tracked at a maximum of 48 hours turnaround.**

This team will continue to manage the Housing Register and oversee the Allocation and Local lettings Policies.

Work stream 2 – consists of the casework function responsible for ‘complex or time consuming’ casework. This would be the more complex cases where possible more investigatory work where home visiting functions are delivering:

- Complicated Part 7 homelessness enquiries, decisions and reviews.
- Complex homeless prevention casework for debt, mortgage arrears and similar complex cases and cases where success is more likely to depend on time consuming direct or telephone intervention with landlords, parents or work with applicants themselves.
- Placements into temporary accommodation, move on and resettlement.

The case work will have a target of 33 days to complete

Housing Advice Team Delivered at the Front End same day office based 48 hours Target for Decisions	Homelessness Team Dealt with through Casework 33 working day target for decisions
Housing Applications and Lettings	Housing Applications and Lettings
Verifying identity and address Undertaking telephone or face to face interview to assess housing register application and priority Banding applicants, confirming band and registration date	Any home visits required to confirm housing application circumstances Complex assessments involving eligibility, social or welfare issues, where preference is to be reduced, complex medical requirements or any other applications that require discretion. Complex verification issues
Receiving, assessing and actioning any change of circumstances Position bands/points and housing prospects and options re areas of choice, PRS alternative, mobility, etc. Options through mobility and prospects if they were to join housing register of another provider or council	Appeals and Reviews under Part 6 Housing Act.
Identifying whether notice is correct or incorrect notices for ASTs section 21 and any discretionary grounds for seeking possession on ASTs Identifying other forms of tenure including licences and tenancies and whether notice given is correct Identify presenting problem that has led to the notice by talking to customer, landlord and third parties and negotiating and taking any actions to resolve problems.	HMO regulations and licensing breaches Threats of illegal eviction or actual illegal eviction Protection from eviction cases where landlord is not prepared to follow advice given by front end team. Complex
Homelessness Prevention Assist in Private Rented accommodation through prevention route, bond and rent in advance referrals	Homelessness Prevention Assist in Private Rented accommodation through prevention route, bond and rent in advance referrals

<p>Homelessness Applications, Assessments and Decisions Keeping the service safe from legal or Ombudsman challenge by recording whether any initial approach for housing assistance has led to a Part 7 Homelessness application being triggered using standard outcome form.</p> <p>Where applications triggered and enquiries can be conducted same day and decision straightforward assessing and issuing a decision on the application. Issuing all straightforward negative homeless decisions. All decisions within 48 hours from initial interview</p>	<p>Homelessness Applications, Assessments and Decisions - More complex homeless applications, enquiries and decisions within 33 working days.</p> <p>Placements into temporary accommodation</p> <p>Offers of 12 month PRSO to discharge duty</p> <p>Homelessness assessment if re approach in 2 years</p>
<p>Defending possession cases - Identifying that possession action is at a stage where emergency action to mount a defence is required and referral into casework.</p> <p>Where a conflict of interest brought about by possession action from the council itself advising customer on list of solicitors or agencies who may be able to assist in defending possession.</p>	<p>Defending possession cases - Court representation Interviews and investigating whether a defence can be mounted to possession and eviction.</p> <p>Completing paperwork to provide a defence against possession and entering paperwork into court.</p> <p>Negotiation with landlords on resolution.</p> <p>Possession proceeding against tenants of mortgage defaulting home owners.</p>
<p>Identifying any disrepair problem that results in risk of homelessness, talking to customer and landlord and negotiating and taking any actions to resolve problems.</p> <p>Referral to Private Sector Housing or Environmental Health for HSSA inspection</p>	<p>Serious disrepair, HSSA cat 1 hazards, closing orders, etc where urgent action is required.</p> <p>Complex or time consuming negotiations with landlords</p> <p>Joint visits with private Sector Housing or Environmental Health</p> <p>Casework where rent have been withheld by the tenant to offset against lack of action on repairs</p>
<p>Identifying HB problem that results in risk of homelessness, talking to customer, landlord, Housing Benefit service and negotiating and taking any actions to resolve problems.</p> <p>Helping applicant to make a claim for backdating of HB claim</p> <p>Verifying paperwork for HB and fast tracking documents to get</p>	<p>Any on-going casework arising from responses from HB service to any of the initial actions taken.</p>

<p>claims into payment where this has led to delays.</p> <p>Helping applicant to make a claim for a Discretionary Housing payment</p> <p>Making or helping applicant to make a claim for safeguarding rent direct to landlord payment</p> <p>Identifying any shortfall in rent and rent arrears including negotiation on paying off rent arrears.</p>	
<p>Identifying problem such as behaviour that has resulted in risk of homelessness, talking to customer, landlord, and third parties and negotiating and taking any actions to resolve problems.</p>	
<p>Identifying number of primary and second charge lenders and level of arrears and what stage any possession action has reached.</p>	<p>Undertaking detailed mortgage difficulties interview, taking actions and providing advice on options.</p> <p>Referral to specialist debt and money advice.</p> <p>Identifying primary and second charge lender action and whether pre action protocol has been followed.</p> <p>Negotiation with primary and second charge lenders including agreement to write off debt or convert to an unsecured debt and repayment plan.</p> <p>Advice on voluntary sale, shared ownership and other options.</p> <p>Assessing case against criteria for Mortgage Rescue scheme or any other national assistance scheme.</p>
<p>Identifying and clarifying the level of rent or mortgage arrears and checking what benefits the customer is accessing including housing benefit where appropriate.</p> <p>Undertaking a basic income and expenditure exercise and identifying priority debts.</p> <p>Helping a customer on HB to apply for Discretionary Housing payment where appropriate and how to access other grants and loans such as budgeting loans, crisis loans, etc</p>	<p>Detailed income and expenditure interviews where level of arrears is a serious risk to homelessness.</p> <p>Negotiating on customer's behalf with landlords, lenders to reach agreement on managing priority and non-priority debts and paying off arrears.</p> <p>Detailed consideration of financial circumstances and whether income could be maximised through any unclaimed benefits.</p>

<p>Giving basic advice on debt management and paying rent and arrears where arrears or rent shortfall is small. Referring cases to external or internal debt advice provided on line, by telephone, or 'face to face' such as CAB.</p>	<p>Any follow up liaison for housing and homelessness prevention work arising from formal debt and money advice outcome.</p>
<p>Basic advice on housing rights in relationship breakdown cases Where to see legal advice and support</p>	<p>Full assessment and advice on housing rights and legal remedies in a housing context Advice on obtaining safe accommodation, a refuge or applying to another local authority out of area. Assessment for any sanctuary scheme Homelessness applications and decisions relating to reasonable to occupy and relationship breakdown and domestic abuse cases.</p>
<p>Housing prospect, housing options for alternative accommodation and awareness of lack of social housing opportunities. Referral or signposting to any other agencies that can provide help including self-help information on website Issuing Housing Options information packs and any relevant leaflets and information. Any low cost shared ownership opportunities and assessment against criteria and a financial initial assessment of eligibility followed by referral to Zone Agent RSL. Advice on rough sleeping services and practical help including getting outreach services involved where claim is that the person is sleeping rough or at risk of doing so. Assessing customer against Homeless Prevention Fund Payment criteria where appropriate and filling out application for fund payment, seeking approval and making payment to landlord.</p>	

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet
2.	Date:	18th July 2012
3.	Title:	Yorkshire Highway Alliance Framework Agreement All Wards
4.	Directorate:	Environment and Development Services

5. Summary

The report seeks Cabinet approval for the Council to join the Yorkshire Highway Alliance.

The YHA will enable highway authorities in the Yorkshire and Humberside region to work together to improve the delivery of several aspects of highways services in our respective areas and regionally.

6. Recommendations

That Cabinet is requested to resolve that:

The Council join the Yorkshire Highway Alliance (YHA) and appropriate officers be appointed to represent the Borough on its Boards and Working Groups.

7. Proposals and Details

Background

The Yorkshire Highway Alliance will be introduced by local authorities in the Yorkshire and Humberside region with the common interests of improving performance and making efficiency savings in the delivery of highway services working in collaboration, through a series of framework agreements. The Alliance will have 13 founding members including Sheffield City Council, Barnsley MBC and Doncaster MBC.

Highway authorities in the YHA will work together to improve procurement of highway supplies and services, so that users recognize that services are both efficient and improving.

The underlying ethos of the YHA will be:

- A flexible approach to the Procurement of Highway Services and Goods based on an inter-authority strategy
- The further development of Best Value, VfM and Construction Best Practice using the partnering approach for the procurement of private sector partners involving the whole of the relevant supply chains
- The rationalisation of systems & procedures enabling duplication of effort and administrative and support costs to be reduced for the YHA Members
- The opportunity to foster innovation within the YHA and to make financial savings
- The creation of more open processes & performance benchmarking partnerships through regional initiatives and with other highway authorities
- The development of skills to help implement and deliver Best Practices across the YHA.

Aim and Objectives

Aim

To help authorities improve highway services in Yorkshire and to deliver efficiency savings and improved Value for Money (VfM) from them.

Objectives:

1. To develop and use a collaborative framework to deliver medium size civil engineering schemes for County, Unitary & District Councils and Passenger Transport Executives.
2. To develop, establish and implement a continuous improvement model for highway services to achieve convergence to Best Practices, initially concentrating on Term Maintenance.
3. To establish and develop other collaborations for highway activities, such as Professional services, “back office” services, delivery of skills development & training and benchmarking/VfM assessments as agreed by its Members.
4. To promote Collaborative Procurement, such as purchasing winter salt as agreed by its Members.
5. To embed partnering principles and construction Best Practice in all its work and throughout the supply chains.
6. To collaborate to minimise waste and the environmental impact of any interventions.
7. To encourage economic regeneration and help sustain local businesses.
8. To promote & publicise the work of the YHA and to act as a voice for Yorkshire.

Joint working will enhance what could be achieved from individual highway authorities' service budgets and that the rationalisation of systems, processes and practices will improve the delivery of service provision. In turn, this will provide better value because the learning process will help all YHA Members individually and service users in the wider context.

The YHA will provide opportunities to monitor service delivery by each of its Members both for themselves & for each other and to compare with the private sector. Performance and processes of all YHA Members will be benchmarked.

8. Finance

The Annual subscription to be part of the alliance is payable and is currently £5,000 per annum. It is intended that these fees are funded from the LTP Maintenance funding Block. However, the YHA Board shall be at liberty to waive any Annual Subscription due from an YHA Member, in the reasonable opinion of the Board, if such an YHA Member provides a significant amount of staff time equivalent to or in excess of the relevant Annual Contribution and such staff time is specifically directed towards the achievement of the YHA's aim & objectives.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

Membership of the YHA will provide an opportunity to reduce the financial pressure on reduced highway maintenance budgets through collaborative working.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Membership of the YHA will better enable Streetpride achieve the Corporate Plan commitment to make sure roads and footpaths meet at least national average standards with an outcome for safe and well maintained roads.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

The Yorkshire Highway Alliance Agreement 2011

Contact Name : **Colin Knight, Network Manager, Streetpride Service, extension 22828, colin.knight@rotherham.gov.uk**

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet
2.	Date:	18th July 2012
3.	Title:	Rotherham Development Demonstrator site for Early and Foundation Years
4.	Programme Area:	Children and Young People's Services

5. Summary:

Following discussions with the CYPS Leadership Team, Early Years colleagues and the Chief Executive Officer, Martin Kimber, an expression of interest has been put forward to the national Children's Improvement Board (CIB) and the LGA for Rotherham to act as Development Demonstrator site for the Early and Foundation Years.

If successful the programme would start in October 2012 and capture learning from early years provision with a focus on narrowing the gap in outcomes, for children in poverty, between 0-5 years of age. Rotherham's commitment would be to host 10 site visits for peer councils and attend at least 2 national meetings. £20k would be available to cover any costs incurred from other authorities wishing to visit and the cost of producing any publicity materials.

6. Recommendations:

- **That Members receive and comment on the content of this report.**
- **That members advise on how they would wish to be kept informed on progress of the programme should it be successful.**

7. Proposals and Details:

After discussions with CYPS Leadership team, the Chief Executive Officer Martin Kimber and Early Years colleagues, Rotherham has put forward an expression of interest to act as an Early and Foundation Years Development Demonstrator. Endorsement from the Yorkshire and Humber region is also required.

This is a new initiative which will create a national learning network and observatory of developing practice, not on the basis of established excellence but on a willingness to champion a journey in progress and share learning from its barriers and pitfalls as much as its successes.

The programme would benefit Rotherham by offering opportunities to showcase areas of outstanding, good and emerging practice across all sectors of early childhood services, such as, health, parenting services, voluntary and private early education and childcare providers, schools, colleges, the third sector and communities, adult learning and Job Centre Plus.

Learning from this programme would incorporate and augment Rotherham strategies such as Early Help Strategy and the Health and Wellbeing strategy by creating a coherent picture of what works and what doesn't work; including connectivity between partners to narrow the gap in outcomes, for children in poverty (0-5 years of age). It would also incorporate learning to support seamless transitions and access to services for children over five and their families.

The programme would build on existing practice and networks. It would also add to the learning from the 100 Families research project and Rotherham's DfE funded trial for additional early education places for vulnerable 2 year olds (2012-13). The programme could form a focal point by bringing together a number of strands across early childhood services to provide clarity and connectivity as part of a holistic approach to narrowing the gap and meeting the needs of children and their families, particularly the most vulnerable and those at risk of becoming vulnerable.

As a demonstrator site the LA would receive:

- £20,000 in cash to facilitate its commitments
- Training to develop action research and action learning capacity
- National CIB commissioned support for the observatory network
- Access to learning from previous relevant pilots, best practice and sector expertise
- Access to expertise in commissioning and productivity
- Access to expertise in integrated working

A Development Demonstrator must demonstrate:

- A leadership commitment to champion integrated early intervention as part of wider planning to tackle child poverty.
- A developing approach to the effective commissioning of services including, where appropriate, work with the private and voluntary sector, and with communities.
- A demonstrated commitment to and evidence of progress in integrated working in early years.

- Evidence of testing and learning from systems change which may include cross boundary and cross sector working, technological based improvements, personalised budgets, community budgeting and payment by results.
- A strong learning culture and a commitment to sector led improvement.

The Demonstrator must commit to host 10 site visits for peer councils and attend at least 2 national meetings. £20k would be available to cover any costs incurred from other authorities wishing to visit and the cost of producing any publicity materials.

Successful applicants will be informed by the 27th July 2012

8. Finance:

There would be no additional revenue costs to the Council. £20k will be provided to cover any costs incurred from other authorities wishing to visit, and the cost of producing any publicity materials.

9. Risks and Uncertainties:

The risks involved in this programme would be low level as it is just as important to capture and learn from what doesn't work as well as what does. However to ensure the success of the programme it would be important to have all key stakeholders committed to the programme and willing to champion their contribution plus the commitment and support of strategic leaders and service managers.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications:

The programme would incorporate and augment a number of strategies across the local authority, health and Job Centre Plus such as Early Help, Troubled Families, Deprived Communities, Health and Well Being and Child Poverty. Other key stakeholders such as schools, learning communities, colleges, early education and childcare providers and the voluntary and community sector are vital partners to have on board to support improving outcomes to narrow the gap for those children and families who are vulnerable or at risk of becoming vulnerable.

11. Background Papers and Consultation:

Early Help Strategy
Early Help Operational Plan
Child Poverty Performance Plan
Health and Well Being Strategy
100 Families Research Project
Children's Centres Statutory Guidance

Contact Name : Mary Smith, Early Years and Childcare Strategy Manager
Telephone: 01709 (2)2535
E-mail: mary.smith@rotherham.gov.uk

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet
2.	Date:	18 July 2012
3.	Title:	Local Development Framework Spotlight Review
4.	Directorate:	Environment & Development Services

5. Summary

On 20 June 2012 Cabinet agreed that the LDF Spotlight Review be noted and a response be submitted to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

The majority of the Review recommendations are accepted, as detailed in the table attached at Appendix 1.

6. Recommendations

- 1. That Cabinet agree the proposed response to the LDF Spotlight Review recommendations.**

7. Proposals and Details

The spotlight review was commissioned following the LDF public consultation undertaken between July and September 2011. The purpose of the main review meeting on 7 Dec 2011 was to debrief members about how the consultation was received by the wider public and to reflect on any improvements for future consultations.

Although LDF is referred to throughout the report since the Spotlight Review was carried out the name of the document has changed to Local Plan.

8. Finance

There are potential budget implications arising from some of the review recommendations.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

Public engagement is key to the LDF process. A failure to carry out appropriate consultation risks not only a lack of public involvement in shaping their local communities but also a potential risk that the plan may not be approved by the planning inspector later in the process.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The implementation of the LDF will make a positive contribution to all of Rotherham's Regeneration priorities. When adopted, the Core Strategy and supporting documents will further the objectives of the Corporate Plan and support the delivery of the Rotherham Sustainable Community Strategy by:

- providing sufficient good quality homes
- ensuring well designed, decent affordable housing
- providing employment land to meet the needs of the modern economy and support sustainable communities through access to employment opportunities
- promoting the "town centre first" policy approach to help the regeneration and renaissance of Rotherham Town Centre

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Appendix 1: Cabinet's Response to Scrutiny Review – LDF Consultation

Council officers involved with the LDF consultation and subsequent Spotlight Review have contributed to the proposed response to OSMB.

Contact name:

Bronwen Knight, Planning Manager
01709 823866, bronwen.knight@rotherham.gov.uk

Andy Duncan, Strategic Policy Team Leader
01709 823830, andy.duncan@rotherham.gov.uk

Appendix 1: Cabinet's Response to Scrutiny Review – LDF Consultation

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Cabinet Decision</u> <i>(Accepted/ Rejected/ Deferred)</i>	<u>Cabinet Response</u> <i>(detailing proposed action if accepted, rationale for rejection, and why and when issue will be reconsidered if deferred)</i>	<u>Officer Responsible</u>	<u>Action by</u> <u>(Date)</u>
Local Development Framework				
The membership of the Group should be amended to include one Elected Member per ward to ensure representation across the Borough	Rejected	<p>The current membership arrangements for the Steering Group allow for a strategic overview of LDF preparation and consistency of member input. The steering group is not the decision making body, all decisions are taken at Cabinet.</p> <p>At all major stages of the process all-member meetings/seminars are held to ensure full representation and this will continue to be the case, e.g. prior to consultation stages and when finalising development sites for further consultation.</p>	Bronwen Knight	
The role of Elected Members on the Steering Group is strengthened in relation to their role in the Statement of Community Involvement. This means strengthening their ability to influence decisions around consultation proposals.	Accepted	Member input to LDF consultation approach is welcomed. The LDF Consultation Plan (the implementation plan for the SCI) is discussed at the Steering Group and then reported to Cabinet prior to major consultation stages, seeking any updates or amendments, and this will continue.	Helen Sleight	October 2012

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Cabinet Decision</u> <i>(Accepted/ Rejected/ Deferred)</i>	<u>Cabinet Response</u> <i>(detailing proposed action if accepted, rationale for rejection, and why and when issue will be reconsidered if deferred)</i>	<u>Officer Responsible</u>	<u>Action by</u> <u>(Date)</u>
The Constitution of the Steering Group therefore is amended to enable recommendations to be referred to Cabinet for consideration	Accepted	No action required - the Steering Group constitution currently provides for items/recommendations to be referred to Cabinet.	Bronwen Knight	N/A
It is recommended that the LSP Manager attends the Steering Group meetings on a regular basis in order to work with members and planning officers to ensure that the links between the LDF & Community Strategy Visions are maintained.	Accepted	The Rotherham Partnership welcomes the opportunity to reinforce the linkages between the two key strategic documents through attendance at the group.	Carole Haywood	

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Cabinet Decision</u> <i>(Accepted/ Rejected/ Deferred)</i>	<u>Cabinet Response</u> <i>(detailing proposed action if accepted, rationale for rejection, and why and when issue will be reconsidered if deferred)</i>	<u>Officer Responsible</u>	<u>Action by (Date)</u>
Localism Act 2011				
It is recommended that a protocol for the integration of Neighbourhood Planning Forums be developed & attached as an addendum to the Statement for Community Involvement. This should set out the process of linking together the LDF consultation process and the proposals of the Neighbourhood Planning Forum with the overall vision of the LDF	Accepted	<p>This is accepted, the statement of community involvement will be refreshed.</p> <p>The need to engage with parish councils and any neighbourhood forums in the future to respond to the new neighbourhood planning is recognised. However, the Council's current priority is to progress the Local Plan. We will continue to work with partners such as PAS and Planning Aid to raise awareness of localism and neighbourhood planning but will advise groups to engage with the Local Plan process prior to undertaking neighbourhood planning.</p>	Bronwen Knight	30 Nov 12
The function of Community Planning undertaken by the Area Assemblies must be extended to take account of the new Neighbourhood Planning powers, so that Community Plans reflect the objectives & outcomes of the Forums.	Accepted	The Area Assembly will work with Parishes and Community groups to ensure that they are aware of the options available to them through the Localism Act and to ascertain the level of support needed to undertake NDP and NDO's etc. Outcomes from LDF consultation will be made available to Parishes and Communities for consideration when undertaking Community Planning and support offered in synthesising this data with community priorities identified through community consultation.	Andrea Peers	

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Cabinet Decision</u> <i>(Accepted/ Rejected/ Deferred)</i>	<u>Cabinet Response</u> <i>(detailing proposed action if accepted, rationale for rejection, and why and when issue will be reconsidered if deferred)</i>	<u>Officer Responsible</u>	<u>Action by (Date)</u>
Elected members will need support in order to take a proactive role in helping to determine how Neighbourhood Planning takes root in their local areas. The review recommends that training & guidance is offered at an early stage in the development of neighbourhood forums so that the opportunities and constraints of the existing Local Development Framework hierarchy of plans are immediately recognised as part of the neighbourhood planning process.	Accepted	<p>There has been some training provided by CPRE, Locality and Rural Action Yorkshire on neighbourhood planning. A further event on Neighbourhood Planning was held in Rotherham town centre on 6 July for parish councils and community groups.</p> <p>To ensure elected members receive training we will take a paper to the member training panel requesting support for this recommendation. This may require additional resources.</p>	Bronwen Knight	September 2012
Community Strategy				
The Strategy should reflect the vision of the Local Development Framework with further work required to highlight the integration between both documents. Emphasis needs to be focussed on the linkages between the	Accepted	<p>It is a requirement for the LDF to be the “spatial expression” of the community strategy. Liaison with the LSP has been undertaken to achieve this.</p> <p>Details of the integration of the LDF and the Community Strategy which details the linkages between visions and themes/objectives are attached</p>	Bronwen Knight	Complete

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Cabinet Decision</u> <i>(Accepted/ Rejected/ Deferred)</i>	<u>Cabinet Response</u> <i>(detailing proposed action if accepted, rationale for rejection, and why and when issue will be reconsidered if deferred)</i>	<u>Officer Responsible</u>	<u>Action by</u> <u>(Date)</u>
Community Strategy vision themes and the LDF vision and strategic objectives set out in the draft Core Strategy.		(taken from the Core Strategy).		
<i>Public Meetings</i>				
<p><i>Officers of the Council will attend public meetings subject to the following criteria:</i></p> <p>That the meeting is formally chaired and the Chair (not necessarily a Members) has met with officers prior to the meeting to agree agenda, format etc.</p> <p>Officers consult with Members prior to a public meeting to discuss agenda & probable issues to be raised</p> <p>Before attending a public meeting, officers should be satisfied that all health & safety regulations are met and that the Council is able to meet its</p>	Rejected	<p>The drop in sessions are public meetings in that all members of the community are invited to attend but are managed such that every attendee can collect information, speak to an officer, raise any queries and at most events seek independent advice.</p> <p>Experience of previous consultation and advice from PAS and Planning Aid has shown that holding drop-in sessions in each locality where members of the public can view details of documents and plans and receive independent advice from Planning Aid, as well as receive advice from Council planners, is the most productive way of providing information and receiving feedback. Public meetings held in the past have been difficult to manage and result in little meaningful feedback to the LDF. Holding the maximum amount of drop-in sessions with available resources to ensure coverage of the Borough means that resourcing ad hoc public meetings is not possible.</p>	Bronwen Knight	

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Cabinet Decision</u> <i>(Accepted/ Rejected/ Deferred)</i>	<u>Cabinet Response</u> <i>(detailing proposed action if accepted, rationale for rejection, and why and when issue will be reconsidered if deferred)</i>	<u>Officer Responsible</u>	<u>Action by</u> <u>(Date)</u>
<p>duty of care to them;</p> <p>Elected members are informed whether or not council officers will be in attendance;</p> <p>That hospitality arrangements are reviewed – such as the provision of refreshments, acoustics/sound systems etc.</p> <p>That public meeting's are held if they are judged to be the best means of communication for the issues and all other options have been considered</p>		<p>Holding scheduled public drop-in sessions enables public engagement to be well planned, advertised and resourced and also allows for individual members of the public to have face to face discussions with planners to air their views. Such engagement is not possible at a traditional public meeting.</p>		
<p>Area Assemblies</p> <p><i>The review recognises that Area Assemblies are an ideal vehicle for consultation with the local communities, parish councils & elected members. Therefore, for future LDF consultations:</i></p>				
<p>Area Assembly staff should be involved in the planning of the consultation exercise;</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>It very useful for Area Assembly staff to organise public consultation events due to their local knowledge and contacts and this should continue.</p>	<p>Andrea Peers</p>	

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Cabinet Decision</u> <i>(Accepted/ Rejected/ Deferred)</i>	<u>Cabinet Response</u> <i>(detailing proposed action if accepted, rationale for rejection, and why and when issue will be reconsidered if deferred)</i>	<u>Officer Responsible</u>	<u>Action by (Date)</u>
As non planners, AA staff require more training on the LDF principles to enable them to support residents & others attending events	Accepted	Appropriate training will be provided as required.	Andrea Peers/ Helen Sleigh	Prior to consultation of Sites and Policies DPD
More resources need to be focussed on promoting & facilitating community workshops at Area Assembly level.	Accepted	Drop in sessions are based around facilitating interaction at a local level to provide information and dialogue on the process. Additional resources would need to be identified and dedicated for additional meetings as there are currently no resources available within Housing and Communities to support this process.	Andrea Peers	
<i>Council Officer's & Partners</i> <i>Officers & partners involved in consultation need to be able to be flexible under difficult & challenging circumstances. Recommendations to support their work are:</i>				
Be prepared to tear up the script and adapt your programme to the situation e.g. late arrivals/early departures from workshops. In essence work more on the community's terms.	Accepted	Officers will always try to adopt a flexible approach to community consultation and engagement.	Helen Sleigh	To be built into consultation on Sites and Policies DPD

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Cabinet Decision</u> <i>(Accepted/ Rejected/ Deferred)</i>	<u>Cabinet Response</u> <i>(detailing proposed action if accepted, rationale for rejection, and why and when issue will be reconsidered if deferred)</i>	<u>Officer Responsible</u>	<u>Action by (Date)</u>
Need for lead-in time and greater effort in establishing contact with key community workers to cascade information out.	Accepted	Planning officers will work with Area Assembly staff to allow sufficient time to make key contacts and cascade information.	Andrea Peers/ Helen Sleigh	To be built into consultation on Sites and Polices DPD
Tailor programmes to the anticipated audience	Accepted	Consultation material will be adapted to suit.	Helen Sleigh	To be built into consultation on Sites and Polices DPD
Consider the need for refreshments for officers, volunteers and the wider public	Accepted	Refreshments for staff and volunteers are usually provided but budget constraints prevents offering refreshments for the public.	Helen Sleigh	To be built into consultation on Sites and Polices DPD
Planning 'jargon' is seen as fundamental to the consultation process as used in national & public spheres. However, all effort should be made to provide clear explanation of the interpretation to support understanding by non planners &	Accepted	Officers will endeavour to make the LDF process and consultation material as understandable as possible.	Helen Sleigh	To be built into consultation on Sites and Polices DPD

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Cabinet Decision</u> <i>(Accepted/ Rejected/ Deferred)</i>	<u>Cabinet Response</u> <i>(detailing proposed action if accepted, rationale for rejection, and why and when issue will be reconsidered if deferred)</i>	<u>Officer Responsible</u>	<u>Action by (Date)</u>
community members;				
Increase the visual support included in the process by using maps & diagrams in public arena's;	Accepted	The existing approach of using maps and diagrams for LDF consultation will be continued and enhanced wherever possible.	Helen Sleigh	To be built into consultation on Sites and Polices DPD
Alignment of information relevant to specific areas may help to focus consultation in specific areas.	Accepted	Consultation material will continue to be "localised" wherever possible.	Helen Sleigh	To be built into consultation on Sites and Polices DPD
<i>Advertising & Marketing LDF Consultation</i>				
Advertising for meetings, events & focus groups etc, should be standardised across the Borough by creating a 'brand' for all LDF	Accepted	Meetings were held to prepare documents that would be used throughout the consultation. A generic feel was given to documentation with clear and precise branding of documents, within the overall branding guidelines of RMBC, which was important to reiterate ownership by the Council. These were then made available through meetings and at the consultation	Tracy Holmes	

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Cabinet Decision</u> <i>(Accepted/ Rejected/ Deferred)</i>	<u>Cabinet Response</u> <i>(detailing proposed action if accepted, rationale for rejection, and why and when issue will be reconsidered if deferred)</i>	<u>Officer Responsible</u>	<u>Action by</u> <u>(Date)</u>
literature;		<p>sessions. The language was defined through consultation with the Communications team. Although the content of documentation varied from meeting to meeting depending on localised issues the documents benefited from a standardised approach.</p> <p>This approach will continue for future consultations.</p>		
Expand the distribution of leaflets as these were thought to be excellent in their content & information offered.	Accepted	Significant effort has been made to ensure wider distribution of leaflets and information. Discussion did take place at one stage as to whether to distribute leaflets to every home in the borough but it was felt that the cost would be excessive. There was very positive feedback on the content and the presentation of information and we are continually looking for new ways to distribute this information at a reasonable cost.	Tracy Holmes	
Identify more sites for advertising & leaflet distribution: e.g. national food chains/stores & local newspapers to include leaflet drops;	Accepted	More sites were suggested at the start of the LDF process for the distribution of information. An advertising campaign was devised with the Communications team to ensure that meetings during the consultation were signposted through local advertising media. Local interest groups were approached as well as individual letters sent to every person who had expressed an opinion in previous consultations. We believe that there is still room for	Tracy Holmes	

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Cabinet Decision</u> <i>(Accepted/ Rejected/ Deferred)</i>	<u>Cabinet Response</u> <i>(detailing proposed action if accepted, rationale for rejection, and why and when issue will be reconsidered if deferred)</i>	<u>Officer Responsible</u>	<u>Action by (Date)</u>
		the development of distribution and see this as a learning process to establish the best possible methodology		
Parish Council Websites should be used for publicity re LDF Consultation process & advertising events & workshops.	Accepted	The overall parish liaison site at www.rotherhamparishcouncils.gov.uk can be used for publicity. There are also several jointly developed websites with parish and town councils so they can themselves can also display the information when needed.	Paul Griffiths	To be built into consultation on Sites and Polices DPD
Ensure careful use of colour coding on LDF maps (indicating designated areas for planning use) is clear and distinct to avoid confusion.	Accepted	The map notation and key did cause some confusion and this will be rectified in future consultation.	Helen Sleigh	To be built into consultation on Sites and Polices DPD

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Cabinet Decision</u> <i>(Accepted/ Rejected/ Deferred)</i>	<u>Cabinet Response</u> <i>(detailing proposed action if accepted, rationale for rejection, and why and when issue will be reconsidered if deferred)</i>	<u>Officer Responsible</u>	<u>Action by</u> <u>(Date)</u>
Parish Council Members				
Members need to be involved from the outset of the process	Accepted	Events are held prior to consultation to brief parish councils and this will continue, for example briefings by officers at the EDS/Parish Liaison meeting, the RMBC/Parish and Town Councils Joint Working Group and the Borough-wide Parish Network meeting.	Paul Griffiths/ Andrea Peers/ Helen Sleigh	Prior to consultation of Sites and Policies DPD
They require training – this could be doubled up with Area Assemblies;	Accepted	This can be considered, subject to budget and staff resource.	Paul Griffiths/ Andrea Peers/ Helen Sleigh	Prior to consultation of Sites and Policies DPD
Planning officers should attend a Parish Council meeting to brief members – local adjacent parish councils could double up on this exercise;	Rejected	The number of parish councils and the timetables for meetings do not allow for every parish council meeting to be attended, hence the approach outlined above. Area Assembly staff also arrange appropriate briefings prior to consultation.	Paul Griffiths/ Andrea Peers/ Helen Sleigh	

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Cabinet Decision</u> <i>(Accepted/ Rejected/ Deferred)</i>	<u>Cabinet Response</u> <i>(detailing proposed action if accepted, rationale for rejection, and why and when issue will be reconsidered if deferred)</i>	<u>Officer Responsible</u>	<u>Action by</u> <u>(Date)</u>
Members & Training				
The review recommend that Elected Members receive further training in the Management of Public Meetings;	Accepted	All of the member development related issues can be dealt with via the Member Development Panel. There is some (limited) resource to help with the delivery of training. However, in-house training would require staff resource that may not be available therefore funding would need to be available for external member training. Opportunities for no-cost or low cost training from PAS and Planning Aid etc. on planning-specific issues will of course continue to be pursued.	Deborah Fellowes/ Bronwen Knight	
Also, provide awareness training for elected members on the most frequently used consultation techniques with emphasis on interpretation of the results;	Accepted	Response as above.	Deborah Fellowes	
Encouraging Members to attend selected consultation events (e.g. focus groups) as observers;	Accepted	Members were invited to the drop-in sessions and are always welcome to attend and contribute to LDF consultation events and workshops. Efforts will be made to communicate these events to members for the next programmed consultation.	Helen Sleight	

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Cabinet Decision</u> <i>(Accepted/ Rejected/ Deferred)</i>	<u>Cabinet Response</u> <i>(detailing proposed action if accepted, rationale for rejection, and why and when issue will be reconsidered if deferred)</i>	<u>Officer Responsible</u>	<u>Action by</u> <u>(Date)</u>
Submission of the results of key LDF consultations to be reported to the Overview & Scrutiny Management Board.	Accepted	The main issues from the consultation feedback report that is reported to LDF Steering Group and Cabinet can be reported to OSMB.	Bronwen Knight	
That each new Municipal Year, Member induction includes training on the LDF process, Neighbourhood Planning & Community Consultation methods.	Accepted	New members do get a planning induction. Due to the timing of the impending Core Strategy consultation, this year's planning induction did focus on the LDF. Consideration will be given to expanding the member induction programme to include neighbourhood planning and consultation methods.	Deborah Fellowes/ Bronwen Knight	

Publication Core Strategy (June 2012) - Table 2: Strategic Objective Linkages

Strategic Objective	Core Strategy Issue Addressed	Rotherham Partnership Priority (2012 - 2015) / RMBC Corporate Plan Priority (2011) *	Core Strategy Policy
1 - Scale of future growth	1,2,3,4,5 7,14	- Supporting the growth of a sustainable and competitive local economy - <i>Helping to create safe and healthy communities</i>	1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 33
2 - Green Belt	3	- Supporting the growth of a sustainable and competitive local economy - <i>Helping to create safe and healthy communities</i>	4, 5, 33
3 - Sustainable locations	1,2,3,4,5 7,13	- <i>Providing quality education; ensuring people have opportunities to improve skills, learn and get a job.</i> - <i>Helping to create safe and healthy communities</i>	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33
4 - Provision for housing	1,2,3,4,5 14	- Supporting the growth of a sustainable and competitive local economy - <i>Helping to create safe and healthy communities</i> - <i>Improving the environment</i>	1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 27, 28, 32, 33
5 - Retail and service centres	3,9,14	- Supporting the growth of a sustainable and competitive local economy - <i>Providing quality education; ensuring people have opportunities to improve skills, learn and get a job.</i> - <i>Helping to create safe and healthy communities</i>	1, 11, 12, 13, 14, 33
6 - Provision for employment	2,5,7,8,14	- Supporting the growth of a sustainable and competitive local economy - <i>Making sure no community is left behind</i> - <i>Providing quality education; ensuring people have opportunities to improve skills, learn and get a job.</i>	1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 18, 26, 31, 32, 33
7 - Local transport connections	1,2,3,5,6 7,14	- Supporting the growth of a sustainable and competitive local economy - <i>Providing quality education; ensuring people have opportunities to improve skills, learn and get a job.</i> - <i>Helping to create safe and healthy communities</i> - <i>Improving the environment</i>	3, 9, 14, 17, 29, 31, 32, 33
8 - Landscape, historic	10	- <i>Helping to create safe and healthy communities</i>	1, 3, 4, 19, 20, 21,

Strategic Objective	Core Strategy Issue Addressed	Rotherham Partnership Priority (2012 - 2015) / RMBC Corporate Plan Priority (2011) *	Core Strategy Policy
environment and settlement identity		- <i>Improving the environment</i>	22, 23, 24, 33
9 - Greenspaces, sport and recreation	2,10,16	- <i>Helping to create safe and healthy communities</i> - <i>Improving the environment</i>	12, 13, 19, 21, 22, 24, 29, 31, 33
10 - Biodiversity / geodiversity	10,14	- <i>Helping to create safe and healthy communities</i> - <i>Improving the environment</i>	3, 19, 20, 21, 22, 33
11 – Minerals	12	- Supporting the growth of a sustainable and competitive local economy - <i>Providing quality education; ensuring people have opportunities to improve skills, learn and get a job.</i> - <i>Improving the environment</i>	26, 33
12 - Managing the water environment	11,16,17	- <i>Improving the environment</i>	19, 20, 24, 25, 27, 33
13 - Carbon reduction and renewable energy	6,11,13,14 15	- <i>Improving the environment</i>	1, 3, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 24, 28, 30, 33
14 – Design	4,9,10,14	- <i>Helping to create safe and healthy communities</i> - <i>Improving the environment</i>	3, 7, 14, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 33
15 - Community well-being	1,2,11,15 16	- <i>Helping to create safe and healthy communities</i> - <i>Improving the environment</i>	1, 3, 14, 24, 27, 28, 33
16 - Waste management	13,15	- <i>Improving the environment</i>	See joint waste DPD
17 - Infrastructure delivery	1,2,4,5,6,8 15	- Supporting the growth of a sustainable and competitive local economy - <i>Making sure no community is left behind</i> - <i>Providing quality education; ensuring people have opportunities to improve skills, learn and get a job.</i> - <i>Helping to create safe and healthy communities</i> - <i>Improving the environment</i>	1, 2, 3, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 24, 25, 29, 30, 32, 33
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bold - Rotherham Partnership Priority. • Italics - Rotherham MBC Corporate Plan Priority 			

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL
REPORT TO CABINET

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet
2.	Date:	18th July 2012
3.	Title:	Local Government Pension Scheme Changes
4.	Directorate:	Resources

5. Summary

This report highlights the recently published proposals to change the Local Government Pension Scheme from April 2014 and seeks to confirm the Council views on these proposals.

In addition this report also seeks permission to apply for a temporary deferment of the provisions detailed in the Pensions Act 2011, where legislation sets out that employers must provide for Automatic Enrolment of their eligible employees into a qualifying pension scheme from a published 'staging date'.

6. Recommendation

That Cabinet support the proposals in respect of the new LGPS from April 2014.

Cabinet give permission to apply to defer the automatic enrolment for eligible employees beyond the staging date originally outlined for Council's of our size.

To further note that the auto-enrolment compliance affects the Teacher's Pension Scheme but it is not yet clear if some short term deferment may be possible in respect of this scheme.

7. Proposals and Details

7.1 Background and Context

Changes to the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) are not unusual with relatively significant changes being made over recent years in 2006 (Taxation changes), 2008 (tiered contributions & 60ths accrual). As a result of changing demographics, where people are living longer and with the costs of providing pensions increasing, the government has now required that the scheme be required to deliver £900m of savings from the current and future costs of the pension scheme.

The proposals set out in Appendix 1, now being circulated for consultation and recommendation, have been the subject of extensive work including representatives of the recognised Trade Unions. It is proposed that these would come into effect from April 2014, with various protections for employees within 10 years of their normal retirement date as at this April 2012.

In addition the government is introducing measures to ensure that as many employees as possible are covered by an occupational pension scheme. As a result it is proposed that eligible Council employees who are currently not members of the scheme will be automatically enrolled from a determined 'Staging Date' based on employee numbers. In the case of Rotherham this would be 1st March 2013. Affected employees could then still elect to 'opt out', but every 3 years Councils will be required to re-enrol them.

There are obviously internal administrative workload issues for both the South Yorkshire Pensions Authority (SYPA) and ourselves in taking payroll deductions and processing entry or withdrawals, but the most significant matter relates to the potential for increased employer contributions associated with this increased membership.

Based on current opt-out numbers there would be a requirement to auto-enrol 2,693 employees into the LGPS at the 1 March 2013 staging date. Given current earnings of those employees and an employer contribution rate of 12% (excluding the usual additional 5.9% costs for historical shortfalls) the potential cost of this auto-enrolment is estimated at over £1.5m pa.

It is expected that many of these employees would immediately opt-out again but the numbers are unknown. Some may decide having reviewed the pension contribution against the benefits of death-in-service, ill health protections, or indeed benefitting from tax thresholds, to elect to remain in the scheme. Overall, there is the potential that the Council could face an increased liability for LGPS pension employer contributions within this current or future financial years.

The legislation allows for a deferment for current optants-out until the end of the transition period. Presently this is October 2016 but the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) is consulting on whether to allow a further opportunity to extend this period potentially until October 2017.

The deferral process does not require the Pensions Regulator approval but an employer is required to notify the affected employees of the transition delay within one month of the staging date.

Teachers Pension Scheme was not initially providing an opportunity to defer but later notifications are suggesting a short term deferment of 1 year might yet be possible. Further details are awaited.

The South Yorkshire Pensions Authority is recommending employers take the transitional delay option but confirms that this remains an employer decision. Discussions with SYPA have also suggested that a deferred date of 1st March 2016 could be the most advantageous date for employers based on impact on Actuary calculations for the next valuation, whilst still reducing the immediate potential cost. This is being considered from a Pensions perspective and advice will be taken into account to enable Councils to make the most advantageous choice.

8. Finance

Note the potential implications for the current and future financial years are outlined in the body of the report. There could be additional system development costs alongside indirect HR Service Centre costs / time spent working on implementing the required administrative requirements that had not been forecast nor planned.

Additional administrative costs may result in respect of administration undertaken on behalf of Doncaster Council for whom Rotherham MBC provide transactional HR & Payroll services under our new shared service operation.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

Concern has been expressed that proposed changes to the LGPS due to take effect from April 2014 and only just published for consultation, may result in greater numbers opting out of the pension scheme.

To not apply the transitional deferment of joining non-members could incur additional administration costs as up to 2,693 employees are enrolled to LGPS on 1 March 2013 plus an immediate cost for increased employer contributions. The potential budget risk is up to a potential worst case scenario of over £1.5m.

As indicated, there are major concerns with respect to the impact of increased pension administration on the Council's Payroll Service especially during this period of migration of the Doncaster Council payroll service. An equivalent deferment of auto-enrolment by Doncaster MBC would help alleviate some of these pressures.

Other payroll providers commissioned by schools would need to be able to cope with the new arrangements. Schools need to be satisfied that their provider would be able to cope with the complexity of this new arrangement.

with further implications for the administration of the auto-enrolment legislation. The proposed deferment until 2016 (2017) or other most advantageous date in consultation with SYPA would ease future administrative pressures.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The provision of an attractive pension scheme is a key element of the Council's remuneration package which supports its ability to attract and retain staff.

Contact Name: Phil Howe
Director of Human Resources

phil.howe@rotherham.gov.uk
tel. 01709823716

6th July 2012

APPENDIX 1

Pensions – New Local Government Pension Scheme Provisions

The Local Government Association (LGA) and trade unions have recently announced the outcome of their negotiations on new Local Government Pension Scheme proposals (for England and Wales) **to take effect from 1 April 2014.**

These proposals will now be communicated to scheme members, employers, funds and other scheme interests. Unions will consult their members over these proposals and the LGA will consult employers. Government has confirmed that a favourable outcome of these consultations will enable them to move directly to a statutory consultation later in the Autumn to implement the proposals.

The main provisions of the proposed Local Government Pension Scheme 2014 are as follows:

Career Average Re-valued Earnings (CARE) scheme using CPI as the re-valuation factor (the current scheme is a final salary scheme).

The **accrual rate** would be **1/49th** (the current scheme is 1/60th).

There would be no normal scheme pension age, instead each member's Normal Pension Age (NPA) would be their **State Pension Age** (the current scheme has an NPA of 65).

Average member contributions to the scheme would be **6.5%** (same as the current scheme) with the rate determined on **actual pay** (the current scheme determines part-time contribution rates on full time equivalent pay).

A table is included below detailing the proposed contribution rates by salary banding.

While there would be no change to average member contributions, the lowest paid would pay the same or less and the highest paid would pay higher contributions on a more **progressive scale after tax relief** (see table below).

Members who have already or are considering opting out of the scheme could instead elect to pay half contributions for half the pension, while still retaining the full value of other benefits. This is known as the **50/50** option (the current scheme has no such flexible option).

For current scheme members, **benefits for service prior to 1 April are protected**, including remaining 'Rule of 85' protection. Protected past service continues to be based on final salary and current NPA.

Where scheme members are outsourced they will be able to **stay in the scheme** on first and subsequent transfers (currently this is a choice for the new employer).

South Yorkshire Pensions Authority will be publishing full details of the new scheme proposals on their website and in a newsletter for all current scheme members.

The Proposed LGPS 2014 Contribution Table Actual Annual Pensionable Pay	Gross Contribution
Up to £13,500	5.5%
£13,501 - £21,000	5.8%
£21,001 - £34,000	6.5%
£34,001 - £43,000	6.8%
£43,001 - £60,000	8.5%
£60,001 - £85,000	9.9%
£85,001 - £100,000	10.5%
£100,001 - £150,000	11.4%
More than £150,000	12.5%

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted