

CABINET

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

Date: Wednesday, 19 June 2013

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. Declarations of Interest.
5. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 5th June, 2013 (copy supplied separately)
6. Rotherham Biodiversity Action Plan 2012 (report herewith) (Pages 2 - 5)
 - Strategic Director of Environment and Development Services to report.
7. Scrutiny Review of RMBC Residential Homes (report herewith) (Pages 6 - 19)
 - Chief Executive to report.
8. Response to the Scrutiny Review of Autistic Spectrum Disorder (report herewith) (Pages 20 - 25)
 - Director of Public Health to report.
9. Revenue Account Outturn 2012/13 (report herewith) (Pages 26 - 39)
 - Director of Finance to report.
10. Response to the Review by the Improving Places Select Commission of Grounds Maintenance and Street Cleansing Services (report herewith) (Pages 40 - 47)
 - Strategic Director of Environment and Development Services to report.

11. DownSizing Policy Report (herewith) (Pages 48 - 53)
 - Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods and Adult Services to report.
12. Proposals to make a 'prescribed alteration' to Thrybergh School and Sports College by a change of age range from 11-16 to 3-16 by closure of Dalton Foljambe Primary School (report herewith) (Pages 54 - 58)
 - Strategic Director of Children and Young People's Services to report.
13. Universal Credit: Local Support Services Framework (report herewith) (Pages 59 - 70)
 - Strategic Director of Environment and Development Services to report.

Extra Report:-

14. Home Affairs Select Committee - Child Sexual Exploitation and the response to Localised Grooming (report herewith) (Pages 71 - 73)
 - Strategic Director of Children and Young People's Services to report.
15. Exclusion of the Press and the Public.

The following items are 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 relating to the financial or business affairs).
16. Report on the Price of a School Lunch 2013-2104 (report herewith)* (Pages 74 - 81)
 - Strategic Director of Children and Young People's Services to report.
17. March Flatts Community Hall and land, March Flatts Road, Thrybergh (report herewith)* (Pages 82 - 87)
 - Strategic Director of Environment and Development Services to report.

Extra Report:-

18. Construction Works to 133 Non-traditional Built Council Dwellings in Wath (report herewith)* (Pages 88 - 91)
 - Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods and Adult Services to report.

In accordance with Section (7) of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board has agreed that the item marked (*) contains a decision which needs to be acted upon as a matter of urgency and which cannot be reasonably deferred (see notice attached)

Cabinet Meeting – 19th June, 2013

Take notice, in accordance with Regulation 5 of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012, that the following reports are to be considered in the private part of the meeting without having provided the required twenty-eight days' notice:-

- **Report on the Price of a School Lunch 2013-2104**

An exemption under Paragraph 3 (Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)) of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 is requested, as this report outlines two options for the price of a school meal from September 2013.

- **March Flatts Community Hall and land, March Flatts Road, Thrybergh**

An exemption under Paragraph 3 (Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)) of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 is requested, as this report recommends disposal.

- **Construction Works to 133 Non-traditional Built Council Dwellings in Wath**

An exemption under Paragraph 3 (Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)) of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 is requested, as this report recommends an award of the contract.

The Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board has agreed that this item is urgent and cannot reasonably be deferred.

Jacqueline Collins
Director of Legal and Democratic Services
17th June, 2013 (updated)

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet
2.	Date:	19th June 2013
3.	Title:	Rotherham Biodiversity Action Plan 2012
4.	Directorate:	Environment and Development Services

5. Summary

This report seeks support for the adoption of the revised Rotherham Biodiversity Action Plan.

6. Recommendations**It is recommended that**

1. the Rotherham Biodiversity Action Plan 2012 is adopted; and
2. support be given for the continuation of RMBC involvement in the delivery of the Rotherham Biodiversity Action Plan.

7. Proposal and Details

The term **Biodiversity** covers the variety of all life on earth; it includes all species of animals and plants, everything that is alive on the planet. **Biodiversity** is important for its own sake, and because it is comprised of fully integrated and inter-dependent ecosystems, human survival depends on it.

The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 introduced a 'Biodiversity Duty' for public authorities under which "**Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity.**" The Rotherham Biodiversity Action Plan (RBAP) is the statement through which the Council seeks to discharge its duty.

The first RBAP was produced and published by the Rotherham Biodiversity Forum which includes the Council and partners such as statutory agencies, local landowners and natural history societies. The Council adopted the RBAP in 2004.

Since 2004 the national priorities for conservation action have expanded and been refined and new legislation and Government information has been published to guide the next era of biodiversity delivery. The 2012 review work was able to take stock of delivery to date, the new thinking and increased Government focus.

The scope and content of the RBAP has now been reviewed and a second edition (dated 2012) produced which is now proposed for adoption by RMBC. This proposal has been supported by Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing (14/01/2013, item K40) and by the Rotherham Local Plan Steering Group (18/01/2013, item 59). The key changes in the 2nd edition are:

- The acknowledgement of recent legislation, strategies and other plans that influence biodiversity action;
- The addition of new habitat action plans for Traditional Orchards and Inland Rock & Brownfield Land
- The expansion of the water-based action plan group to include running water;
- The identification of additional local authority habitats associated with each key habitat group;
- The change from the specific 'Ancient and species-rich' hedgerows to amore general hedgerow habitat which acknowledges heir importance;
- The identification of locally recorded species within each key habitat group;
- The alignment of actions and delivery timescales with regional and national plans and strategies.

An executive summary of the RBAP is attached as appendix 1.

The 2012 RBAP will continue to support the preparation and delivery of the Rotherham Local Plan providing supporting evidence for core strategy policies and for future development management policies, particularly in respect of biodiversity, geo-diversity, green infrastructure and landscape. It will support biodiversity action and delivery until at least 2020 in line with the England Biodiversity Strategy; objectives, targets and programmes of action will be prepared with this date in mind but it is acknowledged that action will be needed to continue beyond 2020.

The adoption of the Rotherham Biodiversity Action Plan 2012 will demonstrate the commitment of RMBC in the delivery of the plan. Once adoption has been formalised it will be possible to prepare a delivery plan and to consider action needed for those species with additional conservation requirements.

8. Finance

The cost of the 2012 review of the Rotherham Biodiversity Action Plan has been met within existing staffing costs and the voluntary involvement of members of groups represented on the Rotherham Biodiversity Forum. Support for the delivery of the RBAP falls within the role of the RMBC Ecology Development Officer.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

The preparation and adoption of a current local Biodiversity Action Plan demonstrates compliance with the principles of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and its 'Biodiversity Duty' for public authorities.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The 2012 RBAP will also provide support for the production and delivery of the Rotherham Local Plan as an element of the environmental evidence base for policy production and site allocation decision making.

The 2012 RBAP will continue to support the Rotherham Local Wildlife Site system which underpins the Local Wildlife Site designation within the planning system and contributes to performance against the Local Nature Conservation/Biodiversity measure on the governments 'Single Data List', i.e. Proportion of Local Sites where positive conservation management is being achieved.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

The draft Rotherham Biodiversity Action Plan 2012 documents were prepared in partnership with the Rotherham Biodiversity Forum which includes representatives of statutory agencies and local interest groups. The documents were made available for public consultation via the RMBC website during October and November 2012; the consultation documents were shared with a range of organisations including Parish Councils, Area Assemblies and voluntary organisations and the positive responses indicate that future involvement will be increased. Only one response was received via the online consultation website and this was supportive. All comments received during the consultation have been incorporated into the final documents.

Contact Names: Carolyn Jones, Ecology Development Officer 822462.

Biodiversity is our most precious resource. The Earth's biological resources are vital to humanity's economic and social development. They provide the very systems that support our existence on this planet and are global assets of tremendous value to both present and future generations. We simply cannot live without a planet rich with biodiversity - we must protect it now and in the future.

Rotherham Biodiversity Forum partners published the first Rotherham Biodiversity Action Plan (RBAP) in 2004. Based on the protection and enhancement of habitats and species prioritised both nationally and locally the plan provided a comprehensive assessment of the nature conservation value of the borough. The 2004 RBAP has been immensely successful in enabling delivery of biodiversity action via targeted site management, project development, guiding survey and monitoring effort and also within the planning framework to highlight the need for habitat retention and enhancement. Since 2004 the national priorities for conservation action have been expanded and refined and new legislation and Government information has been published that will guide the next era of biodiversity delivery. It is appropriate to review the RBAP to take stock of successes and constraints encountered to date and in light of the new thinking and increased Government focus.

This 2nd edition of the Rotherham Biodiversity Action Plan builds on all the work of the previous decades to set Rotherham challenging, but necessary, new targets for the protection and restoration of the natural environment. The Rotherham Biodiversity Action Plan identifies the priorities for the conservation and enhancement of Rotherham's biodiversity. It is the result of the work of Rotherham's Biodiversity Forum, a partnership of naturalists, landowners, conservationists and RMBC staff.

The over-riding principles of Rotherham Biodiversity Action Plan delivery are as follows:

1. To maintain, enhance, expand and connect the biodiversity of Rotherham by:
 - protecting the natural populations and distribution of species;
 - conserving natural and semi-natural areas within which species can be maintained, and;
 - identifying opportunities for habitat creation, expansion and connection
2. To involve local people and develop effective partnerships to ensure that programmes for biodiversity conservation are successful and can be sustained in the long-term.
3. To contribute towards the conservation of UK and global biodiversity by monitoring actions and reporting to established systems.
4. To fully integrate biodiversity action as a central principle of the Rotherham Local Plan

A healthy natural environment contains a mosaic of wild and managed spaces; this enables different plants and animals to find all they need to survive. It will also support movement and expansion so that they can react and adapt to changes in climate and from human impacts. Natural habitats are usually more diverse and can support many kinds of wildlife but semi-natural, landscaped and amenity open spaces are valuable and also support wildlife. All our wildlife will benefit from our efforts to keep, expand and connect open spaces.

A healthy natural environment makes human life possible and provides quality of life; it provides food, fuel, clean air and water, medicine and climate regulation. These products are not just from exotic rainforests and remote jungles; Rotherham's woodlands and street trees help to keep our air clean, our agricultural products are pollinated by bees and other insects that need local woodlands, grasslands and wetlands to survive, our country parks and canals are great tourist attractions improving our local economies and employment levels, our urban parks and nature reserves provide free, healthy recreational and spiritual spaces improving our health, fitness and mental well-being.

To conserve and improve Rotherham's natural environment, and all the benefits we get from it, we need to follow the national approach of 'More – Bigger – Better – Joined'; we need to:

1. Improve the quality of current core wildlife sites by better habitat management
2. Increase the amount and size of core wildlife sites
3. Enhance and create connections between wildlife sites, through physical corridors or 'stepping stones'
4. Reduce pressures on wildlife by improving the wider environment, including through buffering wildlife sites.

The Rotherham Biodiversity Action Plan will guide the delivery of these actions.

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1. Meeting:	Cabinet
2. Date:	19th June 2013
3. Title:	Scrutiny Review of RMBC Residential Homes
4. Directorate:	Resources

5. Summary

This report sets out the findings and recommendations of the scrutiny review of RMBC Residential Homes. The full report is attached as Appendix 1 and was endorsed by the Health Select Commission and the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board at their meetings on 18th April and 24th May 2013 respectively.

6. Recommendations**That Cabinet:**

- **Receives the report;**
- **Feeds its response back to OSMB within two months.**

7. Proposals and Details

This review was identified in the work programme for 2012/13 and was prioritised by both Scrutiny Members and the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care. In light of the budget pressures being faced by the Council and the need to identify further budget cuts it was felt that an independent view on the future of the homes was required. It took place, alongside a financial review, commissioned by Neighbourhoods and Adults Services management, and delivered by Price Waterhouse Cooper. It was intended that the Scrutiny review would add value to the work carried out by PWC and to allow a wider range of discussion to take place about the future of the homes.

The overall aim of the review was to achieve an understanding of value for money, outcomes and quality of service provision and in particular, the potential impact of budget cuts on this. The review would make recommendations to the Executive to be considered alongside the process of setting and reviewing the budget for 2013/14.

It would also aim to support the achievement of the following Council priorities from the Corporate Plan:

- Ensuring care and protection are available for those people who need it most
- Helping to create safe and healthy communities.

The review is reported under the five sub headings; staffing, catering and entertainment, buildings and maintenance, costs and comparisons and options for the future. Each of these sections of the review has its own recommendations. There are 10 recommendations in total, listed below.

1. That RMBC corporately agrees to review the terms and conditions of the staff to address issues of out of hours enhancements and sickness absence payments.
2. That Human Resources and NAS Management consider urgently whether the permanent recruitment freeze could be lifted for the two homes, enabling them to take more control of some of the staffing costs.
3. That the hard work and commitment of the staff and managers of both homes be recognised and the achievements made in enhancing the dignity of residents.
4. To provide the opportunity for the teams to explore this further and to generate independent income for the homes to enhance the experience for residents and to ensure that quality of provision is maintained as far as possible. This might also include some independent management of procurement for food and catering items.
5. That further work is done with the procurement team of the Council to look at value for money in the current contractual arrangements and a review of how the food budgets are spent is carried out in conjunction with the managers of the homes.
6. That consideration is given to the extent to which the handyman service or another internal employee could be trained to carry out some of the maintenance services

that are currently causing the homes to go over their repairs and maintenance budgets.

7. That the same review contained within recommendation 5 for food procurement is carried out regard to procurement of cleaning, repairs and maintenance services
8. Cabinet do not cut staff hours per resident below 25 as it is felt this will be to the detriment of the quality of the service provided.
9. That Cabinet re-consider the proposal to reduce the number of managers within the homes, as this is likely to result in re-deployment and payment protection costs which could outweigh the savings being made.
10. That the Council looks at alternative ways to manage the capital costs and borrowing associated with this, which potential remove the burden from the revenue budgets of the homes.

8. Finance

The review recommendations will need to be considered in the context of the agreed budget for 2013/14

9. Risks and Uncertainties

The review group considered at length the risks around reducing costs and the potential impact on quality. This potential “trade off” between cost savings and quality was at the heart of the review.

10. Contact

Deborah Fellowes
Scrutiny Manager

Ext 22769

Deborah.fellowes@rotherham.gov.uk

Scrutiny review: RMBC Residential Homes

Review of the Health Select Commission

September – December 2012

CONTENTS

	Page No
Executive Summary	3
1. Why Members wanted to undertake this review	5
2. Terms of Reference	5
3. Background	6
4. Residential Homes	6
4.1 Staffing	6
4.2 Catering and Entertainment	8
4.3 Buildings and Maintenance	9
4.4 Costs and Comparisons	9
4.5 Future monitoring	11
5. Background papers	11
6. Thanks	11
7. Appendices	12

Executive Summary

The aim of the review:

The review group was made up of the following members:

- Cllr Brian Steele (Chair)
- Cllr Dominic Beck
- Robert Parkin (co-optee, Speak-up)
- Cllr Colin Barron
- Cllr Christine Beaumont

Summary of findings and recommendations

The overall aim of the review was to achieve an understanding of value for money, outcomes and quality of service provision and in particular, the potential impact of budget cuts on this. The review would make recommendations to the Executive to be considered alongside the process of setting and reviewing the budget for 2013/14.

It would also aim to support the achievement of the following Council priorities from the Corporate Plan:

- Ensuring care and protection are available for those people who need it most
- Helping to create safe and healthy communities.

The review is reported under the five sub headings; staffing, catering and entertainment, buildings and maintenance, costs and comparisons and options for the future. Each of these sections of the review has its own recommendations. There are 10 recommendations in total, listed below.

1. That RMBC corporately agrees to review the terms and conditions of the staff to address issues of out of hours enhancements and sickness absence payments.
2. That Human Resources and NAS Management consider urgently whether the permanent recruitment freeze could be lifted for the two homes, enabling them to take more control of some of the staffing costs.
3. That the hard work and commitment of the staff and managers of both homes be recognised and the achievements made in enhancing the dignity of residents.
4. To provide the opportunity for the teams to explore this further and to generate independent income for the homes to enhance the experience for residents and to

ensure that quality of provision is maintained as far as possible. This might also include some independent management of procurement for food and catering items.

5. That further work is done with the procurement team of the Council to look at value for money in the current contractual arrangements and a review of how the food budgets are spent is carried out in conjunction with the managers of the homes.
6. That consideration is given to the extent to which the handyman service or another internal employee could be trained to carry out some of the maintenance services that are currently causing the homes to go over their repairs and maintenance budgets.
7. That the same review contained within recommendation 5 for food procurement is carried out regard to procurement of cleaning, repairs and maintenance services
8. Cabinet do not cut staff hours per resident below 25 as it is felt this will be to the detriment of the quality of the service provided.
9. That Cabinet re-consider the proposal to reduce the number of managers within the homes, as this is likely to result in re-deployment and payment protection costs which could outweigh the savings being made.
10. That the Council looks at alternative ways to manage the capital costs and borrowing associated with this, which potentially remove the burden from the revenue budgets of the homes.

1. Why members wanted to undertake this review?

This review was identified in the work programme for 2012/13 and was prioritised by both Scrutiny Members and the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care. In light of the budget pressures being faced by the Council and the need to identify further budget cuts it was felt that an independent view on the future of the homes was required. It took place, alongside a financial review, commissioned by Neighbourhoods and Adults Services management, and delivered by Price Waterhouse Cooper. The aim of the Scrutiny review was to add value to the work carried out by PWC and to allow a wider range of discussion to take place about the future of the homes.

The overall aim of the review was to achieve an understanding of value for money, outcomes and quality of service provision and in particular, the potential impact of budget cuts on this. The review would make recommendations to the Executive to be considered alongside the process of setting and reviewing the budget for 2013/14.

It would also aim to support the achievement of the following Council priorities from the Corporate Plan:

- Ensuring care and protection are available for those people who need it most
- Helping to create safe and healthy communities.

2. Terms of reference

The work of the review group was split into two distinct pieces of work:

1. To understand the workings of the residential homes set in the context of Adult Social Care delivery, funding and regulations. This involved spending a full afternoon with the managers and staff of both homes.
2. To receive a summary of the work completed by PWC and the main recommendations regarding the future of the homes.

These two pieces of work were brought together in a final meeting of the review group to pull together their own recommendations.

The review has been provided with support and evidence by a number of officers for Neighbourhoods and Adult Services and these were as follows:

Tom Cray – Strategic Director
Shona McFarlane – Director of Health and Wellbeing
Ros Brown – Service Manager
Lynn Todd – Manager, Davies Court
Lisa Sykes – Manager, Lord Hardy Court
Doug Parkes – Business Manager
Sarah Turner and Paula Woodward – Team Leaders, Lord Hardy Court
Sue Severns and Denise Smith – Team Leaders, Davies Court
Vanessa Barlow – Senior Care Assistant, Davies Court

Juliette Seargent and Denise Gelthorpe, Care Assistants, Davies Court

The review also included visits to two independent homes in the Borough, to allow review group members to benchmark the two Council run homes under review.

In total the review group met 5 times and the notes of these meeting are available as background documents to this report.

3. Background

At the first meeting of the review group, members were provided with the background information and context within which the two homes operate. This is summarised as follows:

- All residential homes are assessed as part of the Home from Home scheme and are graded bronze to gold. Both Davies Court and Lord Hardy Court are currently graded silver
- Each home has 60 beds
- Of these 30 beds are designated for people who have a mental health problem (Elderly and Mentally Ill EMI), 15 are residential and 15 are intermediate care or fast response beds. The latter category is provided in partnership with NHS Rotherham and part funded through intermediate care pooled budgets and NHS reablement grant.
- All EMI beds are fully occupied
- The intermediate care beds have an occupancy rate of 80% which is the highest ever and length of stays is 16 days which is good performance
- People living at home after 91 days from discharge from intermediate care is at 89.53%, a best ever performance achieved.
- The homes were new build and were designed to allow the consolidation of residents from a number of older buildings into the new ones. The old homes were then transferred to Asset Management. Some of the old homes have since been sold and the Council benefited from the capital receipt.
- Because of the design of the buildings and the accommodation of larger numbers of residents, there has been an increase in the staffing levels from those originally planned, particularly for night shifts.
- The remaining homes that have not been sold sit within the Council's property bank and ongoing costs i.e. security, are met by corporate budgets.
- The independent sector has higher vacancy rates and the Council homes continue to be very popular with regular enquiries. Waiting lists are not kept.

4. Residential Homes.

4.1 Staffing.

Members of the review group were provided with the staffing structures and the working patterns of the staff. It was recognised from very early on that the homes would always struggle to remain competitive in terms of costs with the independent sector because of the terms and conditions of the staff, employed by the Council. Members felt strongly from the outset that the need to reduce costs

within the two homes should not result in a deterioration of the quality of the service provided. They were keen to look at value for money and to assess the quality of the provision as well as their financial viability. It was viewed that the review needed to make recommendations about achieving the right balance between these two things.

It was noted that the majority of the costs of the homes were related to staffing costs. It was also noted that staffing costs were higher than originally planned for the two homes because the buildings required higher numbers of staff. The staffing levels had been increased within 6 months of the homes opening. As staff are paid time and one third for night duties staffing costs increased.

It was also noted that sickness levels in Davies Court are high. This issue was explored by the review group at the session they held with staff. Staff discussed this openly and honestly with the group. As a result the following issues were concluded:

- For a number of reasons, including vacancy rates and annual leave, staff will regularly find themselves working longer hours than they are contracted for (e.g. someone on a 16 hours per week contract, could be working up to a 30 hour week
- Since annual leave and sickness are calculated on average hours worked, the result will be that staff will have an entitlement to more annual leave, but importantly, higher levels of sick pay. Night duty enhancements are also paid when on sickness absence.
- This has resulted in an “incentive” for sickness absence.

Staff were concerned that the combination of vacancies, annual leave entitlements and sickness absence have created significant staff shortages. At the time of the review, Davies Court had 10 vacancies. Managers were concerned that they have little control over these costs.

It was noted that a review of terms and conditions was required but that this was something that needed to be negotiated with Unions at a corporate level.

Members of the review group, however, noted that the high quality of care provided in the homes is largely down to the staff. Staff were proud to work for the Council and were extremely committed to driving up quality standards for their residents. Members therefore felt very strongly that although staffing costs did need to be controlled more, that this was not at the expense of the high quality of care provided by the staff. Members also noted that the management style of the two managers was inclusive and that they demonstrated strong leadership.

Recommendation 1.

That RMBC corporately agrees to review the terms and conditions of staff to address issues of out of hours enhancements and sickness absence payments.

Recommendation 2.

That Human Resources and NAS Management consider urgently whether the permanent recruitment freeze could be lifted for the two homes, enabling them to

take more control of some of the staffing costs. Also that they review the average hours offered on part time contracts for staff in the homes.

4.2 Catering and entertainment.

Members noted that there is a very clear policy within the homes that the food and entertainment provision is a key element of maintaining the dignity of residents. For example within the dining room napkins, linen table cloths and background music are provided. For residents who have to have soft or pureed meals they are moulded which means that in appearance terms the food looks the same as the real thing. This means the food is at a higher cost and this is not provided in most independent sector homes.

Similarly the entertainment and activities programme provided for the residents is of a high quality, and as such attracts visitors to learn about how it is provided, for example GPs, managers of independent homes. It is the view of the managers and staff that they are providing a flagship service which others could learn from.

It was noted that none of the mainstream budgets for the homes is being spent on entertainments and activities. They have a shop, café and hairdressing/beauty salon on site and this generates income that is used to fund activities. All of the services are provided at very low cost. This source of income for the homes is totally independent and is therefore an element of the homes' finances that the managers have complete control over. It is used to enhance the "dignity" experience for residents. All of the decorating, much of the furniture and soft furnishings were purchased through this budget and members of the review group noted that these were all of a very high standard.

In addition to this, the managers and staff have worked hard to strengthen links with the local communities and partners, for example the local church and police. Lord Hardy Court have set up Friends of Lord Hardy Court group and they were successful in gaining £10,000 lottery funding last year.

The review group also noted that in procurement terms, the Yorkshire purchasing organisation contract may not be offering the best value for money. It is designed to achieve economies of scale but the staff did not feel that this was being reflected in their budgets. It was noted that the changing arrangements with RBT may well change these procurement arrangements in the coming months.

Recommendation 3.

That the hard work and commitment of the staff and managers of both homes be recognised and the achievements made in enhancing the dignity of residents.

Recommendation 4

To provide the opportunity for the teams to explore this further and to generate independent income, at no additional cost to the Council, for the homes to enhance the experience for residents and to ensure that quality of provision is maintained as far as possible. This might also include some independent management of procurement for food and catering items.

Recommendation 5.

That further work is done with the procurement team of the Council to look at value for money in the current contractual arrangements and a review of how the food budgets are spent is carried out in conjunction with the managers of the homes.

4.3 Buildings and maintenance.

The review group heard from a number of witnesses about some of the problems that had been experienced with the design of the new buildings. The buildings themselves have the “wow” factor but are expensive to maintain. Decoration costs for the wooden exterior, the service charge for the maintenance of the green roof, cleaning of the high rise windows and the sprinkler system weekly servicing costs were all excluded from the original budgets. Staff suggested that it may be cheaper to train someone internally to carry out these tasks. In addition to this the grounds maintenance has been costing £5k per year for each home. It was noted, however, that this may decrease now that a handyman had been taken on for each home.

The review group were also made aware of concerns about costs associated with maintenance contracts and the fact that staff would prefer to be involved in the process for awarding them.

Recommendation 6

That consideration is given to the extent to which the handyman service or another internal employee could be trained to carry out some of the maintenance services that are currently causing the homes to go over their repairs and maintenance budgets..

Recommendation 7

That the same review contained within recommendation 5 for food procurement is carried out regard to procurement of cleaning, repairs and maintenance services. .

4.4 Costs and comparisons

The review group were presented with the findings of the information prepared by Price Waterhouse Cooper, on behalf of Neighbourhoods and Adults Services. The unit cost per resident week is much higher in both of the residential homes, compared to the independent sector.

When the overall budgets of the homes are broken down, by far the largest area of spend is staffing; approximately three quarters of the budget. The rest is split between capital charges, supplies and services and premises.

The conclusion drawn from the work by PWC about the costings of Lord Hardy Court and Davies Court was that although they are highly valued by customers and are fully compliant with external inspections, the current model is expensive and uncompetitive compared with the independent sector. The main areas of higher comparative spend are as follows:

- Pay and conditions of service
- Staff to customer ratios
- Management and supervisory levels
- Occupancy levels
- Procurement charges

As a result of the findings of PWC, Cabinet have considered as part its budget process for 2013/14 a package of savings for the homes which totals £870,000. This is likely to be achieved by changing the management structure, reductions to the staff to customer ratios and looking at changing arrangements to sick pay provisions. These proposals do not bring the homes in line with industry averages, but are proposed to strike a balance between cutting costs without undermining the quality of the service being provided. The reducing staff ratios will result in the number of staff hours per resident being reduced from 30 to 23. It was the view of the review group that this cut is too harsh.

As part of the review, the members visited some independent sector homes by way of comparison. Whilst on these visits they asked questions about staff ratios, costs, term and conditions etc as well as making general observations about facilities on offer and general cleanliness. The visits reaffirmed for the review group that the quality of provision and cleanliness of both Lord Hardy Court and Davies Court was of a considerably higher standard by comparison, although this also varied amongst the independent homes visited. They also noted that the staff ratios did not appear to be much different to those offered in Lord Hardy Court and Davies Court. The main area of difference was that of the staff terms and conditions, most notably the absence of any kind of pay supplement for anti social hours.

Another area of cost that the review group were concerned about was that of the outstanding costs of capital borrowing on the building of the two homes. They received evidence that the original capital costs of the buildings were under estimated and additional borrowing was required as a result of this. The capital raised from the sale of the old homes was used to offset the build costs, but a mortgage was required to plug the gap. The payment of these capital costs creates an additional pressure on the ability of the homes to break even. It also serves to limit the future options for the homes. The independent sector would be unlikely to take on the buildings because of this and if the homes were to close entirely the Council would still be required to pay this debt. The review group were concerned that this additional pressure on the budgets of the homes was not really fair and that other ways to account for this debt should be considered..

Recommendation 8

That Cabinet do not cut staff hours per resident below 25 as it is felt this will be to the detriment of the quality of the service provided.

Recommendation 9

That Cabinet re-consider the proposal to reduce the number of managers within the homes, as this is likely to result in re-deployment and payment protection costs which could outweigh the savings being made.

Recommendation 10

That the Council looks at alternative ways to manage the capital costs and borrowing associated with this, which potentially remove the burden from the revenue budgets of the homes.

4.5 Future monitoring

The action plan for the implementation of the recommendations that are accepted should be reported to the Health Select Commission on a six monthly basis for monitoring purposes.

5. Background Papers

Notes of Meeting: held on 26th September 2012

Notes of Meeting: held on 26th October 2012

Notes of Meeting: held on 2nd November 2012

Notes of Meeting: held on 14th December 2012

6. Thanks

Thanks go to all of the witnesses who gave their time and support to the review process.

The review group would like in particular to thank the staff and residents of all the homes visited during the review.

Thanks are also extended to Shona McFarlane and Ros Brown, who provided valued support to most of the review group meetings.

For further information about this report, please contact

Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, direct line: (01709) 822769
e-mail: Deborah.fellowes@rotherham.gov.uk

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1. Meeting:	Cabinet
2. Date:	19th June 2013
3. Title:	Scrutiny Review of Autistic Spectrum Disorder
4. Directorate:	Neighbourhoods and Adult Services

5. Summary

This report sets out the response to the findings and recommendations of the scrutiny review of Autistic Spectrum Disorder in Rotherham.

6. Recommendations

That Cabinet supports all the recommendations in the review.

7. Proposals and Details

The review was requested by the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People because of the apparent high levels of diagnosis of Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD) in Rotherham. This was identified in a report to the Cabinet Member and was explored further in a position paper to the Health Select Commission in July 2012. It was agreed at this meeting that a full review would be required and this would investigate the steady increase in diagnoses within the last 10 years.

The overall aim of the review was to achieve a better understanding of patterns of ASD in Rotherham, leading to the development of appropriate support and assistance to families affected by it. It was understood that the review took place in a climate of budget reductions and therefore also wanted to look at the potential for more effective use of existing resources.

The four stated objectives of the review were to consider, as follows:

- The reasons for the higher diagnosis rates
- Services required at diagnosis stage and after
- 16+ support and transition
- Budget implications

The review was therefore structured around these four objectives, with a dedicated meeting held for each one and evidence presented around these four headings.

Key messages that came out of the review are as follows:

- Early intervention and prevention work is key for children with ASD
- Mental health needs of children and adults with ASD can arise because of the lack of support
- Lack of clarity about where the lead of support lies – Education, Health etc
- Family and home support is a gap in provision
- It is difficult for many parents to make sense of all of the different agencies that are involved in this area of work
- There has been significant progress made with this area of work and this needs to continue with clear leadership and direction.
- To ensure the best outcomes for children and young people with ASD, parental voice and influence is absolutely crucial
- All of the recommendations formed as part of this review are about more effective use of existing resources, achieving better value for money and becoming better organised in delivery of support. It is the view of the review group that there should not be a need for additional resources to implement the recommendations

8. Finance

It was the opinion of the Review Group that the recommendations being forwarded can be implemented without any additional resources being required.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

The review group found that there is a lot of provision to support for children ASD, however, resources are not being used effectively in all cases. There is also some confusion about how and where to access these services. This has created a level of uncertainty around this agenda and it is the intention of the review groups via its recommendations to address this.

10. Contact

Deborah Fellowes
Scrutiny Manager

Ext 22769

john.radford@rotherham.gov.uk

Cabinet's Response to Scrutiny Review – Autism Spectrum Condition

Recommendation	Cabinet Decision <i>(Accepted/ Rejected/ Deferred)</i>	Cabinet Response <i>(detailing proposed action if accepted, rationale for rejection, and why and when issue will be reconsidered if deferred)</i>	Officer Responsible	Action by (Date)
<p>That the Autism Communication Team (ACT) continue to coordinate the monitoring and intelligence of ASD rates of diagnosis in Rotherham, and partner agencies be requested to share information to facilitate this being done accurately. ACT should also ensure that partner agencies have access to this compiled information.</p>	Accept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local and Regional data continues to be collected and shared across education and health. • CAMHS and LA have improved dialogue. 	Paula Williams Head of Learning Support Service	Review 12 months June 2014
<p>That CDC and CAMHS bring forward proposals to streamline their assessment processes and reduce waiting lists. In particular transition referrals at age 5 should be the subject of a clearly documented care plan that is shared with all partners and the family.</p>	Accept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDC / CAMHS physically located in same building – overt discussions taken place re transition phase. • Both CDC / CAMHS comply with DSM IV. 	Steve Mulligan Principal Educational Psychologist	Review 12 months June 2014
<p>That the SEN reform project group be asked to implement a pilot project for the development of Education, Health and Care plans for children with a diagnosis of ASD with a view to ensuring that in the future all children with a diagnosis will have a multi-agency care plan with a lead worker allocated</p>	Accept	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EHC plans are being developed by the LA group looking at Support & Aspiration under strategic leadership of DS. 	Jackie Parkin Support and Aspiration	June 2014

<p>That proposals are brought forward to develop more wrap around family support to assist with the transition between different services (particularly post 5) and at different life stages. This service should recognise the vital role that parents and carers need to play in working with and influencing service providers, and should be developed in line with the commitments in the Parent and Child Charter.</p>	<p>Accept</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued work re development and understanding of multi element planning. • The principles of the Parent and Child Charter continue to be implemented. 	<p>Steve Mulligan & Claire Whiting Educational Psychology Service</p>	<p>June 2014</p>
<p>That the hierarchy of support within a mainstream setting with ACT and Educational Psychology concentrating on children with more complex needs, be formalised and further developed, including exploring the potential role of special schools to support mainstream schools with support for children with less complex needs.</p>	<p>Accept</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ACT Team have been aligned to the Learning Support Service. The funding of all the targeted services is under a three way review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ High Needs Block ○ Learners First Review ○ Development of Integrated Pupil Services 	<p>Steve Mulligan Principal Educational Psychologist</p>	<p>June 2014</p>
<p>That the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) includes a detailed and thorough assessment of the needs of children and adults with autism, including the identification of any gap in services.</p>	<p>Accept</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ASC Scrutiny report will form the basis of the JSNA around autism. 	<p>John Radford Director of Public Health</p>	<p>June 2014</p>
<p>In line with the JSNA, that commissioners consider the commissioning of Rotherham based service for young people (16+) with ASD over the next 5 years, building on the good practice that already exists. This would result in a reduction of out of authority placements.</p>	<p>Accept</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued work re post 16 provision includes building capacity at local college, bespoke packages and joint venture partnerships with independent service providers. • Director of Safeguarding leading on work re OOA placements. 	<p>John Radford Director of Public Health Clair Pyper Director of Safeguarding</p>	<p>June 2014</p>

<p>That a local care pathway for the management of ASD in adults should be developed in line with appropriate NICE guidelines.</p>	<p>Accept</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussions taken place with Adult Services regarding Autism with Adults paper / pathways linked to the ASC Strategy Group. 	<p>Steve Mulligan Principal Educational Psychologist</p> <p>John Williams Adult Services</p>	<p>June 2014</p>
<p>That RMBC identifies a senior leader for the autism agenda, who is able to challenge provision and raise the status of the condition. The work should then be channelled through the Autism Strategy Group.</p>	<p>Accept</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This work is being considered during the financial year 2013/14 as part of the modernisation of the service structures around pupils' services. 	<p>Dorothy Smith Director of Schools & Lifelong Learning</p>	<p>June 2014</p>
<p>That commissioners should look at how a pathway of care can be resourced effectively and the CCG specifically whether a single diagnostic route would be more appropriate.</p>	<p>Accept</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children and young people are diagnosed at different stages of their development. All systems must be NICE compliant. 	<p>John Radford Director of Public Health</p>	<p>June 2014</p>

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO CABINET
--

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet
2.	Date:	19th June 2013
3.	Title:	Revenue Account Outturn 2012/13
4.	Directorate:	Resources

5. Summary

- In 2012/13 the Council **budgeted** to spend **£213.290m** on its **General Fund Revenue Account**. **Actual spending for the year was £212.402m**, a **saving** against budget of **£0.888m (or -0.42%)**. Of this, £0.705m is accounted for by surpluses on trading accounts, leaving a **net underspend of £0.183m**.

Requests to carry-forward £159k of unspent 2012/13 budgets for specific projects/purposes are also included in this report. **If approved the remaining balance available to support the budget is £24k.**

- In addition, the **Delegated Schools' Budget was £183.574m**. Actual spend against this was **£182.958m**, an **underspend of £0.616m** for the year. This has been added to Schools' Reserves which at 31st March 2013 stood at £8.227m.
- The Housing Revenue Account (HRA) in 2012/13 was **budgeted** to make a contribution to the HRA General Reserve of **£1.838m**. Actual contribution to this Reserve was **£6.801m** - a £4.963m additional contribution.
- This is a very positive outturn, especially given the challenges faced in-year which necessitated the implementation of a moratorium on all but essential spend from October. It is the result of the hard work of both elected Members and staff in managing reducing levels of funding at a time of increasing service need, and also the generally good and responsible financial management on the part of budget holders.
- Reflecting the above out-turn position, and assuming the recommendations in this report are approved, the Council's Revenue Reserves as at 31 March 2013 were: **General Fund Reserves** available and uncommitted to support the Budget **£9.316m** and Earmarked Reserves £51.345m of which £41.663m is ringfenced for HRA, Schools and to meet future PFI contractual obligations. Reserves at the end of 2012/13 are in line with planned levels.

6. Recommendations

That Cabinet:

- 1. Note the Council's General Fund, Schools' and the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Revenue Outturn Position Statements for 2012/13.**

- 2. Note the level of the Council's Revenue Reserves as at 31 March 2013.**
- 3. Approve the carrying forward of underspends on Trading Services (£704,895) and requests for carrying forward of specific items (£158,709) in accordance with the Council's approved policy; and**
- 4. Approve the waiving of the Council's policy of carrying forward 20% of Directorate underspends from 2012/13.**

7. Proposals and Details

7.1 Revenue Outturn 2012/13

Rotherham's Net Revenue Budget (excluding Delegated Schools' Budget £183.574m) for the 2012/13 financial year was £213.290m. Actual spending was £212.402m, resulting in an underspend of £0.888m (or 0.42%). In addition to this, the Delegated Schools' Budget was underspent by £0.616m.

The Revenue Outturn position is analysed by Directorate at **Appendix 1** with the principal reasons for the variations set out in **Appendix 2**. More detailed Directorate Outturn reports have been presented to individual Cabinet Members for their portfolio areas of responsibility.

In spite of significant pressures and commitments, the Council has managed to achieve, through taking a proactive series of management actions and careful financial management, a positive financial out-turn. Excluding the position on schools, there is a net underspend of £0.888m (0.42%) on the Council's Net Revenue Budget. This reflects the Council's continued prudent and sustainable approach to financial management.

During 2012/13 the Council has continued the process of reconfiguring and rationalising its services in order to meet the financial challenges it is facing. As part of the process the Council offered the option of a voluntary severance scheme during the financial year. By the 31st March 2013, 328 employees had left or had been given approval to leave the Council under the terms of its Voluntary Severance arrangements (that is Voluntary Early Retirement, Voluntary Redundancy, Phased Retirement and Redeployment).

7.2 Schools' Budgets

Schools' budgets totalled £183.574m last year. Spending against these budgets came to £182.958m, an underspend of £0.616m (0.34%) which was transferred into Schools' Balances. Schools' Balances (including declared savings of £0.252m) stood at £8.227m as at 31st March 2013. The Department for Education (DfE) makes it clear, that schools are autonomous and self-managing and as such, within set guidelines the use of balances is under their control.

7.3 Housing Revenue Account (HRA)

The outturn position for the HRA showed a surplus for the year of £6.801m, which increased the HRA General Reserve to £15.129m as at 31st March 2013. The Service was budgeted to increase reserves in 2012/13 by £1.838m. This expected level of contribution was exceeded by £4.963m. The principal reasons for the above budget increase in the General Reserve are summarised in **Appendix 2**.

The HRA's 30 year Business Plan (under the Government's Self Financing Regime) has been updated to reflect the Outturn position and contribute towards providing additional future investment in the Council's housing stock.

HRA balances (including Major Repairs and Furnished Homes) stood at £19.845m at 31st March 2013.

7.4 Carry Forward of Balances into 2013/14

The following treatment of year end balances is proposed:

- **Trading services**

The Council's existing practice of carrying forward 100% of surpluses and deficits will continue and these will be taken into account in future year's business plans.

- **One-off or specific project budgets**

In cases where there are exceptional items of expenditure e.g. earmarked funding for special projects or developments, an application and supporting case has to be made to SLT to recommend to Cabinet the carry forward of 100% of any unspent balance at the end of the financial year if the project remains to be completed.

The outturn position for 2012/13 now reported reflects the position before the approval of the carry forward of trading services and specific balances. **Appendix 3** shows the position under each of these categories and the supporting case for their application to carry forward specific project budgets.

SLT has considered the requests for carry forward and recommends to Cabinet that all requests are approved. These total £0.864m composed of: £0.705m in respect of traded services and £0.159m relating to one-off or exceptional items.

7.5 Reserves

Reserves to Support the General Fund Revenue Budget:

General Fund Reserves are held in order to protect the Council against unforeseen costs and contingencies and to mitigate financial risks. In order to ensure that a prudent level of balances is held the value of balances is risk assessed annually as part of the budget setting process. Reflecting the outturn position and after assuming that the carry forward requests are approved, **£9.316m of the General Fund Reserve is available to support future years' budgets**. This figure is equivalent to about 4% of the Council's Net Revenue Budget which is in line with the Council's Financial Plan and is deemed to be at a prudent level. The increase from the estimated figure reported within the 2013/14 Budget Setting report is due to the Council delivering an Outturn within the Cash Limited Budget for 2012/13.

Earmarked Reserves

At the end of the 2012/13 financial year the Council's earmarked reserves stood at **£51.345m** comprising:

- Schools' Balances of £8.227m;
- HRA Reserves of £19.845m;
- PFI Reserve (£13.591m) to meet future contractual obligations over the life of the Schools and Leisure schemes;
- Commutation Adjustment Reserve (£8.394m) to meet future debt repayment costs;

- Culture and Leisure Insurance Reserve (£0.355m) and;
- Other Earmarked Reserves (£0.933m).

Cabinet is asked to note the level of the Council's Revenue Reserves as at 31 March 2013.

8. Finance

In total, the Council **budgeted to spend £396.864m on its General Fund Revenue Account in 2012/13**, (excluding Schools' Budgets the total was £213.290m). **The actual spend was £395.360m**; an underspend of £1.504m or 0.38% less than budget. This is made up of the following:

	£m	%
General Fund (excl. Schools Delegated Budgets)	0.888	0.42
Schools Delegated Budgets	0.616	0.34
	-----	-----
	1.504	0.38
	-----	-----

The summarised effect of this outturn position on the Council's Reserves has been set out above in the Reserves section of this report.

Cabinet is asked to support the following proposed treatment of the non-schools unspent 2012/13 General Fund balance:

General Fund (Non-Schools) Outturn Balance	
- transferred to General Fund Reserves	£0.888m
Less:	
Carry forward of Traded Services	£0.705m
Carry forward requests for specific projects/purposes	<u>£0.159m</u>
<u>Balance available to support budget</u>	<u>£0.024m</u>

9. Risks and Uncertainties

Decisions about the level of resources (including reserves) that are deployed to deliver the Council's priorities involve risk and uncertainty. However, the impact of unforeseen circumstances and adverse variances against budget can be minimised by continuing improvements in financial management, including the more effective management of financial risks.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Approval with regard to the carry forward requests for Traded Services and for specific projects/purposes should be given as soon as possible so as to give certainty to the final level of approved budget for the current (2013/14) financial year.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Cabinet Reports:

- Proposed Revenue Budget and Council Tax for 2012/13, 22nd February, 2012
- Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring reports to SLT and Cabinet.

Other Documents

- Statement of Accounts 2011/12 and draft Statement of Accounts 2012/13

Contact Name: *Stuart Booth, Director of Financial Services, ext:22034,*
stuart.booth@rotherham.gov.uk

APPENDIX 1 – 2012/13 Outturn Summary by Directorate

<u>Directorate</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Outturn</u>	<u>Surplus (-)/ Deficit (+)</u>	<u>Trading</u>	<u>Non- Trading</u>
	<u>£</u>	<u>£</u>	<u>£</u>	<u>£</u>	<u>£</u>
C&YPS	35,176,211	35,600,634	+424,423	-468,616	+893,039
EDS	35,877,844	36,062,876	+185,032		+185,032
Adult Social Services	72,024,293	71,498,149	-526,144		-526,144
Neighbourhoods	<u>2,457,786</u>	<u>2,120,031</u>	<u>-337,755</u>	<u>-62,074</u>	<u>-275,681</u>
NAS	74,482,079	73,618,180	-863,899	-62,074	-801,825
Resources (Including Land Bank)	21,571,350	21,642,297	+70,947	-174,205	+245,152
Central and Other Services	46,182,516	45,477,898	-704,618		-704,618
TOTAL (Excl Schools)	213,290,000	212,401,885	-888,115	-704,895	-183,220
Schools' Budgets	183,573,755	182,957,392	-616,363		-616,363
TOTAL	396,863,755	395,359,277	-1,504,478	-704,895	-799,583

APPENDIX 2 - EXPLANATION OF MAJOR BUDGET VARIATIONS IN 2012/13

Children & Young People's Services

The Children and Young People's service (excluding schools) spent **+£424k above budget** in 2012/13. After allowing for the carry forward of the trading surplus on the Schools Catering Service (-£422k) & the Schools Music Service (-£46k), the **overspend compared with budget was £893k**. The key reasons for the variations to budget are:

Special Education Provision was +£74k overspent. This was due to an overspend of +£147k as a result of more Complex Needs placements (17 at the end of 2012/13 compared with 13 at the end of 2011/12, an increase of 4) which is partially offset by additional income generation in Education Psychology of (-£25k) & staff savings (-£48k).

Delegated services were underspent by -£428k. This includes the School Catering trading surplus (-£422k) and the School Music Service trading surplus (-£46k), which will be carried forward into 2013/14. There was also an overspend at Rockingham Professional Development Centre (+£40k) due to under recovery of income.

Children Looked After services were +£1,566m overspent. The number of Looked After Children has increased by 9 to 392 over the last 12 months. The overspend is mainly due to out of authority residential placements (+£1.607m) and independent fostering placements (+£259k). These overspends are partially offset by underspends on in-house Residential care services (-£228k) & transport for Looked after Children (-£72k).

Other CYPS Services underspent by -£788k to help mitigate the overall service pressure. These underspends are mainly due to staffing savings (-£160k), reduced leaving care costs (-£87k) and the flexible allocation of grant underspends (-£541k).

Impact of Management Actions

Considerable, concerted proactive management actions to contain, and where possible, reduce the financial pressures faced by the Directorate have continued throughout 2012/13. In total these actions have helped the service avoid £2.49m of costs that would otherwise have been incurred including; a reduction in placement costs (£460k) through renegotiating contracts with external providers, a reduction in the use of agency staff (£1.309m) due to successful recruitment of social workers, continued operation of the multi-agency support panel where management actions and decision making has avoided costs of £703k and reduced overtime costs (£18k) in 2012/13.

Environment and Development Services

The overall service out-turn position was **+£0.185m above budget**. The main variations against budget were:

The Directorate's Business Unit underspent by -£57k due to effective management of vacancies, the moratorium on non-essential spend and a controlled Training programme.

Regeneration, Planning and Cultural Services underpent by -£78k. There are some key pressures within the service area. Markets have reported a pressure +£47k due to fewer traders renting stalls and the need to undertake more repairs. Development Control have under recovered against an income budget reporting a pressure of +£103k. Economic Strategy have reported pressure of +£94k, in the main due to the suspension of the European Social Fund, which funded staff time and can now no longer be recovered causing an income shortfall. Other pressures across the service amount to +£64k.

These pressures are being mitigated by some savings which are mainly due to the council wide moratorium on spend. Culture and Heritage Services was -£68k underspent mainly due to staff vacancies. Library services have underspent by -£210k and further savings across Regeneration, Planning and Cultural Services amount to a -£108k underspend.

Network Management was + £662k overspent. The main pressure being the winter maintenance budget (which provides for a below average winter) was overspent by +£536k, mainly due to a prolonged periods of severe weather throughout the winter months. Parking Services under-recovered its income budget by +£142k but has made savings of -£15k to help mitigate this. Other Network Management pressures totalling +£58k, are being mitigated by savings of -£59k from Streetworks and Enforcements additional income recovery. This additional income is unlikely to be recurrent.

Waste Management is -£74k underspent due to some savings from renegotiation of contracts and from changes to collection arrangements for Green Waste over the winter period. These continue to more than offset some income pressures on waste collection, but may be subject to change, as contractual arrangements remain under review.

Leisure and Community Services is -£103k underspent due to savings from the imposed moratorium, a freeze on sports revenue grants and third party funding, not recruiting to vacant posts and increased in income at country parks.

The Corporate Transport Unit and associated services are -£132k underspent mainly due to reduced costs of bus passes from SYPT, a reduction of Post 16 charges from colleges, some additional income from driver training courses, and the impact of the imposed moratorium.

Transportation Services are overspent by +£39k due to additional revenue material costs associated with a Local Transport Plan (LTP) scheme.

Other Directorate wide savings amounted to -£72k.

Neighbourhoods and Adult Services

Adult Services

The Adult Services outturn **delivered an underspend of -£0.526m against budget.** The key variations within each service area can be summarised as follows:

The key variations within each service area can be summarised as follows:

Adults General budgets were underspent by -£27k mainly due to the moratorium on supplies and services and managed savings on training budgets.

Older People's Services were -£761k underspent. Additional Winter Pressures funding received in last quarter (-£378k). Vacancies due to service reviews (-£687k). Impact of the moratorium on non essential spend within Day Care and assistive Technology (-£211k). Slippage on developing services for Dementia clients (-£220k) and carers breaks (-£192k). An underspend on independent residential and nursing care (-£221k) due to 32 less clients receiving service than budgeted together with a reduction in the average cost per client due to more self funders. These underspends were reduced by pressures on Direct Payments (+£998k) due to additional demand (104 additional clients received direct payments) and budget pressure in house residential care income (+£115k) plus an overall overspend on domiciliary care due to increase in demand during final quarter (+£35k).

Learning Disability services were overspent by +£753k. Due to an overspend on independent sector residential care budgets as a result of an increase in the number of clients including the average cost of care packages plus loss of income from health (+£676k). Recurrent pressures on Day Care transport including under-recovery of income from charges and new high cost placements, pending final outcome of review (+£201k). Increase in demand for Direct Payments over and above budget (+£95k). Supported living schemes underspent due to additional CHC income and the decommissioning of one scheme (-£224k). Minor overspend on supplies and services budgets (+£5k).

Mental Health Services were -£58k underspent. Pressures on Direct Payments (+£101k) were offset by savings on Community Support Services (-£155k) as clients moved to a direct payment. **Minor underspends** on supplies and services (-£4k).

Physical and Sensory Disabilities were -£271k underspent. Slippage in developing specialist alternatives to residential care provision (-£584k) used to mitigate pressures within direct payments. An underspend on the equipment and minor adaptations budgets, additional winter pressures funding, vacancies and savings on supplies and services (-£183k). These underspends have been reduced by an increase in demand for Direct Payments (+38 clients) resulting in an overspend (+£496k).

Adults Safeguarding were underspent by -£20k mainly due to slippage on filling vacant posts plus additional fee income from court of protection.

Supporting People were underspent by -£142k due to additional savings relating to a reduction in actual activity on a number of subsidy contracts.

Neighbourhoods

The net outturn for Neighbourhood services shows an **underspend of -£0.338m before the carryforward of traded services balances and -£0.276m after taking traded service balances into account.** The key variations can be summarised as follows:

Environmental Health underspent by -£34k as a result of vacant posts, the impact of the Council wide moratorium on non-essential expenditure, and some one-off grant funding that was used to partially fund expenditure within the Community Protection Team.

Public Health services (Food Safety, Health and Safety, Animal Health, Trading Standards, Licensing and Bereavement Services) **underspent by -£77k** mainly due to slippage in implementing the restructure within this service.

Housing and Communities underspent by -£53k. This included an underspend as a result of Members Allocations not being fully spent in the year within Community Leadership Fund. A request for Cabinet to support carry-forward of £21,248 was submitted on 25th February to Cabinet Member for Community Development, Equality and Young Persons Issues (Ref minute number 41). Further savings were made due to tight vacancy management and tight controls on supplies and services within Area Assemblies.

Housing Strategy and Investment services underspent by -£41k mainly due to lower utility costs within the Lighting of Staircases budget.

Housing Options underspent by -£80k. Within this the Dispersed Units Trading Account generated a surplus of £62k and this report includes a proposal to carry forward the trading surplus. Additional income was also generated from fees within the Adaptations Service.

Central Neighbourhood services underspent by -£53k due to savings made on supplies and services budgets.

Resources

The overall service outturn position **was +£71k before the carryforward of traded services surpluses and +£0.245m above budget when these are taken into account.** The main variations against budget were:

Commissioning, Policy & Performance, HR and Legal Services budgets were underspent by -£112k. This includes delivery of the £500k budgeted Shared Services target for 2012/13, principally from the HR & payroll shared service with Doncaster MBC.

Of the -£112k underspend, £88k is being requested for carry-forward, £79k in respect of the Rotherham Partnership and £9k in respect of underspends on the International Events and Town Twinning budgets. (See Appendix 3).

Financial Services was underspent against budget (-£194k). This includes a net surplus (-£174k) on schools traded services which will be carried forward into 2013/14. (See Appendix 3). The balance (-£20k) is due to savings through the moratorium on non-essential spend.

Revenues and Benefits Service was overspent by £37k due to awards for discretionary rate relief being greater than the level budgeted.

Asset Management was underspent by £325k. This includes an overspend on the Council's Land & Property Bank (+£444k) due to the need to keep secure properties which have been vacated until they are sold or demolished. This overspend was partially mitigated through underspends elsewhere in Asset Management (-£119k). This includes an underspend on the Emergency Planning Joint Service with Sheffield City Council (-£50k) which is being requested as a carry-forward to pay for crucial work on reservoir risk assessments and temporary mortuary / excess death provision, which could not be completed within a reasonable timescale without the

retention of this funding (See Appendix 3) and through additional income generation (-£69k).

Internal Audit and Governance was slightly overspent (£15k) due to the service not achieving its staffing vacancy factor.

Central and Other Services

Overall these services **contributed a net saving to the 2012/13 Outturn of £0.704m**. Key pressures and savings within this were:

- Partial delivery of the budgeted staff savings target (+£1.209m)
- Slippage on the delivery of the budgeted 2012/13 Commissioning Savings Target (+£932k).
- Slippage in delivering the budgeted 2012/13 Customer Service savings target (£87k).
- Provision made for legal claims in respect of property searches (+£273k)
- Write off of uncollectable Sundry Account debts (+£70k)

The above pressures were mitigated through: additional one-off Housing Benefit income (-£495k), the Council's Contingency budget (-£251); and delivery of Accounting Opportunities (-£2.529m).

The Council's Outturn position also reflects inclusion of a provision for the Municipal Mutual Insurance (MMI) liability at the upper end (28%) of the Administrators estimate of the Council's liability. This has been funded via the Council's Insurance fund, additional one-off Housing Benefit income (£460k) and partial use of a pensions overpayment refund (£51k).

Housing Revenue Account (HRA)

The Housing Revenue Account **budgeted** to make a contribution to reserves of **£1.838m**. Actual contribution to reserves was **£6.801m; £4.963m above budget**.

The principal reasons for the £4.963m additional contribution to the HRA General Reserve were:

- Underspend on expenditure on minor voids (-£796k)
- Slippage on planned works and capitalisation of expenditure on garage sites (-£763k)
- Under utilisation of bad weather contingency and contractual risks budgets (-£220k)
- Review of Service Level Agreements, including procurement and support costs (-£1.197m)
- Review of staffing structures, including vacancies, and moratorium on non essential spend (-£883k)
- Savings on final Housing Subsidy payment after final audit (-£157k)
- Additional income from charges for services and facilities (-£760k)
- Additional rent income (-£187k).

APPENDIX 3 - CARRY FORWARD OF 2012/13 REVENUE BUDGET UNDERSPENDS

Carry Forward of Traded Balances (£704,895)

In accordance with the 9th April 2008 Cabinet decision to carry forward 100% of traded services surplus and deficits and be included in future years' business plans, the following trading service balances will be carried forward in to 2013/14 financial year.

C&YPS

- £422,408 Schools Catering Service (Trading surplus). The service has prepared a report for Cabinet to consider the proposed use of this trading surplus.
- £46,208 Schools Music Service. The Authority has secured £1.4m in funding in respect of the Rotherham Music Hub from the Arts Council of England over a 3 year period with the funding reducing over that 3 year period. It is requested that the surplus funds of £46k from operations in 2012/13, be carried forward into 2013/14 to partially offset the fall in government funding in future years.

NAS

- £62,074 This is the trading surplus on the Dispersed and Furnished Units service which provides emergency overnight accommodation. Income from the weekly charge from occupied units is used to contribute to replace fixtures, furniture and furnishings within the temporary units for the homeless and is ring-fenced to the service area. Due to the nature of what the properties are used for it is difficult to estimate the occupancy, thus the income levels that may be generated throughout the year are reinvested into the upkeep of the properties and to cover operational costs, any reserve that is generated at year end is used the following year to maintain property standards and to supplement any short fall in income due to under occupancy of the units in year. This service sits alongside the furnished accommodation scheme operated in the HRA to help support the establishment of vulnerable tenancies.

Financial Services

- £107,647 This surplus relates to the Schools' Staff Sickness Insurance Scheme which provides financial compensation to schools which need to employ additional staff to cover their own staff's absence.
- £66,558 This surplus is for Schools' Finance Traded Service which provides financial management and professional support and advice to Head Teachers and Governing Bodies in managing their financial resources

Carry Forward of specific project budgets

As previously indicated, the existing policy requires that in the case of exceptional items of expenditure, an application and supporting case be made to SLT to recommend to Cabinet the carry forward of 100% of any unspent balance at the end of the financial year.

These requests are set out below by Directorate:

Neighbourhoods

- £21,248 Community Leadership Fund - the Members Community Leadership Fund had an under spend of £21k at the year end. It was agreed on 25th February at Cabinet Member meeting for Community Development and Equality and Young Persons Issues to request to Cabinet a carry forward of any unspent balance for use in 2013/14. (See Minute Ref 41)

Resources

Carry forwards are requested for the following, mainly grant and/or jointly funded activities:

- £79,289 Funding for the Rotherham Partnership is provided by organisations like the South Yorkshire Police, the Chamber of Commerce, NHS Rotherham, Rotherham Hospitals, Voluntary Action Rotherham and Thomas Rotherham and Dearne Valley Colleges.
- £49,743 Emergency Planning Joint Service with Sheffield City Council. This represents the 2012/13 underspend on this jointly funded service which at the meeting of the Joint Committee on 6 December, the Elected Members (supported by the lead directors of both councils) agreed to request the carry-forward of any surplus to support the joint service in 2013/14. The proportionate share of the underspend is: Sheffield £33,825 and Rotherham £15,918. The funding has been provisionally earmarked to pay for crucial work on reservoir risk assessments and temporary mortuary / excess death provision, which could not be completed within a reasonable timescale without the retention of this funding.
- £8,429 International Events (£2,245) and Town Twinning (£6,184) – to fund commitments for events in 2013/14.

TOTAL

- **£863,604** **Of this, £704,895 relates to trading accounts and £158,709 to specific balances.**

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet
2.	Date:	19th June 2013
3.	Title:	Response to the review by the <i>Improving Places Select Commission</i> of Grounds Maintenance and Street Cleansing services
4.	Directorate:	Environment and Development Services

5. Summary

The report provides a detailed response to the recommendations made by the *Improving Places Select Commission* following its review of the Grounds Maintenance and Street Cleansing services.

6. Recommendations

It is recommended that Cabinet agrees the response to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

7. Proposals and Details

A report on the “**effects of budget savings on the Grounds Maintenance and Street Cleansing schedules**” was presented to the Improving Places Select Commission on the 25th July 2012. The commission agreed at the meeting that a review of the services be carried out. The review was conducted over three separate meetings during November and December 2012 against the following objectives:

- To analyse the impact of budget cuts to the service
- To ensure that risk and impact assessments have been fully considered and are in place for the future
- To develop practical suggestions for improvement of the service within budget
- To consider invest to save options.

The recommendations of the Select Commission have been considered by officers, and a detailed response is attached as an appendix.

The review by the Improving Places Select Commission largely aligns with the work undertaken by officers to identify actions which mitigate the effects of the reductions in service budgets.

It is recommended that the detailed response is agreed by Cabinet and reported to the Overview & Scrutiny Management Board at its meeting on 28th June 2013.

8. Finance

There are no direct financial implications arising from the review.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

The review by the **Improving Places Select Commission** was undertaken against a backdrop of concerns that, following reductions in budgets for Grounds Maintenance and Street Cleansing, it is difficult to meet the standards that residents of the borough have been accustomed to. The recommendations and actions already taken by officers will help mitigate these concerns.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The Grounds Maintenance and Street Cleansing services have a direct and significant impact on one of the Council’s key priorities: **Improving the environment**.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

The Cabinet Member for Waste and Emergency Planning has been consulted in drawing up the response.

Report to Improving Places Select Commission - Leisure and Community Services: effects of budget savings on grounds maintenance and street cleansing schedules. Dated 25th July 2013.

Scrutiny review: Grounds Maintenance and Street Cleansing - Review of the Improving Places Select Commission November – December 2012

Code of Practice on Litter and Refuse

Contact Name: *David Burton, Director of Streetpride,
telephone 01709 822906
e-mail david-streetpride.burton @rotherham.gov.uk*

Cabinet's Response to Review by the Improving Places Select Commission of Grounds Maintenance and Street Cleansing services

Recommendation	Cabinet Decision (Accepted/ Rejected/ Deferred)	Cabinet Response (detailing proposed action if accepted, rationale for rejection, and why and when issue will be reconsidered if deferred)	Officer Responsible	Action by (Date)
That the options put forward as part of the initial officer review (appended to this report) that have not been explored further as part of this review be supported in principle and subject to further detailed consideration for ways of improving services and reducing costs.	Accepted	A draft Street Cleansing Action Plan has been produced which will be presented to Cabinet Member for Waste & Emergency Planning before the summer recess.	Director of Streetpride	July 2013
That the proposed review of schedules and the removal of the schedule in one pilot area be completed, the pilot evaluated and rolled out as appropriate. The staff involved in the pilot should be consulted as part of the evaluation.	Accepted	The change to service deliver in a pilot area (Clifton) commenced in May 2013. Further alternative service delivery options are also being evaluated.	Leisure & Community Services (LCS) Manager	September 2013
That the areas detailed in section 5.1, and summarised below are subject to further detailed consideration and proposed actions reported back: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of spare capacity of green waste collection operatives on a Grounds Maintenance winter schedule Urban gardening as an alternative to shrubs 	Accepted Accepted	In place – green waste collections during the winter period are now scheduled for 4-weekly and spare resources are deployed across other Streetpride functions A programme of shrub removal will enable this to happen; officers are working with Rotherham in Root .	Waste Manager LCS Manager	Completed Ongoing

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment of member of staff to identify sites for alternative use/disposal 	Rejected	This work has been completed within existing resources.	n/a	n/a
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waiver of legal fees for disposal of sites 	Rejected	The Council has an established policy covering Asset Transfer and the disposal of sites which are declared surplus. Exceptions will continue to be considered on a case-by-case basis.	n/a	n/a
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotion of Streetpride's grounds maintenance service to schools 	Accepted	In place – schools have been contacted to make them aware of the availability of the Grounds Maintenance service, quotes have already been provided and will continue as contracts become available.	LCS Area Manager	Ongoing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities for grass retardant spraying 	Accepted	Three sites across the borough have been identified – one highway verge, one roundabout and one green space.	LCS Area Manager	Completed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dealing with over grown rural junctions 	Rejected	Sight lines are scheduled for 6 cuts/year, and this is supplemented with monitoring by Highways Inspectors	n/a	n/a
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consortium for purchase of equipment 	Accepted	Most equipment is provided through existing contracts which terminate in 2015. Options will be evaluated for future procurement at the appropriate time.	LCS Manager	Ongoing
That the Council considers the adoption of a Town/Village centre standard for Grounds Maintenance and Street Cleansing that focuses resources in these areas using the Parish Network where appropriate.	Rejected	<p>The basic approach that is already used is to provide the same outcome from the service. This proposal does not therefore fit in with the principle of targeting resources to areas of most need, and does not reflect the level of reports received through Streetpride Connect. In addition some townships already benefit from the use of a 'lengthsman' to match resources to need.</p> <p>An increased focus on village centres would involve the withdrawal of resources from other areas which inevitably means that standards 'where people live' would be reduced.</p>	n/a	n/a
That, subject to a positive full evaluation of the pilot, the Council purchasing further Billy Goat machines as and when resources allow.	Accepted	A full review of equipment is included in the Street Cleansing Action Plan, and will be completed this summer.	LCS Manager	September 2013

<p>That the response times for racist and homophobic graffiti is changed from 4 hours to 24 hours, to allow greater flexibility of resources and ensure this target can be met.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>In place</p>	<p>LCS Manager</p>	<p>Completed</p>
<p>That a study is completed to identify the most effective use of diminishing staff resources</p>	<p>Accepted</p>	<p>This is already included in the Grounds Maintenance and Street Cleansing Action Plans</p>	<p>LCS Manager</p>	<p>September 2013</p>

<p>That customer contact is improved by the following and that this information is used to inform the Town/Village Centre standard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recording contacts with geographical information to gather intelligence on trends and patterns. Weekly lists of big works and schemes Monitoring of standards and reporting back to customers who complain 	<p>Accepted</p> <p>Accepted</p> <p>Accepted</p> <p>Partially accepted</p>	<p>A review of Customer Services systems is being undertaken across Streetpride which will improve processes.</p> <p>In progress – reports have been set up to enable analysis of trends and targeting of resources</p> <p>In place – this has been posted on the Council’s website for a number of years</p> <p>All complaints receive a formal reply as part of the corporate system. Responding to every report/request is not possible with current systems unless additional resources are provided.</p>	<p>LCS Manager & Performance Officer</p> <p>n/a</p> <p>Service Improvement team</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>January 2014</p> <p>n/a</p> <p>tbc</p>
<p>That ways to involve the community and generate civic pride are explored including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development of an accredited volunteer scheme. Making the right tools for the job available for members of the community who wish to assist with neighbourhood tidying Consideration of how the Streetpride Champions initiative could be re-invigorated or replaced. Councillors and staff to become eyes and ears in the community 	<p>Accepted</p> <p>Accepted</p> <p>Partially accepted</p> <p>Accepted</p> <p>Accepted</p>	<p>Work is in progress to establish a Volunteer Bureau to support services across all Council services. An initial report will be made to SLT this summer.</p> <p>The operation of some equipment requires (accredited) training and may not be appropriate for use by volunteers. Basic equipment such as litter pickers is already provided.</p> <p>In progress – a review of the role of SP Volunteers commenced earlier this year.</p> <p>The ‘not my job’ initiative is being re-launched with LCS Staff including awareness training on Child Sexual Exploitation (July).</p>	<p>Director of Housing & Neighbourhood Services/Director of Streetpride</p> <p>LCS Manager</p> <p>Service Improvement Officer</p> <p>Member Development panel/LCS Manager</p>	<p>September 2013</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>September 2013</p> <p>Ongoing</p>

<p>That an exercise to assess over used and under used bins is completed with a view to moving existing bins in line with its findings and that the following methods are used to maintain this over time:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff on the ground to monitor usage • Engagement with Planning on bins at application stages and ward members when removing bins • Monitoring of shopping areas 	Accepted	<p>In progress – initial review has been completed and is being quality checked.</p> <p>In place In place</p> <p>In place</p>	LCS Area Manager	June 2013
<p>That Cabinet consider any ways in which the Cabinet portfolios covering this area could be clarified and simplified.</p>	Accepted	Changes were made to portfolios for the current municipal year	Cabinet	Completed
<p>That all pilots and initiatives generated as a result of this review are evaluated fully and progress is reported back to the relevant Cabinet Member.</p>	Accepted	Regular updates will be provided to Cabinet Member for Waste & Emergency Planning	Director of Streetpride	Ongoing

1.	Meeting	The Cabinet
2.	Date	19th June 2013
3.	Title	Downsizing Policy
4.	Directorate	Neighbourhoods and Adult Services

5. Summary

The Welfare Reform Act 2012 introduced a range of changes that will have a significant impact on people's lives, on rental income to RMBC, and on Rotherham's wider economy. Extensive work has been carried out by teams across the Council to prepare for the changes, and detailed reports have been provided to Rotherham Partnership and Cabinet. The purpose of this report is to seek approval to implement a Downsizing Policy to support tenants who are affected by the Social Housing size criteria ('bedroom tax')

The report has been considered and agreed by Cabinet Member for Safe and Attractive Neighbourhoods on 20th May 2013.

6. Recommendations

THAT CABINET:

- Agree to implement the Downsizing Policy (Appendix A – Downsizing Policy)
- Agree that Cabinet Member for Safe and Attractive Communities should receive a review of the effectiveness of the new policy in April 2014

7. Proposals and details

7.1 Introduction

The Welfare Reform Act 2012 introduced a range of changes that will have a significant impact on people's lives, on rental income to RMBC, and on Rotherham's wider economy. Extensive work has been carried out by teams across the Council to prepare for the changes, and detailed reports have been provided to Rotherham Partnership and Cabinet. The purpose of this report is to seek approval to introduce a new Downsizing Policy which includes housing assistance incentives to support tenants that are under occupying their Council home to downsize.

Social housing size criteria or 'bedroom tax' (implemented April 2013): Tenants who under-occupy their home by one bedroom face a 14% reduction in housing benefit, whilst those under-occupying by two bedrooms or more face a 25% reduction. This will affect 4,384 households in Rotherham, of whom approximately 3,600 are council tenants.

7.2 Downsizing Policy

Moving house is a daunting experience for most tenants, particularly those who are vulnerable. We have operated a successful downsizing scheme for some time but the emphasis has been upon supporting older people to move from family size houses to smaller flats or bungalows. A Downsizing Officer is in post to oversee the process and support is made available with respect to advice, packing, and actual physical help with removals where required, at an approximate cost to RMBC of £200 per move.

With the introduction of bedroom tax we anticipate a much larger volume of people needing to move to smaller accommodation.

Through this report we are seeking approval of the following:

- Implement a new Downsizing policy - please see appendix A

The Cabinet Member for Safe and Attractive Neighbourhoods agreed (20th May 2013) to implement a series of other supportive actions to assist tenants and if appropriate avoid the need to downsize.

A thorough review will be required of progress against the Downsizing Policy. This will be produced in March 2014, and it will clearly set out outcomes and outputs, take account of further impacts of welfare reform, and make recommendations for further funding provision in 2014/15.

8. Finance

Financial implications have already been agreed by Cabinet Member for Safe and Attractive Neighbourhoods (20th May 2013) to support downsizing. A budget of £50K has been agreed to provide practical support to people who need to move to a home with fewer bedrooms.

9. Risks and uncertainties

Risks associated with failure to provide an effective response approach to the need to downsize include:

- Increasing poverty
- Increasing gap between most and least deprived areas
- Loss of rental income to the Housing Revenue Account
- A possible drop in performance on certain indicators including income collection and void repair costs / relet times
- A potential increase in homelessness due to evictions
- Increasing personal debt as some tenants may resort to high interest and illegal lenders, possibly leading to increasing crime levels
- Increasing costs to the NHS as a result of stress and anxiety which can be caused by debt and threat of eviction and homelessness

Risks associated with approving proposals within this report:

- More people will want to downsize to a smaller home as a result of the bedroom tax, and we may not have sufficient one and two bedroom homes. We will seek to address these changing needs via our local authority new housing programme, Section 106 contributions and through strategic acquisitions. We will also encourage people to consider moving into the private rented sector where this would offer them the best solution.

10. Policy and performance agenda implications

Welfare reform has implications across a range of policy areas:

- Child poverty
- Prevention and early intervention
- Troubled Families initiative
- Deprived communities agenda
- Supporting vulnerable people

The relevant sections of Rotherham's Housing Strategy 2013-16 are:

- Commitment 1: We will deliver Council housing that meets people's needs (including the provision of more one and two bedroom homes)
- Commitment 6: We will help people to access the support they need (particularly those in financial hardship)
- Commitment 7: We will help people in Rotherham's most disadvantaged communities

Rotherham's Health and Wellbeing Strategy has a key strategic outcome on tackling poverty.

11. Background papers and consultation

Background papers

- "Making it fit: a guide for preparing for the social sector size criteria" (CIH, June 2012)
- Report on welfare reform to LSP Board 29th March 2012

- Report on welfare reform to Cabinet on 4th July 2012
- Rotherham Partnership welfare reform and benefit changes impact assessment
- NAS Welfare Reform Act Transition Plan
- DLT report on welfare reform and increasing rent collection resources, March 2013
- Report on Discretionary Housing Payments to Cabinet on 10th April 2013
- DWP guidance on Discretionary Housing Payments, April 2013

Appendices

- Appendix A: Downsizing Policy

Consultation

- Extensive consultation and communication has been carried out with Rotherham residents, Elected Members, RMBC staff and partner agencies, and colleagues in various teams have been consulted on this report.

12. Contact name

Sandra Tolley, Housing Options Manager
Sandra.tolley@rotherham.gov.uk 01709 255619/07795475499

Appendix A – Downsizing Policy

People may wish to downsize for the following reasons:

- (1) Because they are affected by the bedroom tax
- (2) Because they need to move from a larger house to a smaller house, a ground floor flat or bungalow

The Allocation Policy

We will continue to award the highest possible status (Priority Plus / Emergency) for reason 2 and this will extend to housing association secure tenants.

Council and RSL tenants who are affected by the bedroom tax (reason 1) will also be awarded Priority Plus/ Emergency status to move to a property with fewer bedrooms. This is regardless of the type of property or how many bedrooms their current property has, the policy applies in all cases where the new home will have at least one less bedroom than the present home.

This policy will apply to existing secure council and housing association tenants who are under occupying their home.

Council tenants (only) who have rent arrears will not be prevented from moving, but a signed agreement will be made to transfer the arrears to their new property.

Where there have been other tenancy breaches that would usually prevent a transfer from taking place, every effort will be taken to address these as swiftly as possible. Cases where breaches haven't been rectified will be considered on their merits and refusal to allow downsizing will be ratified by the Housing Assessment Panel

It will be mandatory for Council tenants to sign a Direct Debit Form to pay their rent (where applicable) before and after the move, assistance can be given where necessary to ensure that the tenant is able to open a bank account.

Support to enable downsizing

The councils under occupying officer (formally called downsizing officer) will provide practical support to existing (Council Tenants only) who need to move to a smaller home where it is clear that they could otherwise not afford the costs. This could include the following forms of support:

- assistance with packing,
- removal, reconnection of utilities etc.
- assistance to provide space saving measures.
- Money advice referrals
- Practical help including financial help depend upon a financial assessment.

They will have an open and honest discussion with affected tenants which will involve explaining and discussing all the available options including:

- Making up the shortfall from benefit or other income
- Transferring to a smaller property within Council stock or with another social landlord
- Swapping homes via a HOMESWAPPER as a mutual exchange may provide a quicker route to a smaller home
- Moving to a smaller home in the private rented sector
- Paying for space saving equipment / storage furniture, or partition walls / screens where appropriate

Tenancy checks will be carried out by the Housing Champion on each transfer application as soon as possible so that issues can be identified and addressed as early as possible to prevent delays.

Where Council tenants wish to downsize to a smaller private rented home and where it is clear that they could otherwise not afford the costs we may consider covering the rent deposit and rent in advance.

Associated downsizing costs up to the maximum value of £250 may be met by the Downsizing budget, however not all cases will need the maximum amount, and the downsizing budget may not always be available.

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1	Meeting:	Cabinet
2	Date:	19th June 2013
3	Title:	Proposals to make a ‘prescribed alteration’ to Thrybergh School and Sports College by a change of age range from 11-16 to 3-16 by closure of Dalton Foljambe Primary School.
4	Directorate:	Children and Young Peoples Service

5 Summary:

In September 2012 Thrybergh School and Sports College formed a collaboration (formerly referred to as a soft federation) with Dalton Foljambe Primary School.

Since the collaboration has been established Dalton Foljambe Primary School has been judged good by Ofsted and the school’s outcomes have been above the National floor standards. The collaboration is now well established and both schools are requesting the opportunity to enter a more formal arrangement. It is proposed that a ‘Prescribed Alteration’ to Thrybergh School and Sports College be consulted upon to change its age range from 11-16 to 3-16 by the closure of Dalton Foljambe Primary School and the Foljambe site becoming the Primary education phase annex of the school.

6 Recommendations:

It is recommended that Cabinet approve the commencement of Pre-Statutory Consultations on the proposals and that a further report be brought to Members detailing the outcome of the consultation.

7. Proposals and Details

Under the requirements of the 'School Organisation (prescribed Alterations to Maintained Schools) (England) Regulations 2007 it will be necessary to undertake a full consultation on proposals to make a 'prescribed alteration'. (confirmed by DfE).

The consultation timeline is outlined in section 11 of this report:

Thrybergh School and Sports College will continue to convert to Academy status 'as is' during the consultation process and should the proposals be approved, Foljambe will then become part of the Academy. Approval of the proposals will then lead to the commencement of legal processes to transfer the land at Foljambe to the Academy Trust by the established lease agreement process.

Historical data and future pupil number projections for Dalton Foljambe and Thrybergh School and Sports College:

DALTON FOLJAMBE JUN & INF SCHOOL

Admission Number: 30 (210 total)

Net Capacity: 140 (NB the number is lower than the Admission Number as Pupil numbers at the School had been traditionally low in previous years)

(as at School Census date in January)

Year	R	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6	TOTAL
02/03	15	16	19	20	17	25	22	134
03/04	18	15	16	20	16	17	27	129
04/05	11	19	14	18	16	17	15	110
05/06	11	11	23	16	19	16	14	110
06/07	18	10	11	21	16	20	16	112
07/08	15	17	9	10	17	15	18	101
08/09	15	11	15	10	11	17	14	93
09/10	11	12	13	14	9	12	15	86
10/11	18	10	12	12	13	10	11	86
11/12	15	18	8	13	14	13	10	91

Pupil Numbers for the latest October 2012 School Census and future projections

	REC	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6	TOTALS
12/13	25	14	16	7	12	15	13	102
13/14	22	26	14	16	8	12	15	113
14/15	22	22	26	14	16	8	12	120
15/16	24	24	23	27	15	17	9	141

16/17	27	24	23	23	27	15	17	156
-------	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----

THRYBERGH SCHOOL

Admission number: 140

Net Capacity: 704

Historical data for the School, Pupil Numbers for the latest October 2012 School Census and future projections

	Y7	Y8	Y9	Y10	Y11	TOTAL
07/08	126	118	114	116	126	600
08/09	122	125	121	117	115	600
09/10	111	120	119	117	116	583
10/11	115	110	115	120	114	574
11/12	107	112	105	119	116	559
12/13	82	103	105	105	110	505
13/14	113	84	105	107	107	516
14/15	116	114	86	107	109	532
15/16	117	116	115	88	109	545
16/17	115	117	116	116	90	554
17/18	126	115	117	116	118	592

The proposal to change the age range at Thrybergh School and Sports College will mean that the Foljambe Primary annex would have a Published Admission Number (PAN) of 30 pupils per year group and pupils will automatically stay on roll at the school in the transition from Year 6 to Year 7 and transfer to the Secondary Education site to continue their education.

The Secondary aged phase will maintain a Published Admission Number (PAN) of 140 but up to 30 places will automatically be allocated to the 'through School' pupils who will remain on roll. There is no intention currently to increase or decrease either Schools PAN.

8. Finance:

During the transfer of the land and assets via lease agreement to the Academy Trust there will be a charge for legal processes of approximately £6,500k which the School will need to budget for.

9. Risks and Uncertainties:

The principal ADVANTAGES of amalgamation arise from the continuous education entitlement:

- removal of the need for a formal school transfer process at the end of key stage 2;
- a unified management structure with a single school ethos;
- the potential to organise and arrange the staffing structure and to safeguard the staffing establishment when pupil numbers change across the key stages;
- a whole school approach to staff development across the primary and secondary phases;
- more efficient and effective use of resources, especially accommodation, when numbers fluctuate across the infant and junior phases.

The principal DISADVANTAGES of amalgamation are:

- potential difficulties in bringing together two different sets of working practice;
- possible fear of and resistance to change amongst staff, governors and parents;
- different site locations
- potential impact on neighbouring schools

10 Policy and Performance Agenda Implications:

The major theme supported by the proposal is 'to ensure that everyone has access to skills, knowledge and information to enable them to play their part in society'.

11. Background Papers and Consultation:

Proposed consultation timeline

Cabinet to agree to consultation	19 th June 2013
Pre statutory consultation period Commences including meetings with governors, Staff and parents etc.	
Report to Cabinet	September 2013
Publication of statutory notices	September 2013
6 week period for representations and objections closes	October 2013
LA decision and notification to Secretary of State	November 2013
Implementation	Date to be determined by legal transfer of assets to the Academy Trust

Consultation meetings should be undertaken with the Governing Bodies of Dalton Foljambe Primary school and Thrybergh School and Sports College. Consultation meetings should also be held with Staff and Trade Unions, Parents (families) of the affected schools, local Councillors, any local Parish Council and the local MP.

Additionally consultation will also need to be undertaken with the Governing bodies of any other school that may be affected plus the Diocese of any school likely to be affected.

Contact Name:

Helen Barre – Service Lead School Admissions, Organisation and SEN Assessment Service (SAO SENAS)

Tel: 01709 822656

Email: Helen.barre@rotherham.gov.uk

Dean Fenton – Principal Officer School Organisation (SAO SENAS)

Tel: 01709 254821

Email: dean.fenton@rotherham.gov.uk

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet
2.	Date:	19th June 2013
3.	Title:	Universal Credit: Local Support Services Framework
4.	Directorate:	Environment and Development Services

5. Summary

Universal Credit (UC) is a new means-tested benefit for working age people both in work and out of work. The purpose of this report is to explain how UC will impact nationally and locally and how we intend to move this work forward in Rotherham.

6. Recommendations

That Cabinet:

- Approves the production of a project plan to address the issues arising from the introduction of Universal Credit and the development of a Local Support Services Framework.
- Receives a further report to agree the local support services framework prior to the Council entering into any agreement with DWP.
- Should consider providing with the LSP a written collective partnership response to the government lead for Universal Credit, highlighting the extent of the issues affecting claimants in Rotherham.

7. Proposals and Details

National Context

Universal Credit (UC) is a new means-tested benefit for working age people both in work and out of work. The aim of UC is to improve work incentives, create a smooth transition into and out of work, simplify the means tested benefit system and reduce fraud and error.

The main changes to the benefit payments for people will be

- Online assessments

- Payments monthly in arrears
- Payments to one member of the household
- No direct payment to landlords for housing element
- Claimants will have the responsibility for paying bills and managing money

By 2017, it is the government's intention that all people claiming benefit will be online and the system will be, 'Digital by Default'. You might claim UC if you are:

- Unemployed and looking for work
- Unable to work due to ill-health or disability
- Caring for a disabled person
- A lone parent whose youngest child is aged under 5
- Working, and either a lone parent or a couple with children
- Working and disabled
- A single person or a couple without children working but on a low income
- Liable for housing costs such as rent or a mortgage

Universal Credit will bring the following six working-age benefits into one single payment:

- Income-based Jobseeker's Allowance
- Income-related Employment and Support Allowance
- Income Support
- Child Tax Credit
- Working Tax Credit
- Housing Benefit

The timetable for the launch of Universal Credit is as follows:

- April 2013: a 'Pathfinder Pilot' in Greater Manchester and Cheshire
- October 2013: National launch for new claimants
- Existing claimants will be moved onto UC in a phased approach up until 2017

Universal Credit will have a £16,000 savings limit. Awards of UC will be decided by the Department for Work & Pensions (DWP) and based on the circumstances and income/savings/capital of the claimant (and their partner if they have one).

Implementation

Cases will move onto universal credit by one of three routes;

- **New claims**
- **Natural changes.**
- **Managed changes**

Current timelines from the DWP are as follows:

- **October 2013** - New claims to universal credit in place of new claims for job seekers allowance, which is expected to be low locally.
- **May 2014** - New claims to universal credit in place of tax credit and income support.

- **September 2014** - Managed migration will start; initially for JSA cases and then for the other benefits and tax credits in the same order as new claims above.
- **October 2014** - New claims to universal credit in place of Employment and Support Allowance and Housing Benefit only cases.
- **End of 2017** - Full migration completed

Local Support Services Framework

The DWP have approached all local authorities to discuss the development of partnership agreements that will set out the support to be provided to help people navigate the transition to UC during phase 2 of its implementation (October 2013 to April 2014). It is expected that these agreements will be in place by September.

Initial discussions with DWP suggest that partnership agreements could include:

- Increase access points for online facilities e.g. libraries (see Appendix 4) and further education provision such as schools.
- Support for people to complete applications
- Support for people to manage money and budgeting.
- One-stop shops (could be mobile) where people can get information, advice and guidance.

There is a clear expectation from DWP that libraries would have a role, particularly in providing supported access to online services.

The government and DWP expect most people to make the transition to online assessments but recognise that for some claimants accessing and dealing with the changes UC will bring will not be as straightforward. Digital exclusion is obviously a key issue in relation to the transition to UC and dedicated support will be required for people who have no or limited access to online information or services, limited ICT literacy or limited familiarity with the internet

DWP representatives have attended meetings with officers of the Council and the local welfare reform task group.

Discussion at these meetings has been used to gain more clarity on the extent to which local partners are expected to ensure the transition to UC is a smooth one and the level of funding to be provided by DWP. To date DWP have not been able to commit to the level or resources that might be available.

Whilst the council and LSP will obviously seek to help those who are struggling to cope with the changes, there is a risk that the framework process could see local partners take on a disproportionate level of responsibility and risk, particularly if – as suggested – any funding is provided on a payment by results basis. There is no statutory basis for any agreements between the Council; partners; and DWP.

Local Context

In Rotherham, we currently have circa 23,500 claims for housing benefit and 16,000 people claiming working tax credit; both will move onto UC in the future.

To date no profiling on numbers and routes has taken place, though it is expected that the main impact will be felt when existing claimants start to migrate to UC from September 2014.

Given the lack of resources, any local support needs to be intelligence-led and properly targeted at areas of highest need. Opportunities should be sought to build on existing provision (e.g. libraries, community learning venues) and link with relevant initiatives and ongoing relationships with those who are likely to be affected (e.g. through disadvantaged areas work and families for change).

Challenges facing communities

Rotherham has a diverse community and some of our households lack English as a main language. Support and resources will be needed to help these potential applicants (see Appendix 3). These are relatively small minorities but they are heavily concentrated in certain parts of the borough, mainly the central area.

A further challenge is poor literacy and numeracy skills which are to be found in all areas of the borough, particularly in more deprived neighbourhoods.

Many people also lack the basic level IT user skills to be able to respond effectively to the *Digital by Default* agenda.

- 21% of adults in Rotherham have never used the Internet.
- 49% of Rotherham's communities (97,356 adults) are in the top 20% of the communities with the most negative attitudes to internet and ICT in England.
- 6,864 of Rotherham's children don't have access to the internet.
- The percentage of internet users in Rotherham is consistent to the rest of South Yorkshire, but lags well behind the GB average. (please see Appendix 6 which illustrates the interventions taking place to address the above issues)

In addition to the changes above, pensioners will start to move onto what is called **pension credit plus** from October 2014. To date, no further details have been released for this.

Proposal for a way forward in Rotherham

Initial feedback on this report from colleagues suggests we should seek to:

- Support people to complete applications – particularly vulnerable groups
- Help people to manage money and budget using CAB, credit unions, money advice service, national debtline, local post offices and VAR.
- Support people when priority debt arrears (rent, mortgage or council tax) have placed their home or liberty at risk using RMBC advocacy & appeals service (please see Appendix 5).
- Support people who require help to appeal their benefit decisions using RMBC advocacy & appeals service (please see Appendix 5)
- Review and re-launch RMBC's corporate debt policy.

Next steps

A Partnership Working Group will now be put in place to ensure a planned approach to this piece of work. It will include a lead person and directorate from RMBC to coordinate, consult and involve a number of partners both internal and external.

It is proposed that Partnership Working group will explore the following to inform the Partnership Agreement:

- An understanding of the volume of people, demographics and geography of the communities we will work with and the challenges they will face.
- Identify organisations from the private, public and VCS e.g. RMBC Advocacy & Appeals Service, CAB, VAR, Colleges, Job Centre Plus and Laser Credit etc who can support the delivery of this work with little or no additional resource.
- Pull together a consultation framework to engage with vulnerable stakeholder groups in the community.
- Set up a Community Task Group as a sounding board around issues affecting vulnerable community groups.
- Look at the role of the customer service centres/libraries as one stop shops for accessing information about UC.
- Work with DWP Universal Credit programme to help inform all aspects from design to migration and implementation in Rotherham.
- Look at the learning from 'Pathfinder Pilot' in Greater Manchester and Cheshire and what good practice we can adopt in Rotherham.

The work of the group will provide that a local partnership agreement includes the following:

- Increase access points for online facilities e.g. libraries and further education provision such as schools and colleges.
- Support for people to complete applications – particularly vulnerable groups in Rotherham.
- Support for people to manage money and budgeting.
- One-stop shops (could be mobile) where people can get information, advice and guidance.
- Seek further resources and funding to support affected claimants, particularly vulnerable groups.

8. Finance

- Whilst the government are providing some transitional payments to a minority to ensure that no-one is initially worse off on transferring to universal credit, analyses have shown that workless lone parents and couple families will tend to lose out once these payments end.
- Reports by organisations such as *The Children's Society* have outlined areas of concern in the design of UC. In particular, they have pointed out that the additional support for childcare costs through housing benefit will be lost under UC, meaning 100,000 of the lowest income families could lose as much as £4,000 per year (this includes the lesser impact of council tax benefit support for

childcare also being lost), though changes announced in the budget may have partially addressed this.

- Local authorities will be particularly concerned about the switch to paying claimants directly (housing benefit to cover rent is currently paid directly to the landlord by DWP). *RMBC estimates that an additional £50m will need to be collected annually, with the likelihood of significant increases in rent arrears and a potential knock on effect on the housing revenue account business plan.*

Various local authority direct payment demonstration projects in 2012 identified further problems, including:

- The lack of consistent monthly dates for payments, which will be every 4 weeks, is an issue when setting up direct debits- (although payments under the revised UC offer will be every month – 12 per year)
- Existing processes around automated arrears letters and trigger points in the arrears process need revisiting due to payment being 4 weeks in arrears
- Some tenants hold Post Office accounts/other bank accounts which do not handle direct debits
- Banks settling debts to themselves (charges/overdrafts) before landlords could be paid
- Daily limits for funding withdrawals at ATMs are often less than monthly rent

There will be costs pressures associated with additional transaction costs (i.e. due to the number of rent payments increasing), supporting tenants (e.g. money management advice) and enforcement activity. The fact that UC will have to be applied for online (and problems in getting the IT system ready have been well documented) may cause further problems as people on benefits are more likely to be digitally excluded in terms of access or ability.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

The main uncertainty relates to the level of demand and the risk is that the available lack of funding and the capacity of current teams and partner organisations may be insufficient to cope.

There have been raised concerns over plans to provide Universal Credit money to be used for housing direct to claimants - rather than housing associations or councils - suggesting that this could lead to rent arrears. Also recipients of UC may not be accustomed to dealing and budgeting with one monthly payment which could result in more debts which will put more pressure on relevant services.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The 'Freud's Report' (2007) illustrated that there is a strong case for moving towards a single system of working age benefits, ideally a single benefit, in order to better support the Government's ambition of work for those who can and support for those who cannot. A range of international evidence suggests that complexity in the benefit system acts as a disincentive to entering work, and that badly designed systems create unemployment and/ or poverty traps. The UK has made progress on both (and virtually eliminated the unemployment trap) but it can go further still. It should also do more to change the perception, where it exists, that moving into work

does not pay; a perception which can be a function of fragmented delivery by the central benefit system, local authorities and tax authorities.

DWP have developed a toolkit for organisations, particularly those in the Pathfinder locations, to inform them about Universal Credit and to help explain the changes that Universal Credit will bring. The link to the toolkit is below:

<http://www.dwp.gov.uk/policy/welfare-reform/universal-credit/toolkit.shtml>

For the council, it is important that our response to Universal Credit within welfare support and welfare reform is more generally is part of a broader drive to reduce poverty and inequalities in the borough. We should seek to be coordinated and consistent in our approach, exploring ways in which preventative action can be taken to reduce the need for reactive “crisis” provision in the longer term.

UC has implications across a range of policy areas and links need to be made with various ongoing initiatives to prevent duplication and maximise partners’ efforts to mitigate the impact for local people. In particular, the UC response should align with the disadvantaged areas initiative in helping to deliver the health and wellbeing strategy’s poverty reduction priority and supporting the corporate plan’s drive to *make sure no community is left behind*.

In terms of the council’s performance framework, the following outcomes are most relevant:

- Fewer children are living in poverty
- Fewer people struggle to pay for heating and lighting costs
- More people are in work or training rather than living on benefits

Whilst the council aims to support people back into work and the general thrust of welfare reform supports this, the economic climate militates against it, and consequently, in the short to medium term at least, benefit changes are likely to have a negative impact on a number of our performance indicators.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

1. Lord Freud’s Report (2007)
2. Universal Credit: Local Support Services Framework (February 2013)

Contact Name:

Asim Munir: Community Engagement Officer, Resources, Tel 22896
Steve Eling: Policy Officer, Resources, Tel 54419

Appendix 1

We need to target the following vulnerable stakeholder groups in the community:

- REMA (BME Communities)
- Unity Centre (BME/Refugees)
- ROMA Community Forum
- Speak Up (learning disabilities)
- Rother Fed (TARA's and residents)
- Disability Network
- SCOPE (people with physical disabilities)
- Women's Refuge (lone parents and potential victims of domestic violence)
- Apna Haq (lone BME parents and potential victims of domestic violence)
- Shiloh (homelessness)
- The Lighthouse (homelessness)
- Food Crisis Network
- Probation Service
- RDASH (mental health and substance misuse)
- Military Covenant and Veterans Centre (MCVC)
- Parish Councils (rural isolation)
- Further Education provision (16-17 year olds)
- Rotherham Families for Change (Troubled Families)
- Carers Corner/Carers Forum
- Care Leavers

Funding and resources will be needed to train these organisations with the knowledge and skills to help vulnerable groups access UC, especially those with barriers such as learning and language etc.

Appendix 2

Local Assessment of Need for Support with Universal Credit

Three factors have been taken into account:

- Worklessness - % of working age on out-of-work benefits
- Poor Literacy/numeracy - % of 16+ residents with no qualifications
- Poor English - % of households where English is not the main language for any adult

Combining these factors provides a crude but effective way of illustrating the areas of greatest need in terms of both people moving onto Universal Credit and having the least ability to apply for the benefit online or understand the process.

SOA	Workless	No Qualifications	Poor English	Average
Eastwood Village	33%	46%	40%	40%
Eastwood Central	31%	44%	21%	32%

SOA	Workless	No Qualifications	Poor English	Average
Ferham	35%	39%	22%	32%
Town Centre	34%	37%	21%	30%
Canklow	35%	46%	7%	29%
Eastwood East	33%	45%	9%	29%
Masbrough	29%	40%	18%	29%
East Herringthorpe N	37%	45%	4%	29%
East Dene East	28%	50%	2%	27%
Thrybergh South	29%	47%	0%	26%
Rawmarsh East	30%	45%	2%	26%
Maltby East – Craggs	34%	42%	1%	25%
East Dene NE	29%	43%	4%	25%
East Herringthorpe S	30%	43%	2%	25%
Munsbrough	33%	38%	3%	25%
Thrybergh East	27%	46%	0%	25%
Aston North	29%	42%	1%	24%
Dalton	27%	42%	3%	24%
Dinnington Central	26%	44%	1%	24%
Wath Central	28%	41%	2%	24%
Rockingham West	27%	43%	1%	23%
Herringthorpe North	25%	43%	2%	23%
Manor Farm	25%	42%	1%	23%
East Dene South	24%	40%	5%	23%
Wingfield	30%	37%	1%	23%
North Anston Central	27%	40%	0%	22%
East Herringthorpe E	25%	41%	0%	22%
West Melton West	23%	42%	0%	22%
Thurcroft South West	24%	42%	0%	22%
Herringthorpe South	23%	41%	2%	22%
Maltby East – Muglet	26%	38%	1%	22%
Swinton North	21%	43%	0%	22%
Wellgate	17%	31%	17%	22%

In addition to the 11 most deprived areas, this analysis shows high levels of need in Munsbrough, Rockingham West, Wingfield, Manor Farm and parts of Wath, Swinton, Thurcroft and West Melton.

Appendix 3

Difficulties with English Language – 2011 Census Data

There were 108,293 households in Rotherham in 2011. In 104,030 households (96.1%) all people 16+ had English as their main language.

There were 1,897 households where at least one adult is fluent in English but other members are not. In 344 households, only children under 16 had English as their main language and there were 2,022 households (1.9%) where no person had English as their main language.

Thus, 4,263 households (3.9%) had some or all members lacking English as a main language and in 2,366 households (2.2%) there was no adult with English as a main language. These are relatively small minorities but they are heavily concentrated in certain parts of the Borough.

Households where no adult has English as their main language

Eastwood Village	40%
Ferham	22%
Town Centre	21%
Eastwood Central	21%
Masbrough	18%
Wellgate	17%

Eastwood, Ferham and Town Centre / Wellgate have high proportions of new migrant communities, particularly Roma, as well as refugees and asylum seekers, and more established BME communities.

Moorgate West	9%
Broom Valley	9%
Eastwood East	9%
Clifton West	8%
Clifton East	7%
Canklow	7%
Broom East	6%
Bradgate	5%
East Dene NW	5%

The above areas have some new migrants, refugees and asylum seekers but their BME communities are mainly well established.

The 15 SOAs listed above contain 9% of households in Rotherham but 61% of those where no adult has English as their main language. In terms of the 11 most deprived areas, these are the five most affected:

- Eastwood
- Ferham & Masbrough
- Town Centre
- Canklow
- East Dene – inner half

Appendix 4

RMBC Libraries

RMBC libraries are accustomed to acting as intermediaries to help people negotiate their way around the best Web sites. They are also used to equipping people with basic IT skills and building their confidence. Libraries are therefore, very much a key player in the Assisted Digital agenda. They have developed and work in a variety of partnerships; work clubs etc that have helped people get jobs. Library staff has already been working with customers on Universal Job match, and they are also talking to DWP at a regional and local level. This also ties in with the four public library offers recently launched nationally which they have helped shape and to which they subscribe.

The focus of the National Information Offer is on supporting people accessing information and services online in life-critical areas such as careers and job seeking; health; personal financial information and benefits. Central to this offer is helping people to use vital government online information and services.

Recent research showed that internet users trust library staff more than most other providers of online support and information, and public library staff are second only to doctors in terms of the trust placed in them by seekers of information.

The Universal Information Offer will:

- Bring together government and non-governmental sources of information, which have been researched by information professionals in public libraries, giving a level of quality assurance to the user.
- Ensure that public library staff and volunteers are continually developing their skills to provide help to people accessing information and services.

With the introduction of Universal Credit this year, libraries all over the country will provide internet access and support to complete the application and manage their account online, signposting claimants to local advice agencies where needed.

Locally to Rotherham, the ongoing merge of Libraries and Customer Services staff has the potential to work well in helping customers to make the transition to Universal Credit.

Appendix 5

RMBC Advocacy & Appeals Service

RMBC Advocacy & Appeals Service provides a specialist debt and benefit advice service. It provides debt solutions such as bankruptcy, debt relief orders, Individual Voluntary Arrangements, and response to court summons. Customers can be referred internally when priority debt arrears (rent mortgage or council tax) have placed their home or liberty at risk.

The service is the only dedicated service dealing with benefit appeals in Rotherham and offers appeals advice on the full benefit range.

A collaborative partnership is in place with the CAB who delivers the lower tiers of advice and refers customers with top tier advice needs to the service via the Nellbooker appointment system (which is also in place for other organisations). Internal and direct public referrals can be made efficiently via the RMBC website e-form.

Rotherham has already experienced a marked increase in customers requiring help with ESA appeals and the expectation is that a similar situation will arise with the introduction of Universal Credit and Personal Independence Payment (PIP)

The combination of disability and means tested benefit changes will see many Rotherham residents with less money and more rent and council tax to pay, with income payments received in one lump sum there is a real risk that debt levels will increase.

Appendix 6

Learning Activity

A concerted effort is being made to ensure that a range of learning opportunities are established to respond to identified needs by focussing the Adult Safeguarded Learning Grant and other funds to deliver relevant activities including -

- Additional support being offered by increasing the number of ESOL classes offered in community settings.
- Family Learning activity is currently focusing on developing English and maths skills of parents
- The improvement of English and Maths skills are embedded in to all community based learning activities.
- A range of community based courses are to be delivered in community locations aimed at improving basic IT skills, especially the skills required to access online applications and online form filling.
- The development and delivery of courses which will improve the financial planning and budgeting skills is being planned in the 11 most deprived communities

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO CABINET
--

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet
2.	Date:	19th June, 2013
3.	Title:	Home Affairs Select Committee – Child Sexual Exploitation and the response to Localised Grooming
4.	Programme Area:	Children and Young People’s Services

5. Summary:

The Home Affairs Select Committee (HASC) published its report ‘Child Sexual Exploitation and the response to localised grooming on Monday, 10th June. The Chief Executive and the Strategic Director of Children and Young People’s Services were called to give evidence to the HASC on the 8th January. Tackling the sexual exploitation of children and young people remains the highest priority for Rotherham Borough Council. We welcome the Select Committee report as a body of evidence and advice that can be used by local authorities around the Country to improve their response to these horrific crimes.

6. Recommendations:

- (i) **That Cabinet welcomes the findings of the HASC and the opportunity to improve our response to child sexual exploitation.**
- (ii) **That a detailed report on our self-assessment against the recommendations from the HASC report be brought to Cabinet on the 3rd July.**

7. Proposals and Details:

In June 2012 the HASC started taking this evidence on the issue of localised (or on-street) grooming. The HASC heard evidence from witnesses about the Council's approach and performance which generally covered the period between 2003 and 2009. A period during which we fully acknowledge that our services should have been stronger. One of the witnesses had been sexually exploited in Rotherham in 2003.

In 2007, Rotherham had its first conviction for sexual exploitation which saw the perpetrator receive an indeterminate sentence for at least 5 years. This was for crimes against young men.

In 2010, the outcome of Operation Central in Rotherham, saw 5 men were sentenced for 34 years between them for sexual exploitation offences against young Rotherham girls.

In January 2011, Barnardo's published a report entitled 'Puppet on a String' which looked at child sexual exploitation. The report noted a worrying trend that child sexual exploitation was becoming more sophisticated.

In June 2011, a thematic assessment (which Rotherham contributed to) by the Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre (CEOP) highlighted the growing awareness of the issue of localised grooming – 'however there have been comparatively few prosecutions, and there is a general lack of knowledge of grooming and sexual exploitation in the UK and the threats posed to children and young people'.

In 2011, the outcome of Operation Czar in Rotherham, where 15 men were arrested for sexual exploitation offences but the Crown Prosecution Service would not progress due to the 'credibility' of the witnesses.

In 2012, further national reports were produced including the Office of the Children's Commissioner interim report into Child Sexual Exploitation in Gangs and Groups (CSEGG). Rotherham contributed to the CSEGG report.

8. Finance:

Our response to the Select Committee findings will be met from existing resources. Cabinet should note an additional £50k had been secured for the work of the CSE team from SRP managed funds from the Police and Crime Commissioner. These funds are for 3 years.

9. Risks and Uncertainties:

The publication of the Select Committee report has rightly made the Council and its partners re-assess the effectiveness of our response to child sexual exploitation. Failure to continually improve our services will mean children and young people are not afforded a comprehensive and quality service.

We will continue to maintain our focus on early intervention and prevention activity, but we also believe that our strengthened multi agency working must lead to enhanced disclosure and evidence gathering, investigations and ultimately prosecutions by the Police. We fully acknowledge the deterrent effect that successful prosecutions can bring.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications:

One of the recommendations from the Select Committee is that Ofsted should inspect Children's Services in relation to CSE before December 2013. We welcome this opportunity.

11. Background Papers and Consultation:

House of Commons Home Affairs Committee 'Child sexual exploitation and the response to localised grooming' 10th June, 2013.

Contact Name : Joyce Thacker
Strategic Director, Children and Young People's Services
Joyce.thacker@rotherham.gov.uk
01709 822677

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted