

ORANGE BOOK FOR INFORMATION

Venue: Town Hall, The Croft,
Moorgate Street,
Rotherham S60 2TH

Date: Wednesday, 24th July, 2013

Time: 2.00 p.m.

A G E N D A

1. Health Select Commission (Pages 1 - 22)
2. Self Regulation Select Commission (Pages 23 - 31)
3. Improving Lives Select Commission (Pages 32 - 39)
4. Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (Pages 40 - 68)
5. Improving Places Select Commission (Pages 69 - 79)
6. Reports for Information (Pages 80 - 120)
7. Police and Crime Panel (Pages 121 - 126)
8. Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Waste Board (Pages 127 - 132)

**HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION
18th April, 2013**

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Wyatt, Barron, Beaumont, Dalton, Goult, Hoddinott, Kaye, Roche and Wootton and Vicky Farnsworth (Speak-Up).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Beck, Middleton, Peter Scholey and Russell Wells.

70. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at the meeting.

71. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no members of the public or press at the meeting.

72. COMMUNICATIONS

Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager reported the following:-

Children's Cardiac Surgery Review

On March 27th the High Court found that the consultation and decision-making process which underpinned the Joint Committee of Primary Care Trusts (JCPCT) reconfiguration of Children's Heart Surgery Services in England and Wales was flawed and that its assessment of Quality of Services was unfair and unlawful. The case was brought by Save Our Surgery Ltd. (Leeds) a body affiliated to the charity linked to the Heart Unit at Leeds Children's Hospital (part of Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust).

The National Commissioning Board (the new body replacing the JCPCT) had been asked to reconsider the elements identified by the Judge, including how they arrived at the quality scores, issues of travel and access, co-location of vital services, strength of cardiac care network and financial viability. The Judge had asked that they then report back on their findings and decide upon which Centres were to be designated on those new grounds.

On the same day as the judgement was made, services at Leeds were suspended because of concerns about mortality rates and patient outcomes. There has been considerable press and media attention in this issue. However, after rigorous examination of evidence surgery was reinstated last week, concluding that there was *"no evidence of significant safety concerns in terms of governance, staffing or the management of the patient pathway for surgical care in the unit or referral to other units as required"* and added that *"A number of very positive aspects of practice are present in the service provided... the teamwork is strong, inter-*

professional working is effective, surgical staffing levels are comparable to other units."

The Joint HOSC met in Leeds on April 10th. Cllr Ali has been the scrutiny representative on this body since the process started in 2011.

The meeting was originally convened to discuss the Secretary of State's referral of the proposed closure of the surgical unit to the Independent Reconfiguration Panel and their response. However, following recent developments regarding the provision of Children's Cardiac Surgery and interventional cardiology at Leeds Children's Hospital, the focus of the JHOSC meeting had changed from what was originally planned.

The JHOSC considered the outcome and implications of the High Court ruling that found in favour of Save Our Surgery Ltd. It also considered issues associated with the implementation phase of the review, with representatives from NHS England in attendance. The meeting also focussed on issues/ concerns about the service provision at LTHT, which resulted in the suspension of services.

Following the meeting, the JHOSC concluded "Our prime concern throughout has been the welfare of the children concerned and limiting the anxiety of their parents and families. We hope that the restoration of services and the outcome of the joint review being made available through NHS England and Leeds Teaching Hospitals Trust will bring families peace of mind and the certainty that their children are in safe hands. We must now focus our attention on the ongoing issue of retaining these key services in Leeds for children and families across the whole of Yorkshire and the Humber"

Although the IRP was expected to report its findings by April 30th, in light of the Judge finding in favour of Save Our Surgery Ltd. and the requirement placed upon the National Commissioning Board to consider the judgement, it was unlikely that the IRP would report its finding to the Secretary of State within the timescale.

Further information was being sought on when the IRP was expected to report. This would be feedback in due course. In the meantime, a press release had been issued outlining Rotherham's participation in the Joint HOSC and expressing continued support to retain services in Leeds.

Review of Services for Adults with Congenital Heart Disease

The Joint Health Overview Scrutiny Committee had taken the view that there was a strong link between the 2 Services and that the work that had been carried out on the Children's Cardiac Services needed to be linked into the work on the Adult Services. The Committee were requesting that individual authorities consider whether they thought it was the right approach with the 2 reviews being integrated which would necessitate a new set of Terms of Reference.

It seemed appropriate that the Health Select Commission nominate a representative for Rotherham.

Resolved:- (1) That the Joint Health Overview Scrutiny Committee be informed of this Council's endorsement of the proposed linkage of the 2 reviews.

(2) That Councillor Steele represent the Health Select Commission.

Conference

It was noted that Councillor Dalton was to attend a Teenage Pregnancy conference to be held in London on 23rd April, 2014, on behalf of the Cabinet Member of Health and Wellbeing.

73. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the Health Select Commission held on 7th March, 2013.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting be agreed as a correct record.

74. HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 27th February and a verbal update on the meeting held on 10th April, 2013.

The Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing highlighted:-

- Progress of the workstreams
- Community Alcohol Partnerships
- Police and Crime Commissioner
- NEETS
- Refresh of the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment
- Health and Wellbeing Conference

The following issues were raised by members of the Health Select Commission:-

- Smoking was 1 of the 6 Priority Themes and had set quite ambitious targets to reduce the number of people smoking in Rotherham. The South Yorkshire Pensions Authority invested money in British American Tobacco which meant that Council employees' contributions were being invested in tobacco ironically when the Authority had taken over responsibility for Public Health. Was this an issue for the Health and Wellbeing Board and may be start a conversation with neighbouring authorities?
Councillor Goulty, representative on the South Yorkshire Pension Authority, stated that this had been discussed in great detail at the last

Pensions meeting due to the new Legislation. For years the SYPA had had a successful investment and ethical policy but it was charged with the duty of getting the best for its membership. A number of councillors and councils had taken it on board in light of the new Legislation so it may be, even though there was a duty to get the best returns, they may be now be able to argue the ethical argument which outweighed the financial

- The target for the number of quitters would be hard to achieve. The biggest issue was that of youth smoking and the prevalence of “bad” cigarettes in Rotherham. A lot of work was taking place particularly with the Tobacco Alliance
- Overarching Information Sharing Protocol – its importance was stressed particularly with regard to issues of child sexual exploitation and domestic violence
- The national charity, Schools Food Trust, worked in schools and colleges on healthy eating. It was suggested that the Health and Wellbeing Board should look at forming links with the Trust and the Obesity Scrutiny Review Group
- 3,000 children in Rotherham who were entitled to free school meals did not take them up. With the impact of the Welfare Reform it was important to continually highlight their availability. It was suggested that the Governors Section request that schools remind parents on a termly basis how to apply for a free school meal

Resolved:- (1) That the minutes and verbal update be noted.

(2) That the Overarching Information Sharing Protocol be submitted to this Select Commission for information.

75. ROTHERHAM HEART TOWN - ANNUAL REPORT

Councillor Wyatt, Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, presented the annual report of the Rotherham Heart Town project outlining the activity undertaken by the Heart Town Partnership and its constituent partners during 2012.

During the first year of the Partnership, activities had included:-

- Establishing a steering group
- Establishing a fundraising branch
- Holding a large stakeholder event
- Attending events to promote the partnership, raise awareness and raise funds
- Establishing the Circle of Hope One Day event

- Running school and health professional education workshops
- Delivering Olympic Legacy events at two schools

Discussion ensued on the report with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Rotherham was looked on as a leading Heart Town by the British Heart Foundation
- 14 new defibrillators were now in place throughout Rotherham
- As a result of the publicity arising from the Fabrice Muamba incident last year, the British Heart Foundation had had to stop funding due to the increase in requests. However, as Rotherham was a Heart Town and worked with the Ambulance Services, the Authority had continued to receive funding
- Staff at the Civic Centre had raised 50% of the funding required to provide a defibrillator
- Ability to measure the impact the defibrillators had had in the future
- 999 should be the first port of call in an emergency. The Ambulance Service would know where the nearest defibrillator was to the address in question. Some of the machines would be publically accessible and others on private property.
- There was no target numberwise for defibrillators but more with regard to location
- Continued funding from the British Heart Foundation due to the ability to demonstrate the rationale for their location as well as the match funding that had been provided.

Resolved:- That the report be received and its contents noted.

76. HOSPITAL DISCHARGE ARRANGEMENTS

Maxine Dennis, Interim Director of Patient and Service Utilisation, Rotherham Foundation Trust, reported that, due to the pressure and demand on hospital beds and the need to be able to accommodate the admission of acutely ill patients, it was important that the hospital could expedite discharge where the patient no longer needed to be in hospital. Whilst it was important to discharge patients in a timely way it was equally important that the discharge was safe and that patients who had complex discharge needs had their needs carefully planned for and executed. As a result, the Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust had a comprehensive and detailed Discharge Policy which had been systematically reviewed.

There would always be some patients who experienced a delay to their discharge. The Delayed Discharge Act clearly defined the criteria for reportable delayed discharges and the Trust, working closely with the Council, had a low rate of reportable delayed discharges.

The Discharge Policy pulled together all potential complex issues in order to ensure that any discharge or transfer of care was safe and effective whilst keeping the patient/family needs at the centre of the decision making process.

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Rotherham Hospital dealt with approximately 70,000 inpatients a year – admitted for planned procedures or emergencies. This figure did not include any patients that were admitted via outpatients, day surgery, medical day assessment or Accident and Emergency. An additional 75,000 attended A&E
- An increase seen in the number of patients attending hospital. Last year 7.6% increase in emergency admissions and this year already a further 5% increase additional to the 7.6%
- The increase in admissions was significant for the frail elderly persons category. They required a complex discharge plan not just involving the Hospital but across all social care providers
- Rotherham worked in partnership with Primary Care and Social Care colleagues and, as a result, performed very well and had low percentage of reportable delay discharges. However, there were still a number of patients whose discharge plans were very complex and took time to discharge
- It was important that once a patient was fit enough for discharge it was expedited in a timely manner
- “Out of hours” was defined as discharge no later than 10 p.m. but depended upon patient choice. Vulnerable patients would not be discharged in an evening
- Approximately ¼ of discharges were out of hours (which included weekends)
- Reports were received on failed discharge where a patient or other provider felt that the Hospital had failed. Another measure was how many patients were readmitted within 24 hours, 7 days and 28 days. Currently that ran at 10% which did not mean that the Hospital had failed in that 10% but needed to understand the reasons why the patient had returned to hospital. There was no external scrutiny of this

- A patient may return to hospital due to the Hospital's failure but it may also be due to the failure of other parts of the care plan
- Once a patient had been deemed medically fit for discharge currently it was a medical consultant in charge of that person's care who would authorise discharge. Work was currently taking place on where a patient had a plan of care and it had been completed and deemed medically fit for discharge, a Nurse or Doctor qualified to make that decision could authorise discharge
- Some of the reasons for delayed discharge was due to family choice
- Re-admission rates were monitored by CQC – details could be supplied

The Chairman suggested that at the next meeting, to be held at the Hospital, a spotlight review take place on this issue with appropriate representation invited.

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

(2) That Select Commission Members e-mail the Scrutiny Manager with issues they would like to discuss further at the spotlight review to be held on 13th June.

77. URGENT CARE REVIEW - NHS ROTHERHAM

Dr. Ian Turner, GP, Lead for Primary Care Quality and Efficiency, Clinical Commissioning Group, gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

Proposals

- Right care, first time
Everything for urgent care in one place
- Quality of care
Bringing together Primary Care skills with the skills and facilities of Accident and Emergency
- Sustainable for the future
Re-investing in urgent care would make the whole NHS in Rotherham work better

By urgent care we mean

- Treatment/advice for minor injuries or illnesses which cannot wait
Broken bones
Burns/scalds
Infections
Sprains
Wounds

Why re-invest in urgent care?

- To improve the quality of care
Bringing together the skills of primary care and Accident and Emergency in one place
- Because the current system was confusing
Patients with urgent care needs often do not know where to go or may access several services before they got the care they needed
- To ensure the NHS in Rotherham was sustainable for the future
More and more patients would need urgent care

A new Urgent Care Centre for Rotherham

- Open 24/7
- Purpose-built at Rotherham Foundation Trust Hospital
- Staffed by experienced and specially trained nurses and GPs
- Joined up with Accident and Emergency
- Reinvesting money from the Walk-in Centre into urgent care
- Urgent care services currently provided at the Walk-in Centre would transfer to the Urgent Care Centre
- The Walk-in Centre would close (but not the building)
- New NHS111 service would provide advice and support for non-urgent care

How the proposals were developed

- Based on best clinical practice
- A review by local GPs
- An assessment of local needs and all of the alternatives
- Discussions with the clinical teams from the Walk-in Centre and A&E
- Discussions with local Councillors, MPs and other stakeholders
- The views of patients and local people

Where we are today

- Hope that the Council would support the proposals and help to improve urgent care for local people
- Recognise that for some the proposals would raise issues. Feedback had already been received on some of the main concerns – would continue to listen and work to address over the coming months

What people were asking about the plans

- Did closing the Walk-in Centre affect other services at the same location?
No. All of the other NHS and Community Services would remain on site including Family Planning/Sexual Health Services, GP Surgery and clinics
- Would public transport be an issue
There were already comprehensive public transport services to the hospital and consideration would be given as to how they might be improved with the transport providers and the Trust

- Would car parking be an issue
Discussions with the Trust. There were already plans for the development of car parking facilities at the hospital

Next Stage – Public Consultation

- Full 12 weeks consultation – 6th May-26th July
- Combination of online, traditional, social and media channels
- Working through local networks of voluntary, community and patient groups
- 4 public meetings

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- The Centre would be open 24/7 – longer hours than the Walk-in Centre
- It would provide the same services for patients that required urgent care
- Wanted to encourage people to attend the correct place for their needs. It was known that sometimes the Walk-in Centre was used as a General Practice which was not the optimum place for a patient; it may be more convenient but they may not receive the quality of care required. The GP surgery would remain on the site
- Due to prudent financial planning, the CCG had some non-recurrent funds for the build of the new Centre. Estimated costs were in the region of £1.5M but the full design process would take place once the consultation process has ended
- Discussions were currently underway with the Foundation Trust and Care UK who were the 2 providers of Urgent Care in Rotherham as to the running of the Centre.
- There were no financial incentives not to refer people to A&E
- The CCG had engaged with the Local Medical Council as part of the consultation process with regard to urgent care. There was an agreement that most GPs should have some facility to see a patient within the same working day if they had urgent medical needs but it was acknowledged that there was an issue with regard to GP accessibility
- There were advantages of having an Urgent Care Centre located at the hospital e.g. when someone had acute chest pains they could be transferred next door to the hospital but a child with a temperature would be better served at the Centre

- Concern that from some parts of the Borough getting to the hospital site involved 2 buses or parking issues for those travelling by car. The current Walk-in Centre was accessed by a free car park as well as being next to the bus station in a central location. Research had shown that the overall maximum travelling time for a patient in Rotherham would remain unchanged and there would be more advantages than disadvantages
- The issue of parking had been raised and, as part of the consultation on design, it would be ensured that there was an appropriate amount of accessible parking
- The new 111 service was completely separate for this proposal. The money currently spent in Rotherham for Rotherham patients would remain in Rotherham for Rotherham patients and would not transfer to 111
- Use Parish Councils as part of the consultation process
- The detail had yet to be finalised but probably some of the outpatient services accessed at the hospital would be re-located to the current Walk-in Centre. This would also free up parking spaces at the hospital
- The area around the hospital was already gridlocked at certain times of the day – the proposal would exacerbate the situation
- Other areas of the country had closed Walk-In Centres without any consultation, however, that was not felt to be appropriate in Rotherham and wanted to ensure that patients were still able to access appropriate services. It was a Primary-care lead patient care service which had been rolled out in many places across the country and viewed very positively. A lot of work had been carried out with A&E and GPs working alongside as their skill sets complimented each other
- It was envisaged that there would be a skilled nurse triage system. This system was currently operated at the Walk-in Centre and worked very well
- The consultation ran from 6th May-26th June. Hopefully there would then be a position that would enable the CCG to ensure that it was up and running by the end of 2014 if not the middle of 2015

The Chair thanked Dr. Turner for his presentation. However, he felt that the Select Commission was not in a position to respond to the consultation as there was further information required:-

- Statistics for patients journeys
- Proposed opening times
- Predicted costs

Resolved:- That a sub-group, Chaired by Councillor Dalton, be established to further discuss the proposal with particular reference to the above points.

78. RESIDENTIAL HOMES SCRUTINY REVIEW

Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, submitted the findings and recommendations of the Scrutiny Review of the 2 residential homes in Rotherham operated by the Council. The review had also included visits to 2 independent homes for benchmarking purposes

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 budgets cuts on this. As well as making recommendations to be considered alongside the process of setting and reviewing the 2013/14 budget, it aimed to support the achievement of the Council priorities i.e. ensuring care and protection were available for those people who needed it most and helping to create safe and healthy communities.

The review had been split into 2 distinct pieces of work:-

- To understand the workings of the residential homes set in the context of Adult Social Care delivery, funding and regulations.
- To receive a summary of the work completed by PWC and the main recommendations regarding the future of the Homes

The Key messages from the Review were as follows:-

- The 2 Council 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
- The majority of the costs of the Homes were related to staffing
- For a number of reasons including vacancy rates and annual leave, staff would regularly find themselves working longer hours than contracted for and also created significant staff shortages
- The high quality of care provided in the Homes was largely attributable to the staff who were proud to work for the Council and extremely committed to driving up quality standards for the residents
- The 2 Home Managers demonstrated an inclusive management style and strong leadership

- The entertainment and activities programme provided for residents were of a high quality
- Costs associated with the maintenance contract and how staff would prefer to be involved in the process

The Chairman thanked Deborah on behalf of the Review Group for her work on the Review and the staff of the 2 Homes for their openness and honesty.

Resolved:- (1) That the findings and recommendations set out in the report be endorsed.

(2) That the report be forwarded to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and Cabinet.

(3) That the Cabinet response to the Scrutiny Review recommendations be fed back to this Select Commission.

79. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That a further meeting be held on Thursday, 13th June, 2013, commencing at 9.30 a.m. to be held at Rotherham District General Hospital.

HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION
13th June, 2013

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Beaumont, Goulty, Hoddinott, Middleton, Roche, Sims, Watson and Wootton, Vicky Farnsworth (SpeakUp) and Peter Scholey.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Barron, Doyle, Kaye and Wyatt.

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at the meeting.

2. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were questions from the member of the press present at the meeting.

3. COMMUNICATIONS

Caroline Webb, Senior Scrutiny Adviser reported the following:-

Children's Cardiac Surgery Review

The Prime Minister had announced that the process in terms of the potential closure of Leeds and a number of other surgical centres had been halted although the future arrangements around Children's Cardiac Surgery would be revisited at some point in the future.

Further details of the implications of this announcement are awaited from the regional Joint Health and Overview Scrutiny Committee. These would be circulated in due course.

4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the Health Select Commission held on 18th April, 2013.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting be agreed as a correct record.

It was noted that the sub-group had been established and held its first meeting (Minute No. 77 Urgent Care Review – NHS Rotherham refers).

5. HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 8th May, 2013.

Resolved:- That the minutes be noted.

6. REPRESENTATION ON WORKING GROUPS/PANELS

Resolved:- That the Select Commission's representatives for the 2013/14 Municipal Year be as follows:-

Health, Welfare and Safety Panel
Councillor Wootton
Councillor Dalton (substitute)

Recycling Group
Councillor Beaumont

7. ROTHERHAM FOUNDATION TRUST - UPDATE

The Chairman welcomed Michael Morgan (Interim Chief Executive), Peter Lee (Trust Board Chairman), Juliette Greenwood (Chief Nurse), George Thompson (Medical Director) and Dr. Tricia Bain (Executive Health Informatics Officer) to the meeting.

Michael gave the following presentation:-

- The Trust had been able to comply with all Monitor's requests for information
- Strategic plan to be submitted to Monitor by the end of September that completely underpinned the recovery for the organisation over the next 3 years. The first year of the plan was in the process of being put into place
- The next 2 years would see a complete revamp of the organisational structure, especially on the clinical side. As a result 135 individuals from the Trust had met with the Executive to look at restructuring the organisation
- Proposed move from 11 to 4 Directorates – Planned Care and Surgery, Emergency Care and Medicine, Women and Children and Diagnostics and Support – would allow for agile working
- Would provide a real oversight of the management of the organisation from the standpoint of accountability
- Community and acute services are not yet fully integrated – hopefully the new structure and Directorates would see a full integration

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- The Directorates would be clinically lead across a range of disciplines
- The Senior Nurses and Midwifery Committee met monthly to discuss issues. The Committee would be pulling together a strategy on how the Trust was going to change areas in the acute part of the hospital/work differently

- Community Nursing was a very important aspect. The Trust included health care and the patient care path in the acute hospital and in the community setting
- The proposed structure would be considered by the Board at the end of June. There would then be 30 days consultation
- The provisional leadership roles in the new structure were quite different e.g. matrons would not just manage Wards but would be looking at the pathway of care and if there were the right colleagues working with the right leadership and right representation. It recognised the uniqueness of professionals that worked in the Community and ensured they were heard. A staff engagement strategy was being developed.
- Staff morale was low, ranked within the bottom 20% of acute trusts, could this have any potential impact on services? In a recovery situation communication with staff had to be improved, having an inclusive and participative leadership style contributes towards this.
- Important to reiterate that the Trust had to take almost 25% out of the operating budget, and that there were some fixed costs so radical change was required in how front line teams work
- The Government was clear that tele-health had a key part to play in the future. The Trust echoed this and said it would play a part in reducing barriers between hospital and community.
- There was a working group working across the region looking at collaboration with other hospitals. Already Weston Park Hospital provided specialist cancer services and the Hallamshire Hospital provided neurosurgery. Due to the constant strive to do better, there would be a requirement in the future that there was far more co-operative work
- Another area for possible collaborative working in the future was the use of locum medical staff - a theme up and down the country. There were discussions across the region with regard to having a pool of medical staff in the region who were willing to work as locums that could be called upon at short notice and at far less cost
- All options had to be considered within the strategic planning process to ensure each service provided at the Hospital was sustainable. However, the Hospital would never close given the population and the volume of patients that the Hospital took care of
- If other providers were going to specialise there was an opportunity for Rotherham to specialise and when looking at the whole issue and process from a regional basis, there was probably much more

opportunity for things to be done at Rotherham on a localised basis than what may go out to other areas. It may be that Rotherham became more of a “well baby” delivery hospital and the more problematic deliveries went elsewhere

- 1 strength the Trust had was its integrated care organisation. It may well be that other Trusts in the area followed/used the model
- If specialists were shared across a bigger area there would be a larger number of patients and would be able to run an on call rota
- At present there was no list of services that the Hospital would not be offering any more
- Consideration had been given to bringing in other private sector organisations to help with service delivery but, following analysis of price and inconvenience, it was decided to retain inhouse. It may be the Trust would provide services to others and bring in revenue
- The Trust had picked up from what was being put into place at the end of 2012 and looked at the corporate spend side of the organisation and that had now been completed. Consultation had taken place and those employees that had been made redundant had left the organisation. There was also tactical control which was considering spending on specific items.
- Over the next 3 years the public would see £50M taken out of the organisation with no new services/revenue coming into the organisation. There would be less people working at the Hospital as 70% of the costs were staff; the other 30% was, supplies and the expenses of the organisation. However, the public would see staff working smarter, working together and doing things differently. 35 people had left the organisation and the process was now to work through how those jobs were going to be taken care of. The Trust had been increasing the number of patient care givers within the organisation at the same time as making the changes. The Board had agreed that the nursing vacancies needed to be filled and the process of recruitment had been in place several months.

The Chairman thanked everyone for their attendance and contributions.

8. NURSING UPDATE AND HEADLINES

Juliette Greenwood, Chief Nurse, gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

Local Operational Challenges

- Workforce Challenges
 - High vacancy factor
 - Ongoing utilisation of ‘flex beds’

- Corporate workforce consultation
- Corporate adult inpatient recruitment
- HV availability v workforce trajectory
- Media and Reputation
- Demographics – deprivation, dementia, children and young people, safeguarding complexities, high risk maternity

Significant National Failures

- Winterbourne View
 - Abuse of patients with complex learning disabilities and missed opportunities (A&E, health assessments)
- Francis Report (2013) and concerns
 - Standards of care Compassion
 - Accountability
 - Nurse leadership
 - Professionalism
 - Specific needs of older people
 - Listening and responding to patients and families
 - Nursing workforce – numbers, skills and competency

Impact and Location Actions

- CQUINS – National and Local ‘Francis Focus’
 - Friends and Family Test
 - Safety Thermometer
 - Patient Experience
 - Complaints
 - Safeguarding
 - Nurse Leadership
 - Dementia
 - Death Certification

Nursing Staffing

- Twice per year Boards (in public session) to receive, confirm and publish assurance of safe nurse staffing levels via agreed evidence based tool
- To adopt recommended Safer Nursing Care Tool (SNCT) (via Assistant Chief Nurse Workforce)
- National development of Community SNCT and A&E SNCT
- To look to re-run Birthrate+ (3 years since last review)
- Children and young people workforce – PANDA, PABM, new national models for HV and School Nursing
- Following a year’s work and ongoing scrutiny
 - Investing in adult inpatient wards 50 wte
 - Investment in additional RN and HCSW resource align general adult inpatient skill mix against national ‘best practice’ of 65:35 ratio
 - Ward Sisters/Charge Nurses to be supernumerary

Impact

- Role of the Ward Sister/Charge Nurse – key Leadership not 'office based'
- Tools for the job e.g. Ward Nurse Accreditation Scheme, local audit program, engage with patients/relatives, Ward rounds
- Minimise bureaucracy – enabling time to care and time to lead
- Support to staff, students and patients and family
- Clarity about professional and personal accountability
- Introduce intentional rounding – impact
- Transparency Agenda

Francis Implications

- Patient Safety Nurse – new Ward level focus
- Nursing Quality Indicators – dashboard – EWS
- BoD required to publically discuss in detail twice per year
- Line of sight of immediate risks – HarmFree meeting
- The Emotional Labour of Care – e.g. Schwartz Rounds/Cultural Care Barometer – staff need time and space to reflect
- All student nurses serve Y1 as a Health Care Assistant (pilots in situ)
- Staff engagement strategy – Friends and Family Trust
- Values based recruitment
- Consider patient/governor involvement in senior clinical appointments
- Appraisal programme – nursing input, patient feedback leading to nurse revalidation

Compassion in Practice 2012-15

- National strategy and implementation plans
- 6C's of Care, Compassion, Competence, Communication, Courage, Commitment
- Principles of Nursing Practice (December 2012)
- TRFT Nurse and Midwifery strategy development (annual work plan)
- Dementia
- TRFT Strategy as part of Rotherham Strategy
- Dementia Champions 'Ward to Board'
- Workforce development
- Carers audit
- Environment

Patient Experience

- National Patient Surveys – A&E, Inpatient, Midwifery, Outpatients, Children and Young People
- Friends and Family roll out – maternity pathway, community, Children and Young People
- Patient Experience Board to 'Ward'
- 'touch and see' i.e. unannounced inspections, Senior Nurse Walkabouts, Patient Safety Visits, Executive Walkabouts
- Patient Stories
- Patient Experience – Review and Refresh Strategy

Complaints – our responsiveness, engagement, ownership, upheld or not, lessons learnt, improvements
Looking across pathways e.g. Safeguarding, C&YPS
“You said We did” – local level, Trust, web page
Celebrating Patient Experience Day

Discussion ensued on the presentation with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- An ongoing issue was agency staff. 60 nurses had been recruited as a result of the January Board decision, half of which had now arrived. It took approximately 3 months to recruit from the time of the advert. Recruitment would be taking place again for a further 49/50 posts, a mix of nurses and health care support workers. There was a challenge nationally as a number of Trusts were in the same position and it may be that there may need to be a targeted advertising campaign
- The new posts would be in areas where there had been a need identified to increase the numbers and on patient care areas
- In the main the Hospital used “flexi” staff - predominantly NHS staff and were bank nurses
- From a nursing perspective the staffing ratio was the same 7 days a week
- Rotherham deliberately did not schedule planned major surgery on Friday evenings and over the weekend. The national pattern shows higher mortality rates at the weekends. Rotherham was well advanced with work to introduce 7 day weeks for all staff across all Wards
- In terms of the position with other Trusts, Rotherham was in the middle. It was a risk for all Trusts if a patient was admitted for non-elective admission on a Friday/Saturday as an emergency
- Patients may be discharged at weekends so 7 day working across the health community, including social care and GPs, to back up the patient’s discharge at a weekend, may need to be explored.
- 60 nurses recruited in last few months
- The Francis Report focussed on nursing care, and the patient’s overall experience and its recommendations concerned actions around medical staff. Validated recruitment had to be the direction of travel

Juliette was thanked for her report.

9. QUALITY ACCOUNTS FOR ROTHERHAM FOUNDATION TRUST

Dr. Tricia Bain, Executive Health Informatics Officer, presented the submitted report on the Trust's Quality Account for 2012/13.

The following issues were highlighted:-

- The report would be available on the NHS website on 13th June, 2013
- Improved on last year and staff should be credited for this
- Work had taken place on Dementia but was included again in the improvement programme
- Significant improvement on the Medication Programme and would not be set as an improvement programme for 2013/14
- Staff morale – the main areas of concern remained the same as last year – learning and development and job satisfaction having scored the lowest of all categories
- Patient feedback and patient experience strategy had been reviewed throughout the year. There had been success in increasing the volume of complaints to obtain more feedback whilst also reducing the overall severity of complaints. Whilst the principal theme related to medical care there had been a significant increase in complaints relating to administration and appointments. This has been attributed to issues arising soon after the implementation of the Electronic Patient Record system
- Care Quality Commission had visited the previous week, carrying out 50 patient interviews, and been very positive. The report was due in two weeks.
- Work next year would focus on intra-operative fluid management, improving data quality, review of death certification and Dementia

Discussion ensued on the report with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Health Assessments for Looked after Children data was collected by the commissioners. Data had been collected throughout the year but was unable to be validated
- Information was reported through to the Safeguarding Board Quality and Assurance Committee who had tracked and monitored the information. There was an issue of Health Assessment for Rotherham Looked after Children who were being cared for outside of the Borough

- The work was being linked through the Ward Nurses and Safeguarding work. The work was still taking place but was not 1 of the key priorities for 2013/14

Dr. Bain was thanked for her report.

10. WARD VISIT

The Select Commission split into 2 groups and visited Medical and Surgical Wards.

11. SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME 2013/14

Caroline Webb, Scrutiny Officer, presented a report that was to be considered by all the Select Commissions and by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board with regard to the 2013/14 work programme.

The proposed programme for the Health Select Commission was as follows:-

Excess Medication
 Contenance Services
 How to Improve Health in Rotherham
 Access to GPs
 Continuing Health Care for Children and Young People

Additional suggested areas of work were:-

Access to School Nursing
 Sexual Health Services
 Mental Health Services

Discussion ensued on the proposed programme:-

- Both School Nursing Services and Sexual Health Services were very important with regard to child sexual exploitation and also following the NHS changes now came under the local authority – to discuss with Public Health colleagues
- How to Improve Health in Rotherham – was it too wide?
- Welfare reform was likely to have an impact on health as well as jobs
- Issues with regard to capacity
- Healthwatch – need to avoid duplication
- Full reviews v spotlight reviews
- Excess Medication and Contenance Services – it was agreed to have initial reports to the commission first
- Access to GPs was seen as this Select Commission's top priority

It was noted that a meeting was to be held on 13th June between the Cabinet and Select Commission Chairs to discuss the work programme followed by approval by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board on 14th June.

Resolved:- (1) That the 2013/14 work programme be noted.

(2) That a meeting be set up between the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Healthwatch to discuss priorities and any potential for overlap.

12. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That a further meeting be held on Thursday, 13th June, 2013, commencing at 9.30 a.m. to be held at Rotherham District General Hospital.

SELF REGULATION SELECT COMMISSION
28th March, 2013

Present:- Councillor Currie (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor Pickering), Councillors Beck, Ellis, J. Hamilton, Mannion, Sharman and Watson.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Atkin, Beaumont, Godfrey and Tweed.

64. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest to report.

65. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from members of the public or the press.

66. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 21ST FEBRUARY, 2013

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Self Regulation Select Commission held on 21st February, 2013, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

Reference was made to Minute No. 62 (Work Programme Update) and whether there were any additional items that the Select Commission wished to include as part of the work being taken forward. Anyone wishing to include any issues should forward them onto the Senior Scrutiny Adviser.

67. CORPORATE PLAN OUTCOMES - QUARTER 3 2012-13

Consideration was given to a report presented by the Matt Gladstone, Director of Commissioning, Policy and Performance, which provided an analysis of the Council's current performance against the twenty-nine key delivery outcomes contained within the Corporate Plan. This report included the Quarter 3 details and a current position statement based on available performance measures for outcomes with a status of red or green, together with an analysis of progress on key projects and activities which contribute to delivery of the corporate plan.

As a result of service reductions, the Council's ability to deliver all the corporate plan objectives is placed as a high risk. The potential for under performance as a result of budget reductions highlights the importance of integrating performance, risk and financial reporting. The report also highlighted the various economic and political influences, including changes in national policy and funding which were already, or could potentially impact, on the performance of this Council's corporate plan outcomes.

Further information was also provided by way of a presentation, which drew particular attention to:-

- The Scorecard and the 29 Outcome Areas.
- Changes in Risk Rating.
- Examples of Good Performance and Areas for Improvement/Recovery Actions for each of the five priority areas.
- Proposed Review of Corporate Plan Outcomes.

A discussion and a question and answer session ensued and the following issues were raised and subsequently clarified:-

- Involvement of this Select Commission in the review of the Corporate Plan Outcome.
- Opportunities to feed in comments to the review and the proposed outcome areas.
- Comparisons against the national average profiles and not what was average in Rotherham.
- Red rating for children living in poverty and how this could be mitigated.
- Continuation of the CYPS Improvement Panel in order to push on and improve performance.
- Low performance in No. 21 (more people are physically active and have a healthy way of life) and the reason for the shift from green to red rating.
- The need for a full review and corporate assessment of all the priorities.
- Self assessment/judgement calls of some of the priorities, whether these could be challenged and the need to take ownership.
- Examples of good performance and objectivity of some areas for matters such as public transport.

Resolved:- (1) That the current position against each of the Corporate Plan outcomes be noted and that there should be continued implementation of the proposed interventions and corrective actions.

(2) That the current Corporate Plan outcomes be revised and realigned to the Council's key strategies and priorities with involvement from this Select Commission.

(3) That any performance issues be kept under close review to prevent green/amber outcomes becoming rated red.

68. EMPLOYMENT AND WORKLESSNESS IN ROTHERHAM

Consideration was given to a report presented by Simeon Leach, Regeneration Manager, which described the current and historical position for employment and worklessness in Rotherham. The report summarised the support currently available and identified potential activity

which the Council could help to deliver in trying to improve employment prospects. The employment statistics for the Rotherham Borough area were appended to the report.

Further information was provided by way of a presentation which drew specific attention to:-

- Employment Rate Comparisons.
- Drivers of Worklessness.
- How to Tackle Worklessness.
- Previous Initiatives.
- Current Initiatives.
- Future Focus.

A discussion and a question and answer session ensued and the following issues were raised and subsequently clarified:-

- Legacy of projects left by Yorkshire Forward and what support was being provided to Rotherham via the Sheffield City Region.
- Unemployment in deprived areas and how the economies could be boosted to prevent areas being skilled bound.
- Success rates of the local initiatives.
- Attraction of new investment and growing existing firms, whilst ensuring that local residents could access them.
- The need for supportive schemes to assist young people getting into work.

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

(2) That the potential and current interventions in the Rotherham employment market be noted.

69. PERFORMANCE CLINICS

Further to Minute No. 21(6) of the meeting of the Self Regulation Select Commission held on 20th September 2012, consideration was given to a report presented by Matt Gladstone, Director of Commissioning, Policy and Performance, which outlined the current process for conducting performance clinics across all Council Directorates.

Concern had previously been expressed that Performance Clinics were not always effective and consistent and this Select Commission sought reassurance that improvements would be made to the process

With the aid of a presentation further information was provided on:-

- The current format of Performance Clinics.
- Issues that had been raised.
- Proposals/next steps to improve the current format.

A discussion and a question and answer session ensued and the following issues were raised and subsequently clarified:-

- The need for consistency in approach.
- To ensure that Performance Clinic outcomes were clear and respective actions communicated.
- Diary management and whether or not Performance Clinics could take place in an evening.
- The need for a strong and independent Chair and appropriate membership to ensure appropriate challenge
- The need for a robust and formalised framework for Performance Clinics to prevent any duplication with any spotlight scrutiny reviews.

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

(2) That a robust and formalised framework for Performance Clinics be submitted to the next meeting of this Select Commission.

70. MATT GLADSTONE, DIRECTOR OF COMMISSIONING, POLICY AND PERFORMANCE

The Chairman, on behalf of the Select Commission, offered its best wishes for the future to Matt Gladstone, Director of Commissioning, Policy and Performance, who would be leaving the Local Authority shortly to take up a position at Barnsley.

71. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next scheduled meeting of the Self Regulation Select Commission shall take place on Thursday, 2nd May, 2013 commencing at 3.30 p.m.

SELF REGULATION SELECT COMMISSION
2nd May, 2013

Present:- Councillor Currie (in the Chair); Councillors Beaumont, Beck, Ellis, Godfrey, J. Hamilton, Mannion and Sharman.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Atkin, The Mayor (Councillor Pickering), Tweed and Watson.

72. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest to report.

73. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from members of the public or the press.

74. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 28TH MARCH, 2013

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Self Regulation Select Commission held on 28th March, 2013 be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

Further to Minute No. 67 (Corporate Plan Outcomes) it was acknowledged that this Select Commission could only recommend that the Corporate Plan outcomes be revised with suggested involvement from this Select Commission.

Reference was made to Minute No. 69 (Performance Clinics) and the deferral of the report until the next meeting of this Select Commission owing to sickness absence by the relevant officer.

75. REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 28TH FEBRUARY 2013

Further to Minute No. 189 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 10th April, 2013, consideration was given to a report presented by Stuart Booth, Director of Finance, which provided details of progress on the delivery of the Revenue Budget for 2012/13 based on performance for the first eleven months of the financial year. It was currently forecast that the Council would overspend against its Budget by £0.601m (+0.3%); an improvement of £0.677m on the January report which showed a forecast overspend of £1.278m (+0.6%). The main reasons for the forecast overspend related to:-

- The continuing service demand and cost pressures in looking after vulnerable children across the Borough.

- Additional, one-off property costs relating to the continued rationalisation of the Council's asset portfolio as part of the efficiency drive to reduce operational costs.

It was expected that this forecast overspend would further reduce in the final month of 2012/13 financial year following Cabinet's instruction, endorsed by Scrutiny, that future spend should be on essential items only. For the remainder of the financial year spend must only be in respect of ensuring that vulnerable children and adults were safeguarded, be contractually committed, where to not spend would be a false economy, or to ensure compliance with health and safety requirements.

Continued, concerted management action would also be required to ensure that the Council was able to deliver a balanced outturn and preserve its successful track record in managing both its in year financial performance and its overall financial resilience.

A discussion and question and answer session ensued and the following issues were raised and subsequently clarified:-

- Definition and determination of essential spend and the need for this to be consistent across the Authority, the statutory obligations and as to what it actually entailed.
- Overspend position for Children and Young People's Services and the Invest to Save Bid for out of authority foster placements to mitigate key pressures.
- Need for more clarity and narrative on the savings to ascertain whether the position was positive or negative year on year.
- Continuation of the Multi-Agency Support Panel in Children and Young People's Services in order to support a move towards a balanced budget.
- Timetable for early sight of monitoring reports by this Select Commission.
- Key pressures in Asset Management as a result of accommodation costs and property sales.
- Forecasted underspend on the Housing Revenue Account and the impact and significant risks arising from the social sector size criteria rules.
- Close monitoring of the financial management arrangements and the risk that this poses from the social sector size criteria rules.
- Potential overspend arising from the pressures of winter maintenance and the basing of this on an average winter.
- Parking income targets and the reasons for the overspend through the target not being achieved.
- The need for adequate and robust budget challenge.
- Non-contractual overtime and the impact of this with the reduction of staff.
- Credit to Waste Management in savings arising from contract renegotiations from changes to collection arrangements.

Resolved:- (1) That the recommendations made to Cabinet be noted.

(2) That the any comments made be forwarded onto the Cabinet for further deliberation.

(3) That a report be submitted to a future meeting on the progress and impact of the Invest to Save Bid for out of authority foster placements in Children and Young People's Services.

(4) That further information be provided on the reasons for the parking income target not being achieved, thus resulting in an overspend.

76. COMPLAINTS - 6 MONTH REPORT (APRIL 2012 - SEPTEMBER 2012)

Consideration was given to a report presented by Dave Roddis, Performance and Quality Manager, which presented information about complaints made between 1st April, 2012 and 30th September, 2012 under the Corporate Complaint's Procedure, the Adult Social Services and Children's Social Services Complaint Regulations.

The figures in the report included details of the number of customers and the number of complaints made with each Directorate area providing information and a breakdown summary.

In total over the last six months the number of complaints received by the Council was **335** (on target decrease - **724** received 2011-12) and overall **98%** of all complaints were responded to within the timescales promised, compared to **94%** (2011/12).

This progressive approach had continued, leading to a year on year improvement and all Directorate leads were targeted to achieve 100% performance.

The report set out in detail the headline results from April to September, 2012 along with lessons learning from complaints and each Directorates' performance.

A discussion and a question and answer session ensued and the following issues were raised and subsequently clarified:-

- Inclusion of Councillors' surgery reports and the capturing of data not logged through the proper channels, i.e. by telephone and face to face.
- Awareness raising with Elected Members.
- Appeals against school admissions were not included in the report and were subject to separate categorisation.
- Positive management of complaints.
- Changes to services driving the level of complaints received.

- Improvements arising through the creation of a centralised complaint function and staff training.
- Formalisation of a complaint and the important elements of a comment.
- External complaint investigation costs, which whilst increased were deemed as good practice across complex Children and Young People's Services cases.
- Submission of an end of year report to this Select Commission.

Resolved:- That the report be received and the contents noted.

77. WORK PROGRAMME - UPDATE 2012/13 AND YEAR AHEAD 2013/14

Consideration was given to a report presented by Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, which provided an update on the Scrutiny Work Programme for 2012/13 and sought views on the work programme for 2103/14 and whether the areas below remained a priority:-

- Scrutiny of commissioning arrangements.
- Corporate plan outcomes – review of priorities.
- HRA – impact of welfare reform.
- Public Equality Duty (update).
- Twelve months implementation of the revised laundry charges with a view to ascertaining whether they provide value for money.
- Private Finance Initiative – update.

Issues of concern needed to be fed into the Self-Regulation Select Commission 2013/14 work programme, which would be submitted for consideration by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board to prioritise the overall work programme across each of the Select Commissions. This would highlight any areas of joint working, thematic approaches or potential duplication.

The work programme was flexible and issues may be referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and Select Commissions by various sources.

Discussion ensued on the work programme and it was suggested that this also include some work on Councillors' Structures.

Reference was also made to reviewing previous scrutiny reviews completed in the last few years as part of Scrutiny aftercare, especially with the challenges now facing the Council and the changes to staffing structures and which would then be captured as part of the Scrutiny Annual Report, which would be presented to Council in July, 2013.

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

(2) That the areas identified in 2013/14 work programme remain valid with the inclusion of a review into Councillors' Structures.

(3) That any additional areas be identified and be fed into the wider scrutiny work programme to be considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

78. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next scheduled meeting of the Self Regulation Select Commission take place on Thursday, 27th June, 2013 commencing at 3.30 p.m.

IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION
Wednesday, 24th April, 2013

Present:- Councillor G. A. Russell (in the Chair); Councillors Ali, Astbury, Buckley, Burton, Clark, Kaye, Lelliott, Pitchley, Read, Roche, Sharman and co-opted members J. Jones and A. Clough.

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Ahmed, Dodson, Donaldson and License and from co-opted member M. Smith.

57. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

There were no Declarations of Interest to record.

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

There were no members of the public or the press in attendance.

59. COMMUNICATIONS.

The Senior Scrutiny Adviser informed the Improving Lives Select Commission of members' training sessions that had been scheduled: -

- Local Government Finance;
- Public Sector Equality Session;
- Corporate Parenting.

60. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 13TH MARCH, 2013.

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission held on 13th March, 2013, were considered.

Resolved: - That the minutes of the previous meeting be agreed as an accurate record for signature by the Chairperson.

61. SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT STRATEGY.

Councillor G. A. Russell introduced the Head of the School Effectiveness Service (Schools and Lifelong Learning, Children and Young People's Services) who had attended to present Rotherham's recently revised School Improvement Strategy.

The Head of the School Effectiveness Service provided a brief background to this work, and included information on local and national funding streams, national policy context and the local drivers and input from Rotherham's schools.

The Government's aim was to 'support the school system to become more effectively self-improving', and intended to charge the school system with responsibility for their own self-improvement. As schools and school leaders took on increasing responsibility for school improvement there was a need to ensure suitable safeguards and a support infrastructure so that all children and young people could fulfil their potential.

An on-going partnership had been established between Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council and the Rotherham School Improvement Partnership in April, 2011. In September, 2012, this partnership became the Learners First Schools' Partnership Ltd., set up as a school company by Wickersley School and Sports College in partnership with the Council. This organisation was the legally constituted successor to the Rotherham School Improvement Partnership. Further information in relation to the partnership included: -

- The Learners First Schools' Partnership Ltd. was a not-for-profit company;
- The Council, through the Strategic Director for Children and Young People's Services acted as the supervising authority for the company;
- The Council's School Effectiveness Service was working in partnership with the Learners First Schools' Partnership Ltd.;
- The Rotherham Schools' Forum had agreed Delegated Schools Grant funding on 5th October, 2012 to support the development and delivery of a school-led school improvement model in the 2011/12 financial year, and up to and including 2014/15;
- All partners were undertaking benchmarking with other local authorities and school improvement partnership models.

Discussion ensued on the information provided and issues raised and discussed included: -

- Scrutiny of the performance of the Learners First Schools' Partnership Ltd.;
- Previous good progress seen in the past 5/6 years had been built upon in this model;
- Choice of other local authorities for the benchmarking and the factors that had led to the choice;
- How would relationships be managed within the new model and ensure that potential issues were managed?;
- What were the statutory and non-statutory activities of the Learners First Schools' Partnership Ltd.?;
- The operation of a buy-back model for the school improvement services provided by the Learners First Schools' Partnership Ltd.;
- Was the Learners First Schools' Partnership Ltd. engaged with all of Rotherham's schools, including its academies?;
- Was the Learners First Schools' Partnership Ltd. engaging and working with Governors and school governing bodies?;

- The aspiration of achieving 'Outstanding', and what could be done to maintain and improve?.

The Chair of this Select Commission thanked the Head of the School Effectiveness Service for her contribution to the meeting and the discussion that had followed.

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

(2) That the scrutiny of the progress and outcomes of the Learners First Schools' Partnership Ltd. be incorporated onto the Improving Lives Select Commission's work programme.

62. FAMILIES INFORMATION SERVICE (FIS) / EARLY EDUCATION FOR TWO-YEAR OLDS / LAUNCH OF NEW FIS WEBSITE.

Councillor G. A. Russell welcomed the Childcare Sustainability Officer (Early Years and Childcare, School Effectiveness Service, Schools and Lifelong Learning, Children and Young People's Services). The Childcare Sustainability Officer had been invited to the meeting to provide the Select Commission with an update on the entitlement for early education for the most deprived two-year old children and the launch of a new website that provided information from the Families Information Service.

On 1st September, 2013, it was noted that the early education offer would become a statutory entitlement for eligible two-year old children. There would be approximately 900 children who would be eligible. There were documented benefits for children accessing early education, and particularly for those who lived in disadvantaged areas.

In preparation for the commencement of the statutory entitlement the Early Years and Childcare Service were: -

- The early education entitlement would be extended from September, 2014, to approximately 40% of two-year old children. This would equate to approximately 1,700 children;
- Eligibility criteria for September, 2013, related to the benefits used to calculate access to Free School Meals and two year olds who were Looked After Children;
- Department for Education proposals for children eligible from September, 2014, included households that were in receipt of Working Tax Credits and with an annual income of less than £16,190; children with a statement of special educational needs; households that attracted Disability Living Allowance; or children who had left care through an Adoption Order, Residence Order and Special Guardianship;
- Awareness raising of the new statutory entitlement was being undertaken by the Early Years and Childcare Service and all partners, including Children's Centres, Health Visitors, Social Workers and childcare providers;

- The Family Information Service was able to undertake an eligibility test for families and provide details of local providers who were offering free early education places;
- Childcare sufficiency analysis had been undertaken by the Early Years Service to determine whether there were sufficient places available to meet the statutory entitlement in September 2013 and 2014. This analysis had uncovered some lack of capacity, but funding had been allocated to provide additional places.

The submitted report also outlined the duties place on the Local Authority by the Childcare Act. 2006, to maintain a service that provided information, advice and assistance to parents and prospective parents on childcare, early education, activities, services and facilities available for 0 – 19 year olds and their family members. It was noted that Rotherham's Family Information Service (FIS) met this duty through the provision of a freephone telephone helpline, email and website. Consultation with service users and stakeholders had highlighted issues with the website, and a revised website had been launched with improved search criteria and a user-friendly interface.

A demonstration of the website (www.rotherhamfis.co.uk) was provided and included a demonstration of the website's search capacity.

- 1,500 local services and activities were represented on the website;
- Regular data refreshes were undertaken on the website and records were removed if there had been no contact with the providers to ensure that all information was up to date;
- The website offered the location, maps, details and opening hours of the services provided;
- There were details of activities and providers for all needs and thresholds, from universal activities to acute.

The literature that had been produced by the FIS to advertise the Service was shared with the Improving Lives Select Commission.

Members of the Improving Lives Select Commission provided the following thoughts on the information that they had been provided with: -

- Positive feedback was provided in relation to the website demonstration;
- The presentation would be useful for local MPs and their staff to be aware of.

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

(2) That members of the Improving Lives Select Commission use and promote the site to residents and highlight any services/providers that are not represented.

(3) That the information be shared with local MPs and their offices.

63. PRESENTATION: SCRUTINY REVIEW OF DOMESTIC ABUSE SERVICES.

Councillor G. A. Russell welcomed the Senior Scrutiny Adviser and the Domestic Violence Co-ordinator (Health and Wellbeing, Neighbourhood and Adult Services).

The Senior Scrutiny Adviser provided an overview of the work that had been undertaken as part of the scrutiny review into domestic abuse services.

The parameters of the review were: -

- What does a 'good' service look like (drawing on national guidance and best practice elsewhere);
- How well do partners work together at a strategic level;
- How well do groups work together operationally;
- How well do we listen to the voice of the victim and their families.

Case studies of service users would be scrutinised to understand how existing approaches were used to protect victims of abuse and recommend where potential service gaps, duplications, opportunities to work more effectively and efficiently respond to future changes could be accessed.

It was noted that Central Government's Action Plan that had been drawn up to address violence against women and girls (VAWG) would also form part of the scrutiny review.

The Domestic Violence Co-ordinator gave a presentation that outlined national context and local issues, including local definitions of domestic abuse, profiles of domestic abuse victims and offenders and domestic abuse services in Rotherham.

Following this presentation, discussion ensued on the matters arising: -

- Which things were going well and not so well in Rotherham?;
- Impact of the whole range of Welfare Reforms and how these were impacting on domestic abuse;
- Lack of available crash pads;
- Support for the children of families that were fleeing from domestic abuse;
- Incidence rates and whether these reflected all incidents of domestic violence;
- Additional training had been developed to help frontline practitioners respond to incidences of financial abuse.

Resolved: - (1) That the information within the report and presentation be received and its content noted.

(2) That any comments arising from the report and presentation be forwarded to the review group for consideration in the scope of the review.

64. WORK PROGRAMME: 2012/13 UPDATE AND THE YEAR AHEAD, 2013/14.

The Senior Scrutiny Adviser presented a report that outlined the progress against the Scrutiny Work programme for the Improving Lives Select Commission for 2012/13 and requested suggestions for the 2013/14 work programme.

The report noted the position of the Improving Lives Select Commission in terms of the 2012/13 work programme and noted that there were two reviews currently underway from this programme. These were the scrutiny reviews into student-led mentoring schemes to support anti-bullying work in schools, and domestic abuse services. It was anticipated that the work would be completed early in the new municipal year.

Areas already identified for consideration in the 2013/14 work programme and shown at section 7.4 were: -

- Child Sexual Exploitation;
- Update on Families for Change and Disadvantaged Areas agendas;
- Support for improving outcomes at Key Stage 2;
- Outcomes and impact of the Lifestyle Survey – six-month progress review;
- Outcomes for Looked After Children (based on the 10 questions to ask...);
- Annual report of the Local Children’s Safeguarding Board;
- Role of alcohol and drug misuse in child protection and safeguarding processes.

Members of the Improving Lives Select Commission also suggested further items for inclusion to the work programme: -

- Early Years – entitlement to early education;
- Child poverty;
- Welfare reform policies;
- Food banks;
- City deal – jobs and apprenticeships for young people.

Resolved: - (1) That the report be received and its content noted.

(2) That the pre-identified issues shown at 7.4 of the submitted report be placed on the Improving Lives Select Commission's work programme for 2013/14.

(3) That the areas identified at the meeting be placed on the Improving Lives Select Commission's work programme for 2013/14.

65. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING: -

Resolved: - That the next meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission take place on Wednesday 12th June, 2013, to start at 1.30 p.m. in the Rotherham Town Hall.

COMMITTEENAME
MeetingDateLegal

Present:- Councillor ChairNameShort (in the Chair); Councillors MembersPresentShortList.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors AllApologiesShortList.

FIELD_SUMMARY

- (a) F
I
E
L
D

-
I
T
E
M

-
N
U
M
B
E
R

- (b) F
I
E
L
D

-
I
T
E
M

-
N
U
M
B
E
R

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
5th April, 2013

Present:- Councillor Whelbourn (in the Chair); Councillors Currie, Dalton, Falvey, Gilding, J. Hamilton, License, G. A. Russell, Steele and Whysall.

148. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

148. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

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

There were no questions from members of the public or the press.

150. GROUNDS MAINTENANCE REVIEW

Further to Minute No. 53 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 27th March, 2013, consideration was given to a report presented by the Scrutiny Manager concerning the scrutiny review of Grounds Maintenance and Street Cleansing Services. A copy of the full scrutiny review report was provided for Elected Members.

The agreed objectives of the review were to:-

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

There were 3 main themes that had emerged from the findings of the review:-

1. Flexibility of resources (a – g)
2. Local feedback and support (a – b)
3. Information sharing (a – c)

Discussion ensued on the issues presented and the following issues were raised: -

- Working with towns and villages on a charter;
- Liaison with partner organisations, including parish councils, bowling clubs;
- Communication within services and with members of the public;

- Cabinet Member portfolios and how the different issues related to each portfolio;
- Timeliness of Review for the next year's budget consultation;
- Roles and responsibilities of operatives and different teams within the Council;
- Utilising the winter and summer maintenance programmes to respond to need;
- On-going monitoring and evaluation of the plan when approved;
- Ensuring that machinery was operated as effectively as possible;
- Loss of posts due to budget reductions;
- Front-line workers had not been interviewed as part of the Review process;
- In relation to 1b, it be amended to reflect that frontline workers should be involved in the evaluation of the pilot scheme.

Resolved:- (1) That the findings and recommendations, as amended, set out in the report be endorsed.

(2) That the report be forwarded to the Cabinet.

(3) That the Cabinet's response be provided to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

151. CENTRE FOR PUBLIC SCRUTINY ANNUAL SURVEY

Consideration was given to a report presented by the Scrutiny Manager which contained the Centre for Public Scrutiny's annual survey of overview and scrutiny in local government (2012/13). Members discussed the various questions contained in the survey and agreed the responses that would be provided on behalf of Scrutiny Services in Rotherham.

The questionnaire related to issues including: -

- Political and gender balance and average size of membership on Scrutiny Panels;
- Number of items covered each year;
- Number of full time equivalent scrutiny support officers within the local authority;
- Scope of Scrutiny's role in Rotherham;
- Resources and a 'wish list' of desired resources;
- Relationship between Scrutiny and the Councillor's Executive and Senior Leadership Team;
- A self-assessment of Scrutiny's impact on services and the lives of people across Rotherham;
- How Scrutiny will look in ten years' time.

Discussion ensued on the survey, and the following point was made: -

- The survey was not 'user-friendly' and did not allow for a fullness of answers that truly reflected Scrutiny in Rotherham. This included the prescriptive answer boxes that did not allow for full responses and limited the quality of answer Rotherham could provide.

Resolved:- (1) That the contents of the report and annual survey be noted.

(2) That the Scrutiny Manager respond to the survey questionnaire as discussed and it be submitted to the Centre for Public Scrutiny.

(3) That the Scrutiny Manager send a letter to the Centre for Public Scrutiny outlining the concerns of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board in relation to the questionnaire used.

152. SCRUTINY ANNUAL WORK PROGRAMME 2012/13

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Scrutiny Manager, containing a detailed review of progress made to date on the overall work programme for the Scrutiny function during 2012/13, with a focus on the work of each of the Select Commissions, as well as this Management Board. The report also reviewed work still outstanding for this year and provided updates on progress with the emerging work programme for 2013/14.

Discussion ensued on the submitted report in relation to priority setting for 2013/14. A number of suggestions were made to increase as far as possible the ability for stakeholders to contribute to the process: -

- Liaise with the seven Area Assemblies to learn their priorities;
- Communication with all Elected Members to learn their priorities;
- Hold an away half-day of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and Scrutiny Services to identify and plan priorities for the coming year.

A suggestion was made that Chairs of the Select Commissions should make contact with the members of their Select Commission to canvass for their priorities and suggested areas for review. A collated version would then be made available for the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and Scrutiny Service's away half-day. A likely timeframe for this would be towards the end of May or early June, 2013.

Resolved:- (1) That the contents of the report and the progress made to date with the Scrutiny work programme 2012/13 be noted.

(2) That an outline work programme for Scrutiny in 2013/14 be initiated through an email to all Elected Members seeking suggestions for items across all of the Select Commissions, and through the Chairs of Select Commissions to canvas for thoughts from the members of each Select Commission.

(3) That an Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and Scrutiny Services away half-day be arranged to consider the 2013/14 work programme for Scrutiny.

153. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES.

The Scrutiny Manager, Scrutiny Services, Legal and Democratic Services, Resources Directorate, reported that the Scrutiny Officer was continuing to work through the issues reported at the 11 Million Take Over Day meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management and building them into a work programme that could be evaluated.

A report outlining a work programme to address the issues raised at the joint meeting with the Youth Cabinet would be presented to a future meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

154. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 22ND MARCH, 2013

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 22nd March, 2013, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

155. WORK IN PROGRESS.

Updates were provided to the meeting in relation to the work in progress of the Select Commissions.

Self-Regulation Select Commission: -

Councillor S. Currie, Chair of the Select Commission, provided an update on the progress of the Select Commission: -

- Budget Review – was concluding for the second financial year. The Select Commission was undertaking a lessons learned approach to determine the best methods used, and planning for the next financial year's scrutiny review;
- Commissioning Review;
- Budget Monitoring Review.

Improving Places Select Commission: -

Councillor J. Falvey, Vice-Chair of the Select Commission, provided an update on the progress of the Select Commission: -

- Completed Grounds Maintenance Review;
- Consideration of the Allocations Policy, which has been delayed.

It was also requested that the Management Board look into the correct order for reports to be submitted through Scrutiny and the Executive.

Improving Lives Select Commission: -

Councillor N. License, Vice Chair of the Select Commission, provided an update on the progress of the Select Commission: -

- The Improving Lives Select Commission had utilised a 'pre-meet' opportunity prior to a full meeting to plan the questions they would ask to the Officers in attendance in relation to corporate parent and looked after children's service. This had been a successful approach and had led to a large area being covered;
- The Select Commission had responded to Government consultation in relation to childcare and changing required child to adult ratios;
- Reviews were underway in relation to Bullying, Domestic Violence and Countering Child Sexual Exploitation.

Health Select Commission: -

Councillor B. Steele, Chair of the Select Commission, provided an update on the progress of the Select Commission: -

- The Health Select Commission had utilised a 'pre-meet' opportunity prior to a full meeting to plan the questions that they would ask to the Chair of the Hospital and the Chief Executive of the Rotherham Foundation Trust. Questions had focused on performance measurement, the use of electronic information sharing and ensuring it was fit for purpose and quality analysis of the Services provided.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

156. CALL-IN ISSUES - TO CONSIDER ANY ISSUES REFERRED FOR CALL-IN.

There were no formal requests for call-in to report.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
19th April, 2013

Present:- Councillor Whelbourn (in the Chair); Councillors Currie, Dalton, Falvey, Gilding, J. Hamilton, G. A. Russell, Steele and Whysall.

157. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

158. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from members of the public or the press.

159. HM GOVERNMENT WELFARE REFORM - UPDATE

Michael Holmes, Policy and Partnership Officer, presented a summary of recent developments, at a local and national level, in relation to the Government's Welfare Reform Programme.

He drew particular attention to:-

Fund for Change/Local Welfare Provision

Rotherham's model had gone live on 2nd April, 2013, where applications were made via the telephone to the Customer Contact Centre with the vast majority of decisions made by a short software-assisted assessment. The Scheme comprised:-

- A small emergency payment, via the Post Office, for those whose health and safety were at immediate risk and had no other means of support (expected to be available from late April)
- Loans via Laser Credit Union for those in financial difficulty but needed less urgent support
- Provision of goods via the Council's Furniture Solutions Team to help people resettle or stay in the community with repayment required in cases where the assessment deemed it appropriate

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Monthly governance meetings due to start in May to assess the Scheme's effectiveness, applications received, payments made and Service pressures
- There had been a few problems with regard to customers not being sure where to contact the Council or the DWP
- It was a 6 months contract with Laser Credit Union who already had a relationship with the Council with regard to rent in advance

Festive Food Fund

The Fund had operated from 19th December, 2012, to 11th January, 2013, aiming to help those lacking money to buy food over Christmas. It had been delivered by Laser Credit Union offering interest free loans of £50 for individuals and £100 for families with payment in the form of vouchers for PAK Stores.

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- The locality of PAK Stores had been made it difficult for those living in outer parts of the Borough, however, it was recognised this had been due to the ability of PAK being able to respond to the request quickly and other supermarkets having to refer the request to their respective head offices
- Could vouchers exclude alcohol and cigarettes in future?
- The Local Welfare Provision Scheme was in place where the Post Office was allowing people to access £20

Discretionary Housing Payments (DHP)

DHP funding was provided by the Department of Works and Pensions (DWP) to help local authorities deal with the impact of Welfare Reform, in particular the Social Sector Size Criteria and the Benefit Cap. The national annual funding for 2013/2014 had been increased from £60M to £155M and, as a result, Rotherham's allocation had increased from £115k to £437k.

The Cabinet had agreed (Minute No. 190 of 10th April, 2013), to prioritise DHP as follows:-

- Support disabled people who lived in significant adapted accommodation and were affected by the social sector size criteria
- Support foster carers who need an extra room and were affected by the social sector size criteria
- Provide short term assistance to claimants affected by the benefits cap

In Rotherham it was suggested that 4,384 households would be affected with an average loss of £12.66 per week. Of those, 3,577 would see a 14% cut with an average loss of £11.24 per week while 799 would see a 25% cut with an average loss of £19.57 per week. It was anticipated that 136 households would be hit by the benefit cap losing an average of £53.18 per week.

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- The estimated total benefit loss in Rotherham was £3.27M
- Revised Allocations Policy still in draft – was retaining social housing for Rotherham residents included?
- Clarity required on redesignation of rooms

Universal Credit

There was no detail as yet on the amount of funding to be provided (if any) but the Guidance indicated that local authorities would be expected to continue to provide welfare and housing advice and support “from existing funding arrangements”.

Part of the support available to claimants would include (temporary) alternative payment arrangements for those who could manage monthly payments. This could include rent paid directly to the landlord, more frequent payments or payment split between partners.

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Clarification still required on a number of points
- Funding would be available but would be payment by rewards
- Possibility that claimants may be fined if they made a mistake on their application form
- Issues for Self Regulation Select Commission to monitor – impact on Performance Indicators, effect on Housing Revenue Account, income stream coming back to the Council and trends
- Possibility of temporary transitional support for clients in exceptional circumstances
- Direct payment pilot in a number of areas last year
- Research from Sheffield Hallam University showed a £91M potential impact when the full impact of all the benefit cuts came in - £611M across the City Region
- A more detailed analysis had been undertaken to look at the impact which provided detail on where potential problems were in the Borough, work with the DWP to provide preventative support and help through the online system

Welfare Benefits up-rating

Certain working age Social Security benefits and payments, and certain elements of tax credits, would be up-rated by 1% rather than in line with inflation for the 2013/14 tax year.

The Government had accepted that the measures would push an additional 200,000 children into poverty. The DWP's impact assessment showed that 4.4M couples with children would lose an average of £3 per week whilst 2M lone partners would lose an average of £5 per week.

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- An extensive awareness raising campaign had been undertaken to make people aware of the changes that were coming in and give an understanding of the benefits they were entitled to linked into the work in Deprived Areas
- To be included on the agenda of the next Parish Liaison meeting

- Research being undertaken in the City Region on the impact on housing. The Cabinet Member for Safe and Attractive Neighbourhoods was to attend a meeting on 15th May where the outcomes would be reported. The increase of rent arrears had already been flagged
- The Government had already accepted it would push many into poverty. The Authority was working closely with the Troubled Families Initiative

Resolved:- (1) That the report be noted and a further report be submitted in 6 months.

(2) That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board retain the overview for the new workstreams with the following being delegated as follows:-

- (a) Self Regulation Select Commission consider Performance Indicators across all the initiatives as the information became available;
- (b) Improving Lives Select Commission consider Child Poverty in its general terms and the impact of Welfare Reform and benefits take up;
- (c) Improving Places Select Commission consider the research undertaken by Sheffield Hallam University and the impact on housing.

160. 2011 CENSUS - UPDATE

Miles Crompton and Elena Hodgson, Policy and Partnerships Team, gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

2011 Census

- 27th March, 2011 – Census Day
95.5% response rate in Rotherham
- July, 2012: first Census data released
Rotherham's population 257,300 (+3.7%)
Up from 248,175 in 2001
Mid-2011 est. 257,700 (+1,900 above projected)
108,300 households (+6%)
- 11th December, 2012: Local Authority key statistics
- 30th January, 2013: Ward, SOA

Age Structure

- School age –10%
- Over 85 +35%

BME Population

- 91.9% White British
- 8.1% BME
- 95% of population are UK born

BME Population – National Comparison

- 20% are BME
- 86% are UK born
- Pakistani ranked 50 (top 15%)

Families with Children – Rotherham Households with Dependent Children 2011-2011

- Average household size fell from 2.40 to 2.36
- Co-habiting couple family ranked 26 (top 8%)

Religion

- Muslims had increased by 78%

Housing Tenure

- 112,000 homes
- 3,775 were empty (3.4%)
- 108,300 households
- 4.5% were crowded
- Council rented ranked 26 (top 8%)

Economic Activity – Economically active Rotherham residents aged 16-74

- Employment +6%
- Unemployment +39%
- Men: from full-time to part-time work and self-employment
- Women: more in all areas, mainly full-time and part-time

Change since 2007/09

- Unemployed: 92% of men and 61% of women claim benefit
- Reduced from 36% to 33%
- Ranked 51 for long term sick or disabled (top15%)

Health: Limiting Long Term Illness (national comparison)

- 22% had a limiting long-term illness (England 17.6%)
- Limited a lot ranked 40 (top 12%)

General Health: Not Good – national comparison

- Bad and very bad health – ranked in worst 10%

Carers - % of Rotherham population providing unpaid care

- 31,000 or 12% provide unpaid care (England 10%)
- 3% increase in carers but estimated 14% increase in hours of care

Qualification Level

- 98% increase in Level 3+
- Ranked 29 for no qualifications (top 8%)
- Lowest 6% for Level 4+ qualifications
- National Comparison – Level 3+ Rotherham 29% England 40%

Car Ownership

- 123,783 cars and vans (+18%)

Summary of Key Issues

- Ageing population (especially 85+)
- BME population had doubled and more diverse
- 95% born in the United Kingdom, 98% spoke English
- More co-habitation, lone parents, one parent households
- Shift from Council to private renting
- Rise in unemployment and part-time work
- High levels of limiting long term illness and bad health
- Intensification of unpaid care (longer hours)
- Large rise in level 3+ qualifications
- 30% have no qualifications
- Rise in multi-car ownership – 18% more cars

Discussion ensued on the presentation with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Illustrate the 11 Deprived Areas on the maps
- When Universal Credit was introduced there could only be 1 claimant per household
- The information reinforced the reasoning for selecting the 11 Deprived Areas. There were some real issues relating to the elderly – insufficient consideration given to pensioner poverty
- The Health statistics aligned with information known generally about the health of the Borough and emphasised the priorities of the Health and Wellbeing Board
- The information was being used to support funding bids

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That further reports about the 2011 Census of population be submitted to future meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board as each of the releases of Census data are made by the Office for National Statistics

(3) That the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board oversee the preparation of a report about the 2011 Census of population and the implications for service planning, delivery and funding, for eventual submission to a future meeting of the Cabinet.

161. PROPOSALS TO STRENGTHEN THE CODE OF RECOMMENDED PRACTICE ON LOCAL AUTHORITY PUBLICITY - CONSULTATION

Steve Pearson, Communications and Marketing, presented a report on the above consultation.

The Department for Communities and Local Government was consulting the Local Government Association and the National Association of Local Councils on proposals to give the Code of Recommended Practice on Local Government publicity greater force in particular to “protect the independent press from unfair competition”.

The consultation proposed the provision of the Secretary of State of powers to make directions requiring compliance with some or all of what were currently guidelines/recommendations in the Code.

The consultation ran from 8th April to 6th May, 2013.

The existing Code included specific guidance about the frequency, content and appearance of local authority newspapers, including recommending that principal local authorities limit the publication of any newspaper to once a quarter and Parish and Town Councils limit their newsletters to once a month. Local authority publicity should be lawful, cost effective, objective, even-handed, appropriate, have regard to equality and diversity and be issued with care during periods of heightened sensitivity.

The Council did not produce its own Council newspaper or magazine. However, the Authority currently spent approximately £53,000 on placing public notices in local newspapers and may in future wish to consider alternative more cost effective methods of doing so.

Rotherham continued to operate consistently within the Framework of the Recommended Code of Practice on Local Authority Publicity, drawing on expert legal, media and communications advice to interpret the Guidance in a local context.

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

(2) That the DCLG be informed that this Board felt that statutory underpinning was not necessary as self-regulation worked with the vast majority of cases and may be an additional burden to both sides.

162. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES.

There were no issues to report.

163. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 5TH APRIL, 2013

Resolved: - The minutes of the previous meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 5th April, 2013, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

164. WORK IN PROGRESS

Updates were provided to the meeting in relation to the work in progress of the Select Commissions as follows:-

Select Regulation Select Commission

Councillor Steele provided an update on the progress of the Select Commission:-

- A meeting had taken place with regard to the scoping of the Commissioning Review
- Members were submitting requests for the work programme which would be further discussed at the away day

Improving Places Select Commission

Councillor Falvey provided an update on the progress of the Select Commission:-

- An additional meeting had been held which had discussed potholes and off-road motorcycles

Improving Lives Select Commission

Councillor A. Russell provided an update on the progress of the Select Commission:-

- Reviews were continuing on Domestic Violence and Bullying

Health Select Commission

Councillor Steele provided an update on the progress of the Select Commission:-

- Rotherham Heart Town -1st year report of the 5 year project. The work that had been carried out in the 1st year had been excellent. Defibrillators had been placed around the Authority both on Council premises and private properties
- Hospital Discharge arrangements – Rotherham Foundation Trust's draft Policy had been submitted. It had been agreed that a spotlight review be held on the Select Commission's 3 priorities
- Urgent Care Review – The Select Commission had felt that there was insufficient detail to enable a response to be made. A sub-group was to be established to look at issues further
- Residential Care Review – The Review Group's recommendations would be submitted to the Board

Away Day

The Scrutiny Manager reported that the work programme was already fairly well developed; the away day would need to look at the priorities together with the information presented within the Welfare Reform and Census agenda items.

165. CALL-IN ISSUES - TO CONSIDER ANY ISSUES REFERRED FOR CALL-IN.

There were no formal requests for call-in to report.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
24th May, 2013

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Currie, Dalton, Falvey, Gilding, G. A. Russell and Sims.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Beck, Read and Whelbourn.

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

2. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from members of the public or the press.

3. SCRUTINY REVIEW OF THE COUNCIL'S RESIDENTIAL HOMES

Further to Minute No. 78 of the meeting of the Health Select Commission held on 18th April, 2013, consideration was given to a report presented by Councillor B. Steele and by the Scrutiny Manager containing the findings and recommendations of the Scrutiny Review of the two residential homes in Rotherham operated by the Council. The review had also included visits to two independent homes, for benchmarking purposes

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 budgets cuts on these matters. As well as making recommendations to be considered alongside the process of setting and reviewing the 2013/14 budget, the review aimed to support the achievement of the Council priorities i.e. ensuring that care and protection were available for those people most in need and helping to create safe and healthy communities.

The review had comprised two distinct pieces of work:-

- to understand the workings of the residential homes set in the context of Adult Social Care delivery, funding and regulations.
- to receive a summary of the work completed by Price, Waterhouse Cooper and the main recommendations regarding the future of the residential homes.

Significant issues from the scrutiny review were as follows:-

- the two Council-owned residential homes would have difficulty being competitive in terms of costs with the independent sector, in part because of the terms and conditions of the staff employed by the Council;

- the majority of the costs of the residential homes concerned staffing;
- for several reasons, including vacancy rates and annual leave, staff would regularly find themselves working longer than their contracted hours and sometimes resulted in staff shortages;
- the high quality of care provided in the residential homes was largely attributable to the staff who were proud to work for the Council and extremely committed to improving the quality standards for the residents;
- the managers of the two residential homes demonstrated an inclusive management style and strong leadership;
- the entertainment and activities programme provided for residents were of a high quality;
- the costs associated with the maintenance contract and the involvement of staff in this process.

The Management Board noted the current position concerning the management of staff vacancy rates, as well as the costs of building maintenance at the residential homes.

Members placed on record their thanks to everyone who had participated in this scrutiny review, including the staff of the two residential homes.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That the findings and recommendations of the scrutiny review of this Council's residential homes, as detailed in the report now submitted, be endorsed.

(3) That the scrutiny review report be forwarded to the Cabinet for further consideration.

(4) That the Cabinet's response to this scrutiny review's recommendations be reported to a future meeting of the Health Select Commission.

4. SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME 2013/2014

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Scrutiny Manager, concerning the suggested scrutiny work programme for the 2013/14 municipal year, with a focus on all of the Select Commissions, as well as this Management Board. A list of the currently suggested areas of work for scrutiny in 2013/14 was appended to the submitted report (nb: additional matters to be included in the list were (i) food banks and (ii) customer services provided at Council premises, including libraries; and (iii) fostering services – invest to save scheme). It was noted that not all areas

of work would have to be the subject of full scrutiny reviews and that use could also be made of the shorter 'spotlight' reviews.

In considering issues to be included in the 2013/14 work programme, the Management Board concentrated upon the need to ensure added value from the scrutiny process and to focus upon outcomes, any public perception and opinion, budget pressures and implications and any key changes to existing Council policy. It was acknowledged that duplication must be avoided, as services and issues may be subject to scrutiny by other bodies (both within and external to the Borough Council) and by processes such as performance clinics.

The Management Board divided into two groups for detailed discussion of all the suggested items within the draft work programme.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That the following draft scrutiny work programme for 2013/14 be the subject of further consideration by this Management Board:-

(a) Scrutiny Reviews

Review of the Scrutiny function and Elected Member structures (Overview and Scrutiny Management Board)

City Deal – jobs and apprenticeships, together with Disadvantaged Areas and the impact of recruitment policies (e.g. qualifications required) on deprived communities (Overview and Scrutiny Management Board – Vice-Chairs of Select Commissions to lead the scrutiny review)

Families for Change (Improving Lives Select Commission)

Council budget setting process and the impact of budget cuts on equalities (Self Regulation Select Commission)

(b) Spotlight Reviews

Council Housing finance and the impact of Welfare Reform (Self Regulation Select Commission)

Commissioning, together with local procurement policies (Self Regulation Select Commission and other Scrutiny members to be invited to participate)

Customer Services Centres and Community Libraries (Improving Places Select Commission)

Performance monitoring and review of Corporate Plan outcomes (Self Regulation Select Commission)

Safeguarding of Children and Young People and the transition from Children's Services to Adult Services (Improving Lives Select Commission)

Child Poverty and Benefits take-up, together with pensioner poverty (Improving Lives Select Commission)

Access to GPs (Health Select Commission)

Medication – financial savings achievable by reducing the issue of unnecessary prescription medicines (Health Select Commission)

Incontinence – Services in the Community (Health Select Commission)

(c) Agenda items and reports

Budget monitoring (Self Regulation Select Commission)

Annual report of the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board and the impact of alcohol and drug misuse in child protection and safeguarding processes (Improving Lives Select Commission)

Child Sexual Exploitation (Improving Lives Select Commission and other Scrutiny members to be invited to participate)

Support for improving pupil outcomes at Key Stage 2, together with the impact of the Pupil Premium (Improving Lives Select Commission)

Continuing Health Care for Children and Young People (Health Select Commission)

Private Finance Initiative (Self Regulation Select Commission)

(3) That the remaining issues listed on the draft schedule, now submitted, be noted and the scrutiny work programme 2013/14 be kept under review.

5. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board noted that:-

(a) the Improving Lives Select Commission will be considering the review of anti-bullying policies in schools (an issue raised by the Youth Cabinet); and

(b) members of the Youth Cabinet had attended the Young People's Transport Day in Sheffield on Saturday 27th April 2013, as part of the Eleven Million take-over day.

6. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 19TH APRIL, 2013

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 19th April, 2013, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

7. WORK IN PROGRESS

Health Select Commission:-

The Chair reported on the recent activities of the Health Select Commission:-

: a spotlight review into childhood obesity has begun, with a focus on healthy eating and physical education in primary schools.

Improving Lives Select Commission:-

The Chair reported on the recent activities of the Improving Lives Select Commission:-

: two reviews were currently taking place (i) anti-bullying policies in schools; and (ii) domestic violence.

Self Regulation Select Commission:-

The Chair reported on the recent activities of the Self Regulation Select Commission:-

: had recently considered monitoring reports concerning the budget and also about complaints made in respect of Council functions and services.

Improving Places Select Commission:-

The Chair reported on the recent activities of the Improving Places Select Commission:-

: at the next meeting, to consider a report about homelessness.

8. CALL-IN ISSUES

There were no formal requests for call-in to report.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
14th June, 2013

Present:- Councillor Whelbourn (in the Chair); Councillors Beck, Currie, Dalton, Falvey, Read, G. A. Russell, Sims and Steele.

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Gilding.

9. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

10. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from members of the public or the press.

11. LIVING WAGE

Consideration was given to a report presented by Simon Cooper, Human Resources Manager, which provided details on the Living Wage which was set independently by the Centre for Research in Social Policy at Loughborough University and updated annually in November. The rate was calculated based on assumed expenditure considered the minimum for a decent standard of living on: childcare; clothing; food and drink; household goods and services; housing rent; water; electricity; gas; Council Tax; personal goods and services; social and cultural participation; and transport.

To be accredited as an official Living Wage Employer (205 employers as of 18th April, 2013 from across public, private and voluntary and community sector employers, less than 1% of larger companies across the United Kingdom), an organisation must satisfy four basic criteria:-

- Pay all its own staff at least the Living Wage.
- Commit that within six months of the annual uprating of the Living Wage, its pay rates would be uprated accordingly.
- Demonstrate progress towards requiring any contractors it had to do the same.
- Have a plan in place to work with any remaining contractors to get them to pay the Living Wage.

The number of Councils in England and Wales now paying or committed to pay a living wage as of 15th February, 2013 had risen to 37 (this represented 9% of all Councils).

The implications of a migration to the level of the Living Wage would be significant for our overall job evaluated pay structure and overall costs and budget pressures. Potentially additional costs could be passed on to other departments as the majority of the relevant jobs affected work in

Traded Services. An indication of potential costs and benefits was outlined and set out in detail as part of the report.

All jobs have undergone recent job evaluation which has determined where they were positioned on the overall pay and grading structure, thus there would be an impact on pay differentials and this may pose some risk of challenge in respect of equal pay.

Full time employees could potentially benefit from an increase of up to £46 per week, however, for some employees Social Security benefits such as Working Family Tax Credit or Pensions Credit would be affected.

For employees in receipt of benefits a £4 per week increase results only in a £1 increase in 'take home pay' after tax, national insurance and consequential benefit reduction. In the case of single parents a larger gross increase of £10 per week was required for the £1 increase in 'take home pay'.

It was not considered currently affordable to implement the Living Wage, without offset measures to restructure the current pay and reward framework. Any move to address pay levels at lower levels would need to be compensated by savings achieved through service changes, job reductions and/or changes to terms and conditions. The impact of future pension reforms would also augment the overall pay bill significantly.

A discussion and a question and answer session ensued and the following issues were raised and subsequently clarified:-

- On-going discussion with Trades Unions on matters relating to pay and conditions.
- Mitigation of risks and the impact of welfare reform.
- Potential impacts on individuals.
- Meeting the costs in schools and the moves towards academy status.
- Adoption of the Living Wage in Whitehall.
- Planned visit and information gathering from Islington.
- Pay inequalities and effect of Living Wage on Job Evaluation.
- Families Income Supplement – exemplar in Rotherham.
- Encouragement of local contractors to adopt the Living Wage.
- Procurement process and the potential negatives for small and medium sized enterprises.
- Equality impact assessments and the risk of legal challenges.
- Breakdown between part and full time workers and the potential impact on pay bands.
- Types of jobs and bands affected by the potential implications of the Living Wage.
- Calculation of the Living Wage based on assumed expenditure.
- Regionalised national pay.

- Adoption of recommendations arising from the Scrutiny Review undertaken by the Self Regulation Select Commission.

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

(2) That a further update report be submitted to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board in due course, with an invitation to attend extended to the Deputy Leader.

12. ANNUAL REPORT

Consideration was given to a report presented by Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, which provided some early proposals for the Annual Report for 2012/13 and aimed to allow the Management Board to discuss and approve format and content at a draft stage.

The proposed format for this year was to review further back than just the last year and to look at some of the key areas of work over the last few years, focusing on the difference that Scrutiny had made. The aim was to provide some tangible outcomes that have been achieved and could be directly attributable to the work of Scrutiny, providing good added value to the work of the Council.

The Management Board were invited to comment on this and also flag up any key issues which they would like to see included in the report. Members are asked to consider whether the focus is correct and whether any key issues are missing.

The report was to be completed over the next month and a final version brought to the Management Board's meeting on the 12th July, 2013. This would allow final comments to be incorporated before it was presented to full Council on the 24th July, 2013.

Discussion ensued on the format and the difficulty aligning to the previous Scrutiny Panels and current Select Commissions. It was suggested that text be inserted to confirm that certain areas of the report aligned to previous structures and that the current Chairmen provide a recap on progress at the Council Meeting.

Resolved:- (1) That the proposed format of the Annual Report 2012/13 be approved for revision and presented to this Committee on the 12th July, 2013.

(2) That the Annual Report once approved be presented to Council on the 24th July, 2013.

13. WORK PROGRAMME

Further to Minute No. 4 of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 24th May, 2013, consideration was given to a

report, presented by Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, concerning the proposals for the allocation of issues for scrutiny to the work programmes of each Select Commission.

A number of issues arose from the Development Sessions. Discussions had taken place with regard to a couple of omissions from the Health Select Commission's work programme and which now included School Nursing and Sexual Health.

Discussion ensued on the importance of the City Region Economy and how this could be incorporated into the work programme of the most appropriate Select Commission. Whilst it was noted that the Self Regulation Select Commission had received a presentation on employment and worklessness in Rotherham, anything to do with the regeneration strategy of particular areas fell into the Terms of Reference for Improving Places Select Commission. It was, therefore, suggested that this be undertaken jointly by the two Commissions named and tie this in somehow to commissioning and the procurement work. With regard to linking the local economy to local procurement it was agreed that this Board should receive an initial paper on this and then pass it to the relevant Select Commission.

As a result of a meeting of Cabinet, Scrutiny and the Strategic Leadership Team on the 13th June, 2013, the Chairmen that were in attendance gave an update on the relevant outcomes specific to their areas which would be incorporated in some way into the relevant work programmes and which included:-

- Domestic Violence.
- Elderly Care.
- Grass Cutting and Litter Picking.
- Carers.
- Parking.
- Customer Services/Libraries.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That the work programmes of each Select Commission for the 2013/14 Municipal Year be endorsed.

(3) That the arrangements for looking at the local economy and local procurement be considered initially by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

14. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

There were no outstanding issues to report.

15. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 24TH MAY, 2013

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 24th May, 2013, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

Reference was made to Minute No. 3 (Scrutiny Review of the Council's Residential Homes) and it was suggested that Councillor Beaumont be asked to present the report at the Cabinet meeting.

16. WORK IN PROGRESS

The Chairmen of the relevant Select Commissions gave a report on progress.

Health Select Commission:-

The first meeting on Urgent Care had been carried out at Oak House.

The Commission held its last meeting at Rotherham Hospital, which incorporated ward visits. Positive feedback was received from staff and patients. Also present was the Peter Lee, Chairman of the Board, Juliette Greenwood, Chief Nurse, and Michael Morgan, Interim Chief Executive, who provided information on their spending power, collaboration with other hospitals and their hopes for a specialist area in Rotherham. They were also asked questions about staffing, if they had any concerns and morale.

Improving Lives Select Commission:-

Further work was to be undertaken on issues relating to Keeping Children Safe in Education and Children Missing from Education. A presentation had also been received on poverty in Rotherham and further discussion was to take place with the Local Strategic Partnership Manager regarding some joint work on Families for Change.

17. CALL-IN ISSUES

There were no formal requests for call-in to report.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
28th June, 2013

Present:- Councillor Whelbourn (in the Chair); Councillors Beck, Falvey, Gilding, G. A. Russell and Sims.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Currie, Dalton, Read and Steele.

18. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

19. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from members of the public or the press.

20. REPRESENTATIONS ON PANELS, SUB-GROUPS ETC.

Resolved:- (1) That Councillors J. Falvey and B. Steele be appointed as the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board's representatives to the Members' Training and Development Panel for the 2013/14 Municipal Year.

(2) That Councillor D. Beck be appointed as the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board's representative to the Recycling Group for the 2013/14 Municipal Year.

21. SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME 2013/14

Further to Minute No. 13 of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 14th June, 2013, consideration was given to a report presented by the Scrutiny Manager concerning the discussions which had taken place at recent meetings of all of the Select Commissions with regard to the overall scrutiny work programme for the 2013/2014 Municipal Year.

Accordingly, consideration was given to the detail of the 2013/2014 scrutiny work programme. The following issues were raised during the debate:-

- : procurement;
- : Elected Member structures and the scrutiny function;
- : the economy of the Sheffield City Region;
- : tourism;
- : the impending scrutiny review of access to GPs;
- : Council Housing finance and the impact of the Government's welfare reforms;
- : care for the most elderly people in the Rotherham Borough area.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That the overall scrutiny work programme for the 2013/2014 Municipal Year, as now discussed, be approved.

22. RESPONSE TO THE SCRUTINY REVIEW OF AUTISTIC SPECTRUM DISORDER

Further to Minute No. 203 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 24th April, 2013, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Principal Educational Psychologist, outlining the response to the Scrutiny Review of Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD) in Rotherham.

The four stated objectives of the review were to consider:-

- : the reasons for the higher diagnosis rates
- : services required at diagnosis stage and after
- : age 16+ support and transition
- : budget implications.

The scrutiny review was therefore structured around these four objectives, with a dedicated meeting held for each one and evidence presented around these four subjects. Key messages that came out of the review were:-

- 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.

The recommendations of the scrutiny review were included as an appendix to the submitted report. Members noted that it is the view of the scrutiny review group that there should not be a need for additional resources to implement the recommendations of the review.

Members' discussion of this review included the following salient issues:-

- early diagnosis of autism spectrum disorder;

- in recent years, Rotherham has become extremely effective in diagnosing this condition;
- the sharing of best practice with this Council's regional and statistical neighbour authorities;
- the implementation of the review's recommendations will be monitored by the Health Select Commission.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That the progress with the implementation of the review's recommendations be reported periodically to future meetings of the Health Select Commission.

23. RESPONSE TO THE REVIEW BY THE IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION OF GROUNDS MAINTENANCE AND STREET CLEANSING SERVICES

Further to Minute No. 204 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 24th April, 2013, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Streetpride Community Delivery Manager, outlining the response to the Scrutiny Review of Grounds Maintenance and Street Cleansing services.

Members noted that a report on the effects of budget savings on the Grounds Maintenance and Street Cleansing schedules had been presented to the Improving Places Select Commission on 25th July 2012, where it was agreed that a review of the services be carried out. The review was conducted over three separate meetings during November and December 2012 with 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; and
- : to consider invest to save options.

The recommendations of the scrutiny review were included as an appendix to the submitted report. The review by the Improving Places Select Commission largely aligns with the work undertaken by Council officers to identify actions which mitigate the effects of the reductions in service budgets.

Members' discussion of this issue included the following salient issues:-

- : grounds maintenance, grass cutting and the use of the 'grass retardant' and weed killer; it was noted that the original trial of the use of the 'grass retardant' had occurred during the later 1990s;

- : cutting back vegetation at the junctions of rural roads, so as to maintain sight lines;

- : the Council's procurement and use of specialist grass-cutting equipment;
- : street cleansing and the review of the provision of litter bins;
- : the recording of contacts with geographical information to gather intelligence on trends and patterns;
- : large-scale works alongside the highway, which sometimes require temporary road (or lane) closures and traffic diversions;
- : maintenance works which encourage the growth of wild flowers, especially in central reservations and alongside many of the principal routes into Rotherham;
- : the various comments, criticisms and feedback received from members of the public;
- : the proposal to establish a Town and Village Centre Standard for grounds maintenance and street cleansing throughout the Rotherham Borough area;
- : future monitoring of the recommendations of this scrutiny review.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That the Improving Places Select Commission be asked to establish arrangements for the monitoring of the implementation of the recommendations of the Scrutiny Review of Grounds Maintenance and Street Cleansing services.

24. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

The Overview and Scrutiny Board noted that the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive has continued to liaise with the Youth Councils/Parliaments in South Yorkshire. Rotherham Youth Council members visited the Rotherham Interchange in May 2013, to meet interchange managers and discussed safety and security and other related issues of concern to young people. A number of recommendations were made by the young people, which are now being assessed by the Interchange managers. There will be further meetings with young people to discuss progress. A delegation from the Youth Council participated in the Young People's public transport summit organised by SYPTE and Sheffield City Council and will feature in a dvd film to use for driver training at SYPTE's Transport Academy. The production of this training film was one of the outcomes of the transport summit.

25. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 14TH JUNE, 2013

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 14th June, 2013, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

26. WORK IN PROGRESS

Members referred to the establishment of the overall scrutiny work programme for the 2013/2014 Municipal Year, as approved at Minute No. 21 above.

27. CALL-IN ISSUES

There were no formal call-in requests.

IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION
27th March, 2013

Present:- Councillor Falvey (in the Chair); Councillors Andrews, Astbury, Atkin, Ellis, Foden, Gilding, Gosling, N. Hamilton, Jepson, Read, P. A. Russell, Sims, Swift and Wallis.

Together with:- Mr. Brian Walker and Councillor Richard S. Russell

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Whysall, Dodson and Havenhand.

49. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

50. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from members of the public or the press.

51. COMMUNICATIONS

None were received.

52. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION HELD ON 20TH FEBRUARY, 2013

Resolved:- (1) That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission, held on 20th February, 2013, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

Further to Minute No. 47(1) (Work Programme), Members asked why the Allocations Policy had not been submitted. It was explained that although the Policy had been seen by the Cabinet Member it had to be approved by Cabinet before it could be submitted to Scrutiny. This was further clarified with an explanation that an instruction had been issued to officers that, reports submitted as part of the decision making process, had to be considered by the relevant Cabinet Member or Cabinet before consideration by a Select Commission. Accordingly, the Allocations Policy was to be submitted to Cabinet.

Members of the Select Commission expressed their concern with regard to the apparent change in the decision making process. It could lead to any new Policies being "called in" to enable Members to consider their implications and therefore delaying their implementation. It was explained that this was not a change in process.

The Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board was aware of the position.

(2) That the Improving Places Select Commission's concern be noted at the apparent change in the decision making process and request that the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board investigate and report back to the Commission.

53. SCRUTINY REVIEW OF GROUNDS MAINTENANCE

Further to Minute No. 14 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 25th July, 2012, consideration was given to a report presented by Councillor Read, Review Group Chair, concerning the scrutiny review of Grounds Maintenance and Street Cleansing Services. A copy of the full scrutiny review report was provided for Elected Members.

The agreed objectives of the review were to:-

- i) analyse the impact of budget cuts to the Service;
- ii) ensure that risk and impact assessments have been fully considered and are in place for the future;
- iii) develop practical suggestions for improvement of the Service within budget;
- iv) consider invest to save options.

There were 3 main themes that had emerged from the findings of the review:-

1. Flexibility of resources
2. Local feedback and support
3. Information sharing

Resolved:- (1) That the findings and recommendations, as amended, set out in the report be endorsed.

(2) That the report be forwarded to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and Cabinet.

(3) That the Cabinet response to the Scrutiny Review recommendations be fed back to this Select Commission.

54. IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION - WORK PROGRAMME 2013/2014

Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, reported on the discussions that had taken place at a recent meeting between Select Commission Chairs, the Cabinet and the Strategic Leadership Team, focussing on the forthcoming work programme.

A number of strategic priorities had been agreed:-

- Welfare Reform in particular benefits capping and potential impact on child poverty
- Implications of the Spare Room Supplement – Housing Allocations Policy – wider implications on the Housing Revenue Account/Maintenance Programme

It was also proposed:-

- Local Plan in terms of the Sites and Allocations Policy
- Community Right to Buy
- Standard of housing repairs – comparison between the 2 contractors

Members were asked to contact the Scrutiny Manager with any other suggested topics.

Resolved:- That the details of the Select Commission's work programme be noted.

55. DATE, TIME AND VENUE FOR THE NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That a further meeting be held at the Town Hall, Rotherham on Tuesday, 16th April, 2013, commencing at 1.30 p.m.

IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION
16th April, 2013

Present:- Councillor Whysall (in the Chair); Councillors Andrews, Astbury, Atkin, Ellis, Falvey, Gilding, Gosling, N. Hamilton, Jepson, Read, P. A. Russell, Sims, Swift and Wallis.

Together with co-opted members Mrs. P. Copnell and Mr. B. Walker and Councillor G. Smith (Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Development)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dodson, Foden, Havenhand and Johnston.

56. CO-OPTED MEMBER - MRS. P. COPNELL

The Chairman welcomed Mrs. Paul Copnell to her first meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission. Mrs. Copnell had replaced Mr. D. Corkell as a co-opted member, representing RotherFed.

57. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

58. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from members of the public or the press.

59. COMMUNICATIONS

None were received.

60. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION HELD ON 27TH MARCH, 2013

Resolved:- (1) That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission, held on 27th March, 2013, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman, with the inclusion of Councillor Johnston in the list of persons attending that meeting.

(2) That a report be submitted to a future meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission explaining the use of the 'proceeds of crime' funding.

61. HIGHWAYS MAINTENANCE - 'MULTIHOG' PATCHING AND POTHOLE PROCEDURES

Further to Minute No. 15 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 25th July, 2012, consideration was given to a report presented by the Director of Streetpride describing the effectiveness of

the new method of highway maintenance and repairing of potholes and defects using the 'Multihog' milling machine.

The report outlined the main benefits of undertaking highway repairs with the 'Multihog':-

- : health and safety improvements for employees;
- : financial savings, because the cost of repairs is reduced;
- : the unnecessary removal of highway surfacing, around the repair area, is prevented;
- : the 'Multihog' is small enough to be transported quickly and easily between locations and is capable of repairing defects in areas inaccessible to larger machinery;
- : as well as highway repairs, the machine is used for Winter maintenance and salt spreading.

The report also described the revised arrangements for safety defect repairs to highways.

Members asked various questions on the following issues:-

- : the pilot scheme began in November 2012, although trials of the machine have been hampered by the relatively prolonged period of snowfall; the recent years of bad weather has caused deterioration of highway surfaces;
- : the trial is continuing and comparative information is still being collected about highway repairs before and after use of the 'Multihog';
- : it was agreed that Members should be afforded the opportunity to observe the 'Multihog' in operation in their own Wards; Members requested details of the projected use of the machine around the Borough area; and Members were requested to inform Streetpride if they wished to observe the 'Multihog' machine in use;
- : the machine specialises in repairing small patches of highway surface, but is not suitable for larger, more substantial areas;
- : emphasis was placed on the need for highway surface repairs to be completed quickly, for reasons of safety;
- : the various methods of highway surface inspection and repair and their budget implications were explained; Members noted that the existing highway repair budget was limited;
- : Members requested information about the cost of 'repeat' repairs, ie: instances where an initial repair to a highway surface is unsuccessful and has to be repaired again;

: it was acknowledged that it is sometimes a fairly difficult task to ascertain which roads require priority repairs; this process is responsive to reports received from the general public and from Councillors;

: it was explained that the surface dressing method (ie: the use of tar and stone chippings) was an unsuitable method of highway repair in residential areas, in part because of the problem caused by loose chippings.

: it was also noted that the 'Multihog' machine has proved to be very useful for snow clearing in areas where access is restricted.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That a report on the progress of the use of the 'Multihog' milling machine be submitted to a meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission in September, 2013 and such report shall include the following details:-:

: a financial appraisal of the use of the machine;

: information about the number of potholes being repaired and the repeat repairs;

: explanations of the criteria for each type of highway surface repair; and

: comparative information and costs with the methods of highway repair utilised before acquisition of the 'Multihog' machine.

(3) That Elected Members be informed of the proposed schedule of use of the 'Multihog' milling machine, throughout the Rotherham Borough area, to enable them to observe the use of the machine on site.

62. OFF-ROAD MOTOR VEHICLES - PREVENTION OF NUISANCE

Consideration was given to a report presented by the Director of Streetpride concerning the current arrangements for managing and responding to the Off-Road Motor Vehicle nuisance.

The Select Commission's consideration of this issue included the following salient issues:-

: budget limitations for this area of work; the funding available for 'target-hardening' and installation of barriers restricting vehicular access to specific areas of land, ie: preventative measures so that the nuisance does not occur; Members referred to the importance of ensuring the most effective use of the available funding;

: South Yorkshire Police has responsibility for responding to this nuisance, including the direction of specific resources to 'hotspot' areas of concern, as well as the powers to seize motor vehicles and apprehend culprits;

: Members referred to those locations in their electoral Wards which continued to suffer from the off-road motor vehicle nuisance;

: the nuisance occurs on the public highway, as well as 'off-road' locations;

: an explanation was provided of Streetpride's response to complaints received by the Council relating to off-road motor vehicle nuisance; it was noted that there was regular contact with the Safer Neighbourhood Teams; Members emphasised the usefulness of there being a single point of contact for this type of complaint and also to ensure they would receive feedback about the progress of response to the complaints; officers explained that the single point of contact was the Leisure and Community Services (LCS) administration team and that the LCS Area Manager would be the officer lead;

: the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner had included the response to the off-road motor vehicle nuisance as a priority within the 2013/14 policing plan and would make funding available for measures to tackle this nuisance.

Resolved:- That the report be received and its contents noted.

IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION
19th June, 2013

Present:- Councillor Falvey (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor John Foden), Councillors Andrews, Astbury, Atkin, Ellis, Gosling, N. Hamilton, Johnston, Pickering, Read, Roche, P. A. Russell, Sims, Swift, Vines, Wallis and Whysall.

Together with:- Mrs. P. Copnell

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Dodson, Gilding, Godfrey, Jepson and Roche.

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION HELD ON 16 APRIL 2013

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission, held on 16th April, 2013, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

It was also noted that with regards to Minute No. 61(3) (Highways Maintenance) the proposed schedule of use of the "Multihog" milling machine had been circulated to all Elected Members.

3. REPRESENTATION ON OTHER BODIES 2013/14

Resolved:- (1) That the following appointments of representatives from the Improving Places Select Commission to the groups and outside bodies listed below, be approved:-

Rotherham Bond Guarantee Scheme
Councillor Sims.

RUSH House Management Committee
Councillor Ellis.

Social Concerns Committee Churches Together
Councillor Sims.

Environmental Protection – Yorkshire and Humberside Division
Councillors Andrews, Atkin, Beaumont and Roche.

Yorkshire and Humberside Pollution and Advisory Council
Councillors Ellis and Wallis.

Women's Refuge
Councillor Sims.

Groundwork, Cresswell, Ashfield and Mansfield
Councillor Swift, as a Director of the company, and Councillor Falvey as substitute.

Health, Welfare and Safety Panel: -
Councillor Swift with substitute Councillor P. A. Russell.

Local Plan Members' Steering Group
Councillor Falvey, Chair of the Improving Places Select Commission.

Recycling Group
Councillors Atkin and Falvey.

(2) That further information be sought on whether some of these groups still meet.

4. HOMELESSNESS STRATEGY SCRUTINY REVIEW

Further to Minute No. 74 of the meeting of the Cabinet Member and Advisers for Safe and Attractive Neighbourhoods held on 22nd April, 2013, consideration was given to a report presented by Sandra Tolley, Housing Options Manager, and Jill Jones, Homelessness Manager, which set out in detail how Rotherham's first Homelessness Strategy (2003-2008) had been produced as part of the implementation of the Homelessness Act, 2002. Members noted that this Strategy was refreshed in 2008 and had a stronger emphasis on homelessness prevention and partnership working and that the Homelessness Strategy was due to end in 2013.

The report confirmed that, during 2012, this Council's Homeless Service had begun a consultation process to complete a thorough review of the Homelessness Strategy. The review also considered how effective the Strategy had been and whether further changes might be needed to ensure homelessness prevention was prioritised.

As part of the Homelessness Strategy review process, it had been recommended that the Improving Places Select Committee carry out a Scrutiny Review on the Homelessness Strategy. The report included the suggested outline scope of this proposed scrutiny review and was supplemented by the following presentation:-

- Housing Act 1996 Part VII – Homelessness Legislation.
- Homelessness Act, 2002.
- Homelessness Strategy.
- Track Record – Homelessness Acceptances.
- Track Record – Prevention of Homeless.
- Current Prevention Strategies.

- Reviewing the Strategy – The Work Done So Far.
- Sample of Questions asked at the Workshop.
- The Future of the Homelessness Strategy from 2014 onwards.
- The Homelessness Strategy Scrutiny Review.
- Implementation Timetable.

A discussion and a question and answer session ensued and the following issues were raised and subsequently clarified:-

- Trends in homelessness and the economy and whether it would be best to keep under review any three or five year strategy.
- Use of sheltered housing provision as crashpads.
- Review of community facilities.
- Promotion of the private rented sector and whether landlords would be directed to take greater responsibility.
- Housing for local people and the self registration for landlords.
- Allocation of crashpads and the process of liaising with the local Housing Champion.
- Allocations in line with the Local Lettings Policy and the checking of information.
- No proposal to redesignate residential bedrooms not currently in use.
- Under recovered rent arrears and their assessment on future allocations, which was subject to review.
- Homelessness acceptances and prevention of homeless figures which on paper looks as though Rotherham does not have a great problem.
- The duty on the Council to rehouse and whether early intervention or flagging up accounts that suddenly become a problem would ease the problem, especially for private sector housing.
- Mechanisms in place to flag up concerns.
- Management of difficult tenants and the impact of their housing allocation on other tenants.
- Number of temporary accommodation units throughout the Borough and their current locations for use by the homeless and also those in crisis.
- Review of the Allocations Policy – to be presented to the July meeting.

In taking forward the suggestion of the Scrutiny Review nominations were sought.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That a Scrutiny Review of the Homelessness Strategy take place and include Councillors Falvey, Gosling, N. Hamilton, Read and Swift and Ms. P.Copnell.

(3) That once the Select Commission has completed the scrutiny review, a report be submitted to the Cabinet Member for Safe and Attractive Neighbourhoods detailing a proposed revised Homelessness Strategy for the period 2013 to 2018.

5. SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME 2013/14

Consideration was given to a report presented by Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, which updated Members of both the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and all of the Select Commissions on the outcomes from the "development session" on the scrutiny work programme, held during the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board meeting on 24th May, 2013, and on the proposals for allocation of that work programme to each of the Select Commissions in 2013/14.

The Select Commission was advised that the work programme had been revised since it was previously circulated and identified the differences by way of the presentation. It was suggested that the proceeds of crime money also be included.

With regards to linking the local economy to local procurement it was agreed that the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board should receive an initial paper on this and then pass it to the relevant Select Commission. The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board would also be overseeing the review of the Members' structure.

It was also acknowledged that whilst some gardens of Council houses were maintained, this was not consistent across the Borough, hence the need for some further work.

The Select Commission was advised that the process of Cabinet Members attending the relevant meetings when Scrutiny Reviews were presented would be addressed.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That revised work programme, with the inclusion of the proceeds of crime money, be approved.

6. DATE, TIME AND VENUE FOR THE NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- (1) That the next meeting of this Select Commission take place on Wednesday, 24th July, 2013, at 10.30 a.m.

(2) That a briefing be arranged thirty minutes prior to this meeting.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
26th March, 2013**

Present:- Councillor Wyatt (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor Pickering), Councillors Roche, Godfrey, Wallis, Clark, Atkin, Barron, Beaumont, Ellis, Sims and Wootton.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dalton, Doyle, Hoddinott and Lelliott.

ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE STRATEGY.

Councillor K. Wyatt, Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, welcomed Elected Members to the Seminar that had been put together to inform them on the update and revision to the Local Authority's Environment and Climate Change Strategy. Elected Members would be informed about each section and stakeholder's contribution to the Strategy and then invited to feed in their comments and ask questions on the content, prior to it being re-launched in May, 2013.

Councillor Wyatt stated that it was a statutory requirement for local authorities to develop an Environment and Climate Change Strategy, and that in Rotherham good practice was already taking place and embedded in Directorates.

A number of Officers were in attendance to reflect that the Strategy was a cross-cutting document across all Directorates. The areas represented within the Strategy were: -

Area	Lead Officer
Rotherham Environment and Climate Change Strategy Review	David Rhodes, Environmental Manager
Streetpride	David Burton, Director of Streetpride, Environment and Development Services
Housing and Neighbourhood Services	Paul Benson, Housing Officer
Planning and Regeneration	Bruce Carter, Principal Building Control Officer

Kathy Wakefield, Nurse Consultant, Protecting Health, Public Health, Neighbourhood and Adult Services, and Zafar Saleem, Community Engagement and Cohesion Manager, Commissioning, Policy and Performance, Resources Directorate, were also in attendance to represent their Services.

Rotherham Environment and Climate Change Strategy: -

David Rhodes informed Elected Members about the previous Strategy that had existed.

- There were 10 Climate Change Performance Indicators within the revised Strategy;
- The revised Strategy would be linked to the Council's Corporate Plan;
- Key objectives included the reduction of CO2 emissions and biodiversity.

Streetpride: -

David Burton provided an overview of the contribution within Streetpride towards the Environment and Climate Change Plan:

- Local Access Framework;
- Street Cleansing Review;
- Rotherham Rivers Project – conservation of biodiversity and restoration;
- South Yorkshire LNP: green infrastructure mapping and development and maintenance of an environmental database. Action plan – targeting resources to areas of greatest need;
- Sustainable development, building developments and economic development across the Sheffield City Region;
- Transport – alternative fuel vehicles. Working with the Yorkshire Purchasing Organisation to develop collective buying power for alternative fuel vehicles. Electric Vehicle trials and demonstrator vehicles. Next generation dustcarts, including electric adaptations. Use of vehicle telematics to plot location and identify performance improvements, including the winter maintenance fleet, intelligent route planning to be as efficient as possible. Sustainable transport – successful as a sub-region for grant funding for sustainable transport – cycle and bus lanes, widening roads for better quality bus routes, substantial programme of works – reported to delegated powers meeting;
- Waste and recycling – review on-going, waste PFI project to be up and running in 2015 whereby in excess of 50% of municipal waste would be recycled;
- Flood management – Surface water management plans had been developed, recent issues had not been rivers flooding but run-off from surface water. A sustainable urban drainage approval body would come into operation and all future planning applications would have to go through a water management approval process.

Housing and Neighbourhood Services: -**Actions to be delivered: -**

- Improve the energy efficiency of social housing as measured through the SAP rating;
- Improve and maintain access to information on energy efficiency for Rotherham residents;
- Obtain external funding to support energy efficiency initiatives;
- Achieve zero carbon new residential development.

Useful resources: -

- The revised strategy was available to access on the intranet: <http://intranet.rotherhamconnect.com/C0/Environmental%20Management/default.aspx>
- The presentations presented at this seminar were also available on the intranet: <http://intranet.rotherhamconnect.com/C0/Environmental%20Management/Environmental%20Management%20Manual/Forms/Rotherham.aspx?RootFolder=%2fC0%2fEnvironmental%20Management%2fEnvironmental%20Management%20Manual%2fEnvironmental%20Presentations%20and%20Training%2fEnvironment%20and%20Climate%20Change%20Strategy%20Members%20Workshop%2026th%20March%202013&View=%7bC3F2C4C9%2d6860%2d4B3B%2d86E1%2d9D2B73BD0F90%7d>

Questions and comments on the Strategy: -

Elected Members were asked to send any comments or questions to environmental.managment@rotherham.gov.uk. Answers would be provided electronically.

Councillor Wyatt thanked the officers in attendance for their informative presentation and information shared.

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

(2) That Elected Members feedback any questions and comments to the email address provided.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
26th March, 2013**

Present:- Councillor Wyatt (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor Pickering), Councillors Atkin, Clark, Dodson, Ellis, Lakin, McNeely, Read, Sharman, Sims, Smith, Wallis and Wootton.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Barron, Beaumont, Dalton, Doyle, Godfrey, Hoddinott and Lelliott.

SEXUAL HEALTH AGENDA.

Councillor K. Wyatt, Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, introduced Elected Members to the Seminar that had been put together to inform them about the range of services that were provided by the Local Authority and partners in relation to sexual health.

The Officers in attendance were: -

Gill Harrison, Public Health Specialist, Public Health, Neighbourhood and Adult Services.

Dr. Claire Dewsnap, Lead Consultant, Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust and the Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust.

Ann Berridge, Teenage Pregnancy and Sexual Health Co-ordinator, Rotherham Integrated Youth Support Service, Children and Young People's Services.

Information was provided in relation to the following areas: -

- Transfer of Public Health responsibilities to local authorities with effect from 1st April, 2013;
- Transfer of budget into local authorities;
- Re-charge facility available where testing and treatment was undertaken outside of someone's home local authority. This was not considered to be a significant risk;
- Use of best practice disease prevention model;
- Statutory responsibilities.

There were three outcome delivery measures in relation to sexual health outlined in the Public Health Outcomes Framework for England, 2013-2016: -

1. Working towards achieving a diagnosis rate for Chlamydia of 2,400 – 3,000 per 100,000 population (adults aged 15-24);
2. Working towards a reduction in the proportion of persons presenting with HIV at a late stage of infection;
3. Working towards a reduction in teenage conceptions.

Comparison of Rotherham's performance, compared to the Yorkshire and Humber region and England, was considered including diagnosis rate of acute sexually transmitted infections (STIs) per 100,000 of the population, and rates of gonorrhoea and genital herpes.

Data relating to the local Super Output Areas was being used to target resources and education in the correct areas.

Testing for Chlamydia was now focused on targeting those groups most likely to have the infection. This had changed from previous guidelines that were evaluated on the testing of as many people as possible, who were not necessarily the most at risk groups.

Teenage conceptions had decreased, partly due to Long-Acting Reversible Contraception (LARC), but this could be a contributor to increasing STI rates, as barrier methods of contraception were not used.

Commissioning services: -

- Quality services;
- Rotherham was starting from a positive baseline;
- Good local services and partnership working;
- Work was underway with GPs and Pharmacists to provide LARC services as widely as possible.

Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust: -

- Statistics around service users;
- Target to provide an appointment within 48 hours had been met in 100% of cases, with many patients being seen within 48 hours;
- Worked at level three genito-urinary medicine;
- The Service provided three outreach services, one GP-based service, one central community hub and one Prison Service;
- Multi-agency;
- Worked with Health Protection Agency demographic data to treat STIs and target outreach work, target groups covered all age-ranges, ethnicities and sexualities;
- The Trust was working on governance of Sexual Health Services with an aim of ensuring unhelpful duplication did not exist within provision.

Rotherham Integrated Youth Support Service: -

- Sexual Health Youth Clinics were provided for 11 – 25 year olds;
- There were 10 community based clinics; all were available at least once a week. Services provided included pregnancy testing, STI information and contraception advice. Young people could build relationships with Workers. Information provided centred on positive relationship education;

- Healthy Schools Team within Children and Young People's Service had produced a booklet for schools on all available services in relation to sexual health;
- The Service had provided guidance in relation to Sex and Relationship Education and Personal, Social and Health Education;
- The Hardware scheme – provided free condoms on an ad-hoc basis, no appointment necessary, since 2001. The service had been maintained and updated and staff had been trained on positive relationship advice;
- The Young Women's Project was provided for young women considered to be at risk of becoming teenage parents. This was a long-term project with a focus on early intervention and prevention working in three areas of Rotherham with 117 young people. At end of 2012, all young people were still in education. The cost to the public purse of a low-risk pregnancy and first three-years of a child's life was £29,000, so there was a strong financial argument to maintain this work.

Discussion ensued and the following issues were raised: -

- Savings achieved through projects;
- Avoiding stigmatisation of young people and young parents and families. Young parenthood could be a positive thing in a young person's life, including helping them to turn their lives around and access support;
- Peer education where young parents went into schools to inform other young people about young parenthood;
- Benefits of developing relationships between young people and youth workers to promote barrier contraception and LARC and relationship education and safeguarding issues.

Councillor Wyatt thanked the officers in attendance for their informative presentation and contribution to the discussion. All Elected Members in attendance expressed their appreciation to the officers.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
28th March, 2013**

Present:- Councillor Stone (in the Chair); Councillors Akhtar, Ali, Atkin, Beaumont, Ellis, Foden, Godfrey, Gosling, J. Hamilton, N. Hamilton, McNeely, Sims, Smith, Wallis, Whelbourn and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Doyle, Hoddinott and Lelliott.

**WELFARE REFORM AND LOCAL WELFARE PROVISION - THE
ROTHERHAM FUND FOR CHANGE.**

Councillor Roger Stone, Leader of the Council, welcomed Elected Members to the Seminar that had been arranged to inform them about the changes that were due to take place from 1st April, 2013, under the Government's programme of Welfare Reform. The Seminar would include details on the national changes and the local measures that Rotherham had put in place in response to the pressures created by Welfare Reform.

Karl Battersby, Strategic Director, Environment and Development Services, and Carole Haywood, Partnerships and Policy Manager, Commissioning, Policy and Performance, Resources Directorate, were in attendance.

Karl provided an overview of the Welfare Reform measures that would become effective from 1st April, 2013, and continue until 2015: -

- From 1st April, 2013, the responsibility for welfare assistance would transfer from the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) to local authorities in relation to crisis loans and community care grants (discretionary social fund): -
 - It was noted that Rotherham's funding allocation was 13% less than the DWP had paid during 2011/12 in the Rotherham area;
 - There was no confirmation of what Rotherham's funding allocation would be for 2014/15;
 - There were no statutory requirements on the Local Authority relating to required provision.
- Universal Credit – all payments would be made in a single payment, paid monthly in arrears and made to one nominated member of per household. This was being gradually phased in;
- Council Tax reforms;
- Bedroom Tax – loss of 14% of Housing Benefit for a single 'spare' room in a property where Housing Benefit was being paid, and 25% for second and subsequent 'spare' rooms (a limited number of exceptions were being reviewed nationally);

- Benefits would be capped at £500 per week (£26,000 per year) per household;
- Personal Independence Payments - changes to the assessment process;
- Applications for benefits would be undertaken through the internet for the majority of cases with only a few exceptions being paper-based. Proactive management would also be required for existing benefit claimant's benefit accounts on an internet portal.

Rotherham Fund for Change: -

In recognition of the Local Authority's new responsibility for administering the welfare assistance schemes, Rotherham had created a scheme called 'The Rotherham Fund for Change', which would be open for applications from 2nd April, 2013, following the Easter weekend. The scheme would reflect the Local Authority's focus on helping people to change their lives and avoid the need for on-going 'crisis' support. The fund was different to the Department for Work and Pension's previous fund, and eligibility criteria would be different.

- The DWP would stop receiving applications for their current scheme on 28th March, 2013, although they would continue to process live applications within their system;
 - The DWP would continue to provide short-term advances and budgeting advances under their Social Fund. These would be re-paid through the claimants' future benefit payments, over a period of three-months to one year;
 - Short Term Advances and Budgeting Advances could be applied for on 0845 603 6967.
- The Rotherham Fund for Change would provide grants and loans for people who were in urgent need or under exceptional pressure, or who needed support to remain or re-settle in the community;
- Eligibility criteria for the Rotherham Fund for Change would be: -
 - Be resident in Rotherham;
 - Be in receipt of one of the following benefits: Income Support, Income-based Job Seeker's allowance, Income-based Employment and Support Allowance or Pension Credit (guaranteed credit).
- Applications to the Rotherham Fund for Change would be received by phone on the following number 01709 336000;

- RMBC Customer Contact Centre staff would undertake an initial assessment. It was envisaged that they would be able to make an immediate decision on whether support would be available. The Customer Contact Centre would signpost applicants to the Lazer Credit Union and be able to arrange an appointment, all within the initial telephone call;
- The application process had been designed to limit applicants having to contact multiple Council departments/services, and streamline the process. Lessons learned by the Council and the Lazer Credit Union through administering the Festive Food scheme had been incorporated into the Fund for Change process;
- Applicants would be limited to one payment per year for a loan, crisis and grant payments;
- To receive their payment, applicants would be required to open a current account with the Lazer Credit Union. The Credit Union would help with setting up Direct Debits and money management issues as required;
- Timescales for applicants receiving their payments were: crisis payments – 2 days, loans – 4 days, grants – 15 days;
- There would be no right of appeal against a decision;
- Where applicants were not eligible for support under Rotherham's scheme, they would be signposted to other services and agencies that may be able to help. Requests for Section 17 payments (support for children to remain with their families) would be referred to the Common Assessment and Referral Team within Children and Young People's Services, and eligible applicants could also be referred to the DWP for their social fund scheme, and Food Banks and other charitable organisations.

Resources available to administer the Rotherham Fund for Change: -

- Three additional posts had been created in the Customer Contact Centre. Initially ten members of the team had been trained in the Rotherham Fund for Change procedure, and it was intended that training would be rolled-out to the whole team in the near future;
- Additional capacity and support had been provided to the Lazer Credit Union, including information technology equipment to provide appointment scheduling assistance;
- Relationships had been continued to be developed between the Local Authority and local Food Banks and charities that provided hot meals to people in crisis;

- Progress reporting would be provided to the Cabinet and/or the Deputy Leader on a regular basis;
- A six-month full progress review would be undertaken on how the Fund for Change was operating.

Discussion ensued, and the following issues were raised by Elected Members: -

- Working with partners in all sectors, did they have the capacity to respond to the expected demand? Were the organisations secure for the long-term?;
- What support was in place for the Customer Contact Team and partners when there were times of high demand/contacts?;
- A phone application system may not be a preferred method of applying – many applicants would prefer to speak to an officer face-to-face;
- Was there capacity for library staff to support applicants and benefit claimants to use the free technology available in libraries across the Borough?;
- Support for the Borough's outlying areas and the difficulties people could face in coming to the Town Centre;
- Accessing small cash payments through local post offices;
- Potential role for other Council assets, including the Borough-wide service centres and mobile provision;
- A composite document that had all of the contact numbers for the organisations available would be useful for Elected Members to refer to in their surgeries and when in contact with constituents;
- The importance of keeping local MPs, Area Assemblies and Parish and Town Councils up to date with the Rotherham Fund for Change;
- Positive endorsements for the contributions made by charities across Rotherham, often through donation and volunteering, and the importance of not over-loading these organisations.

Councillor Stone thanked Karl and Carole for their informative presentation and contribution to the discussion.

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

(2) That a similar presentation, or communications, be made to local MPs, Area Assemblies and Parish and Town Councils.

(3) That a composite document be produced for quick-reference of the services and support available for Elected Members.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
16th April, 2013**

Present:- Councillor Smith (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor Pickering); Councillors Ahmed, Atkin, Burton, Clark, Foden, Gilding, Godfrey, Goult, Hoddinott, Kaye, Pitchley, Read, G. A. Russell, P. A. Russell, Smith, Swift and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dodson and Jepson.

TRAM-TRAIN: SHEFFIELD - ROTHERHAM - PARKGATE.

Members received a presentation from Steve Davenport (South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive) about the proposed Tram-Train project which will link the Sheffield City Centre, the Rotherham town centre and the Retail World development at Parkgate. During the presentation, further contributions were made by:-

Chris Elliott - representing 'Stagecoach' the Supertam Operator – this Company will operate the new system, which will integrate with the existing Supertram network; the Company will undertake vehicle maintenance of the rolling stock in an enlarged vehicle depot on the Supertram line in Sheffield;

Simon Coulthard – representing Network Rail, a senior sponsor of the project; Network Rail will analyse the project as part of a learning experience in preparation for the introduction of the Tram-Train elsewhere in the United Kingdom;

Tony Bentley – representing Northern Rail, who will be the overall project manager;

Helen Plummer - Project Manager, SYPTE.

Members noted that the Government Department of Transport is the main funding provider and overall project sponsor. The project will attract in excess of £60 millions of public funding, the vast majority being provided by the Department of Transport. Norman Baker MP, Minister for Transport, has a keen interest in ensuring that the Tram-Train project succeeds in South Yorkshire and, eventually, elsewhere in the United Kingdom.

The presentation referred to the following salient issues:-

(a) Project Inception

: the project is a strategic objective of the South Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority; a previous intention to extend the Supertram network into the Rotherham Borough area had not received Government funding;

: the 2009 trial of Tram-Train technology (eg: in Alicante in Spain; Karlsruhe in Germany) and the desire to do the same in the United Kingdom;

: from 2010 to 2012, the project's business case had been prepared, both for South Yorkshire and other locations in the United Kingdom;

May 2012 – Ministerial approval for the project to proceed;

April 2013 – contractual close.

(b) Service and Vehicles

: an explanation was provided of the technical differences between heavy goods and freight rail rolling stock and passenger trains, especially the different gauges of track used by the different types of rolling stock;

: the principal purpose of the project is to deliver a new passenger transport service; the project has begun as a pilot to test the new technology;

: the project will utilise the existing rail and Supertram infrastructure and new electric railway technology, providing a route via the refurbished Rotherham Central Rail Station;

: the scheme provides a connection directly between the conurbations of Sheffield and Rotherham;

: the pilot allows the railway and transport industry to learn about further uses of the Tram-Train concept; untried technology and service delivery will be tested to ensure their fitness for purpose and sustainability;

: project benefits include connections of the City and town centres (via an enlarged, redeveloped Tram-Train halt at Meadowhall South); encouraging the modal shift from private car to public transport; providing improved access to places of education, health, employment and leisure; opportunities to expand the network (eg: stops near to the Magna Centre and to Rotherham United's New York sports Stadium; possible future extension of the network to Swinton, Consibrough and Doncaster;

: the project may create as many as 30 to 35 new jobs (principally drivers and conductors on the Tram-Trains), as well as other jobs specifically during the construction phase;

: the scheme involves direct capital investment in South Yorkshire;

: the scheme provides positive publicity for Rotherham, Sheffield and South Yorkshire;

: Members viewed an artist's impression of the Tram-Train vehicle (quite similar to an existing Supertram vehicle); the vehicles will be manufactured by the Spanish Company 'Vossloh'; each vehicle has three carriages and will accommodate as many as 238 passengers, including seating for 96 passengers; at the end of each carriage there will be space for buggies/pushchairs and wheelchairs; the vehicles will have a 'low floor' area larger than the 'low floor' areas of the existing Supertram; included in each vehicle will be a closed circuit television system (both internal and external) and a passenger-counting system;

: vehicles have a maximum speed of 85 kilometres per hour (slightly more than 50 miles per hour); vehicles will utilise the existing 750 volt DC system as used on the Supertram network; however, the construction phase will 'future-proof' the new Tram-Trains which will be capable of operating on the modern 25,000 volt AC system;

: the Tram-Train passenger service is expected to begin operating during the Autumn 2015; the contract will specify three Tram-Trains per hour (ie: service every 20 minutes), between 0700 hours and 1900 hours (nb: these hours may eventually be extended);

: target journey times are 25 minutes from Parkgate to the Cathedral within the Sheffield City Centre and also 15 minutes from the Rotherham town centre to Sheffield Arena stadium;

: the new passenger transport service will complement existing services operating from the Rotherham Central railway station and is not intended to replace any existing services;

(c) Construction Works

: the preparatory work for the project includes plans for the connection of Supertram track and the Network Rail track network;

: the Tram-Trains will utilise the Supertram line from the Sheffield City Centre to Meadowhall and then transfer to the rail line to access Rotherham town centre and Parkgate;

: Network Rail will undertake most of the construction work (design works will soon be completed) and construction work will begin on site during 2014;

: construction works near to the Meadowhall South tram stop includes the provision of 400 metres of new track and the building a new junction on the track; there will be two new platforms constructed at this enlarged tram-train stop;

: the Electrification of the line used by the Tram-Train will extend eleven kilometres to Parkgate, with an additional power supply terminal to be constructed at Parkgate;

: within the Rotherham Central station, the Tram-Trains require a platform height different to that currently provided for trains; to achieve this objective, new platform extensions will be constructed at the Sheffield end of the existing station platforms; passengers will continue to use the existing access to this railway station;

: passenger safety and the provision of travel information to passengers are paramount and are being designed into all stations and new stops;

: a significant civil engineering challenge has occurred with the Bridge Street/College Road bridge immediately adjacent to the entrance to the Rotherham Central rail station; this bridge crosses the railway line at a height too low to accommodate the electrical wiring needed for the new tram-Trains; various solutions have been assessed, including the lowering of the railway line; however, this solution was rejected because of the flooding history of this area of Rotherham; the long term intention is to provide an Electrified route (25,000 volts AC) between Sheffield, Rotherham and Parkgate; therefore, the preferred solution is to raise the height of the highway bridge by constructing a new bridge deck so as to enable the electrical wiring for the Tram-Train to pass beneath the bridge; it is acknowledged that this construction work will cause significant disruption, both to the highway network and to passengers using the Rotherham Central rail station;

: the majority of Tram-Train's electrification system is capable of being installed during the night, which will minimise any disruption to travellers;

: construction works involving the bridge at Parkgate may require road closures at weekends;

: there will be a public consultation exercise in order to provide information about construction works and road, rail and travel disruption;

: Parkgate is the current termination point for the new Tram-Train system; 300 metres of track sidings and a Tram-Train turn-back facility will be constructed; in addition, this area will accommodate a terminus building on the shopping centre side of the track (providing passengers with easy access to the main walking route to the shopping centre);

: this terminus will be an important aspect of any future extension of the Tram-Train system to other areas, such as Doncaster.

(d) Questions from Elected Members

: Members expressed concerns about the condition of some of the rolling stock vehicles in South Yorkshire; it was acknowledged that investment in new and replacement rolling stock was essential;

: it was noted that the Tram-Train would not provide a direct service to the new Waverley development between Rotherham and Sheffield;

: the pilot project did not include any proposals for a 'Park-and-Ride' facility to be provided at Parkgate;

: the existing traffic congestion on roads in the Parkgate area was acknowledged;

: members requested clarification of the job creation benefits of the project; it was acknowledged that many of the jobs would be for the temporary period of the construction works; it was anticipated that one of the benefits of the new transport system would be to assist in attracting companies to invest in this area of the Rotherham Borough;

: half of the £60 millions funding would be utilised to purchase seven new vehicles (three compatible with the existing system and four of the new Tram-Train vehicles); £20 millions will be used for construction works on the track and station network and the remainder will be used to fund the operation for the pilot period;

: Members discussed the possibility of the Tram-Train system eventually being extended to the wider Dearne Valley area; it was noted that any further extension would depend upon the assessment of this initial pilot project and its technology and service patterns, as well as Government approval and funding being made available in the future; reference was made to the tram system operating in Manchester on previously de-commissioned railway lines;

: there were no proposals to allow bicycles to be carried on the Tram-Trains, nor on the existing Supertram network and no immediate trials were proposed; it was considered that bicycles occupied too much space and restricted passenger mobility inside the vehicles;

: it was noted that Local Transport 'pinch-point' funding had been obtained to replace and renew some of the existing Supertram tracks, especially the tracks embedded within the public highway which were prone to a faster rate of deterioration than the more traditional railway line; there would be a phased programme of repair and renewal of the Supertram tracks during the period to 2024;

: Members asked to receive information on a regular basis about the progress of the development of the Tram-Train project.

The Chairman thanked the officers for their interesting and informative presentation.

COUNCIL SEMINAR
Thursday, 18th April, 2013

Present:- Councillor Wyatt (in the Chair); Councillors Akhtar, Atkin, Buckley, Dalton, Doyle, Gosling, Hoddinott, Rushforth and Wootton.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jepson.

THE FRANCIS REPORT.

Councillor K. Wyatt, Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, welcomed Elected Members to the Seminar that had been arranged to provide them with information following the publication of the Francis Report, which had reported that catastrophic failures had impacted on the level of care provided by the Mid-Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust. Issues highlighted in the report related to a lack of governance and scrutiny and a focus on financial and back office functions at the expense of frontline care.

A number of agencies were represented at the Seminar: -

G Ratcliffe

C Edwards

Dr. John Radford, Public Health;

Juliette Greenwood, Senior Nurse Representative on ?;

Professor George Thompson, Medical Representative on ?.

Giles Ratcliffe introduced a presentation on the main issues reported: -

The Francis Report was commissioned following concerns surrounding high hospital mortality rates and poor standards of care at the Mid-Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust. Indicators that raised concern were:

-

- High death statistics;
- Feedback from those who had received care;
- Quality assurance of statistics
- View of commissioners.

The inquiry consisted of three reports: -

- The Francis Report (care between 2005 – 2009);
- Colin Thome – lessons for commissioners;
- Alberti Report.

Francis made 250 findings and 18 recommendations: -

- Long-term failure of staff and governance;
- The Board lacked urgency and there was an absence of follow-up;
- Actions of management were ineffective;
- Financial issues were wrongly prioritised;
- Strategic-level Directors did not link to procedural level, and were taking the word of operational managers at face value;
- Relevance was assigned to star ratings, rather than the experiences of patients;
- Benchmark data was not considered;
- There had been a failure to listen;
- Staff had become disengaged;
- There had been failure to maintain professional standards;
- There was a lack of support for staff; they were not kept up to date and were not able to raise concerns;
- There was weak professional voice – for example, the Board had lost the Nurse representative;
- A disregard for mortality statistics had been identified;
- There had been errors in measurements, comparison and benchmarking;
- The Trust had failed to meet the challenges of caring for the elderly;
- The failure of care had been documented in case studies;
- Francis described the failures as ‘abuse of vulnerable people’;
- There was a lack of internal and external transparency.

Recommendations: -

- Involving patients and public;
- ‘Real-time’ patient feedback;
- Holding commissioners to account for engaging patients;
- ‘Commissioning outcomes supported by excellent use of

appropriate data’;

- ‘Governance and clarity of accountability’ – responsibility of the commissioner, rather than the provider;
- Clinical leadership – to be reviewed at Board level, and to include a separate input for Medical and Nursing Directors.

Relevant recommendations for Rotherham: -

- Recommendation 18;
- Establishment of a set of key competencies for members of Board for NHS Trusts;
- The culture in Rotherham was very different to Mid-Staffordshire and Rotherham had a high reputation for robust quality assurance. Over fifty-thousand data items were considered;
- All Trusts faced a time of limited and reducing resources.

Discussion ensued and the following issues were raised: -

- Overall governance – difficult to apportion blame to individuals;
- Culture of whistle blowing was not supported by wider management as important. There was a promotion of the best face to the outside world;
- Capability and willingness of lay members on the Board to challenge professionals;
- Engagement of Trade Unions – were they also involved in the processes at a time of what seemed like reducing resources to Unions? Rotherham’s Board met the statutory requirement for having representative of Chief Executive, Medical Director, Nurse Director and Finance Director on the Board. It was up to individual Trusts to strike a balance between executive and non-executive members. There had been no previous experience of Trade Union involvement on the Board, but the new Friends and Family test had a third element relating to staff ;
- Data protection? – Monthly open forums would operate;
- Discharge Planning documentation – were all agencies included in any identified risks.

Juliet Greenwood and George Thompson: -

The Rotherham Foundation Trust had examined the Recommendations of

the Francis Report and RAG rated them: red – emergency, amber – work needed, and green. There was around 27 of the 250 recommendations that were of interest.

A report would be presented to the Board that responded to: -

- How engagement worked;
- Avoidance/removal of duplication;
- Response to the CCG;
- Unannounced inspections and planned clinical walkabouts;
- Workstreams would be convened that linked to the Francis Recommendations;
- CQUIN;
- Process reviews;
- Transparent and publically available;
- CQUIN for complaints;
- CQUIN for hours worked by Junior Doctors and signing off of deaths;
- CQUIN for common patient experiences;
- Recruitment of a second named safeguarding nurse;
- Skill mixes on wards;
- Investments onto wards;
- There were changing patient needs;
- Reports to the Board would be made at a public-level;
- Working time regulations for Doctors – there were strict regulations for who could certify deaths. It had to be a doctor who had seen the patient before their death. This caused issues if the doctor was not on shift at that time.

Councillor Wyatt thanked the Officers in attendance for their informative presentation and contribution to the discussion.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

**EARLY RELEASE
24th April, 2013**

Present:- Councillor Stone (in the Chair); Councillors Akhtar and Doyle.

EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 1 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (information relating to individuals).

EARLY ACCESS TO PENSION BENEFITS

The Panel considered an application for the early release of pension benefits on compassionate grounds in respect of C.D.

Resolved:- That the early release of pension benefits on compassionate grounds in respect of C.D. be approved.

**EARLY RELEASE
24th April, 2013**

Present:- Councillor Stone (in the Chair); Councillors Akhtar and McNeely.

EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC.

Resolved:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 1 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (information relating to individuals).

EARLY ACCESS TO PENSION BENEFITS

The Panel considered an application for the early release of pension benefits on compassionate grounds in respect of R.B.

Resolved:- That the early release of pension benefits on compassionate grounds in respect of R.B. be approved.

**APPEAL PANEL
1st May, 2013**

Present:- Councillor Akhtar (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin and McNeely.

EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 1 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (information relating to an individual).

APPEAL - D1/05/01 - CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES

The Panel considered an appeal by D1/05/01 against her dismissal from her post.

Resolved:- That the appeal be not upheld.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
10th May, 2013**

Present:- Councillor Wyatt (in the Chair); Councillors Beaumont, Buckley, Ellis, The Mayor (Councillor John Foden), Hoddinott, McNeely, Read, G. A. Russell, Sims and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence were received from The Mayor (Councillor Pickering) and from Councillor Jepson.

SOUTH YORKSHIRE PROBATIONARY TRUST

Councillor Wyatt introduced Lynda Marginson (Chief Executive of the South Yorkshire Probation Trust) and Sarah Mainwaring (Director of Probation Rotherham) who gave a presentation to Members about the Probation Trusts of England and Wales and especially the South Yorkshire Probation Trust and its role in the Rotherham Borough area.

Members were aware of the announcement by the Justice Minister, Christopher Grayling MP on 8th May, 2013 of the coalition Government's intention to reform and privatise the probation service.

The presentation and subsequent discussion included the following salient issues:-

: various facts about the 35 Probation Trusts of England and Wales;

: the South Yorkshire Head Office is located in the Sheffield city centre and the Probation Trust services the four major conurbations of Sheffield, Doncaster, Rotherham and Barnsley through Local Delivery Units (LDU) situated in each area; the Rotherham LDU is situated at Masbrough;

: Probation Trust staff also work on secondment at the four prison establishments situated in South Yorkshire;

: a main priority of the Probation Trust is to reduce re-offending; since 2000, both the re-offender rate and number of crimes committed by re-offenders has fallen for those on community orders and suspended sentence orders; by comparison, the proven re-offending rate for those adults who received short-term custodial sentences of less than 12 months, who do not receive any interaction with probation services, has increased;

: the most dangerous offenders are placed under MAPPA supervision (Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements);

: the South Yorkshire Probation Trust Mission is to "protect the public and make our communities safer by reducing re-offending";

: the South Yorkshire Probation Trust Vision is to “be the best at reducing re-offending”;

: the collective Probation Service (ie: all of the 35 Probation Trusts) was the first ever public service to be awarded the British Quality Foundation's Gold Medal for Excellence; this award is made for continuous and sustained improvement over a number of years;

: in recent years, according to published statistics, the South Yorkshire Probation Trust is one of the best performing Probation Trusts (ie: OMI - Offender Management Institutions) in England and Wales and is the best at reducing re-offending; the Trust has gained the Green 4 PTRS highest performance rating;

: in 2010, Probation became a responsible authority of the Community Safety Partnerships; at the same time, a new duty on the Partnerships was put in place to formulate and implement a strategy to reduce re-offending by adult and young offender; it also placed a duty on local authorities, fire and rescue authorities and police authorities, to consider reducing re-offending in the exercise of all their duties;

: the South Yorkshire Probation Trust works in partnership with numerous key stakeholders including the Ministry of Justice, with other criminal justice agency partners and with organisations such as local authorities and health services;

: details of the Rotherham Local Delivery Unit staffing establishment and the Integrated Offender Management team;

: as at 31st March, 2013 there were 6,769 offenders on the South Yorkshire Probation Caseload, of whom 1,072 were managed by the Rotherham Local Delivery Unit; of these 90.95% were male and 9.04% were female;

: whilst re-offending rates reduce, the last few months have seen an increase in the number of burglaries and shoplifting in Rotherham (often, but not always, drug-related crime);

: 50% of the Probation Trust's caseload are people aged 30 years and younger – therefore it is important for the Trust to work closely with the Youth Offending Service;

: the Probation Trust has the aim ensuring offender compliance – which means that an offender reaches the end of the statutory period of time with the Trust without any re-offending and with no breach of the terms of any community order;

: a difficult target for the Probation Trust to achieve is the endeavour to have 36% of offenders in employment of at least 25 hours per week at the end of their community order; it is acknowledged that being in

employment helps prevent re-offending; although the target is currently being exceeded (41% success rate), the future is uncertain because of the difficult economic outlook;

: the Probation Trust is achieving the target of 80% of offenders obtaining suitable living accommodation;

: reference was made to the Business Planning 'Steeple' model now being used by the Probation Trust;

: the achievements the Rotherham Local Delivery Unit include (i) the sustained and continued reduction in re-offending; (ii) improved compliance; (iii) excellent inspection results; and (iv) has developed relationships with the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner;

: the Rotherham Local Delivery Unit has a range of priorities for the forthcoming year, which include maintaining the reduction in re-offending rates; the commitment to the protection of the public is paramount.

Questions from Elected Members:-

(1) any local arrangements whereby an offender meets the victim and the offender has to face up to the consequences of the crime?

: there is the system of restorative justice; the Rotherham Local Delivery Unit has a lead role and works with the "Remedy" and Victim Support organisations to deliver post-sentence restorative justice at various levels according to the severity of an offence; a study by Sheffield Hallam University has shown that the pilot system is beneficial; however, sometimes the victims do not like the lengthy time lapse between the offence and the arrangement to meet the offender; funding for the pilot system is provided by the Ministry of Justice and the Police and Crime Commissioner;

(2) has the coalition Government's welfare reform caused an increase in crime ?

: the South Yorkshire Probation Trust makes use of the Business Planning 'Steeple' model to prepare to respond to any increase in offending and to plan ways of helping offenders not to re-offend

(3) reference to the different age groups of offenders;

: the high incidence of offenders aged under 30 years is a source of concern.

(4) a question about the levels of education of offenders;

: it is not unusual for offenders to have difficulty with literacy and numeracy, which are factors limiting their employment prospects; all

offenders are assessed for their risk of re-offending and one of the thirteen categories of the assessment is 'literacy and numeracy'; the post-sentence contract and plan requires an offender to participate in appropriate education courses;

(5) with regard to the reduction in re-offending rates – do the rates of re-offending alter after the time period of the probation order has ended ?

: some 34% of offenders do re-offend and 66% do not; each offender is assessed twelve months and twenty-four months after the end of the probation order;

(6) a question about the progress of the 200 most persistent and repeat offenders;

: approximately 58% of these offenders are achieving compliance with the terms of their probation orders;

(7) offenders do unpaid work and provide a payback to the community – is the system effective enough ?

: yes it is considered to be the jewel in crown and gives offenders the chance to put back something positive into the community; eg: working on such things as housing renovation projects; the Probation Trust undertakes spot checks of the community projects to ascertain that the objectives are being achieved;

(8) is it possible to remove the restrictions and barriers which sometimes prevent these community payback projects from happening ?

: there has to be a thorough risk assessment of any project work-site (eg: to check the provision of basic facilities), but it is always unfortunate if any project of this type cannot be undertaken;

(9) how does the Probation Trust manage people convicted of offences involving sexual exploitation – and prevent re-offending ?

: there is a small number of such offenders and the Probation Trust has to manage them from the moment they are released from prison, utilising a rigorous risk management plan (there is a specific programme for offenders who have used the Internet when committing offences of sexual exploitation); in addition, the wishes of the victim have to be taken into account; some offenders are checked via satellite tracking and there may also be surveillance methods used for a small number of very serious offenders.

Agreed actions:-

(a) Elected Members will be provided with details of the South Yorkshire Probation Trust web site, enabling them to make on-line suggestions of

local projects which are suitable for the community payback system;

(b) Elected Members will be provided with summary details of the community payback projects which have taken place in Rotherham during the last three years and arrangements may be made for Elected Members to view these projects;

(c) Elected Members will be invited to visit the Rotherham Local Delivery Unit premises at Masbrough.

Lynda Marginson and Sarah Mainwaring were thanked for their interesting and informative presentation.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
29th May, 2013**

Present:- Councillor Smith (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Barron, Beaumont, Beck, Buckley, Clark, Gilding, Gosling, Goulty, Hoddinott, Kaye, Middleton, Pickering, Read, Smith, Swift, Wallis and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence were received from The Mayor (Councillor Foden) and from Councillors The Mayor (Councillor John Foden), Astbury, Dalton, Doyle, Ellis, Falvey, Godfrey, Jepson, McNeely, Roche, Sims, Watson, Tweed, Whelbourn, Whysall and Wootton.

HIGH SPEED RAILWAY HS2 - "ENGINE FOR GROWTH"

Members received a presentation from three representatives of the company HS2 Limited, Stephen McFarlane, Alasdair Hassan and Rachel Blake, about the proposed high speed railway (HS2) which will link London, the West Midlands and Manchester and also travel through South Yorkshire to Wakefield and Leeds.

During the presentation, it was explained that a Government-led examination had initially been undertaken of whether the long term demand on the rail network could be satisfied by the development of a new high speed line. It was clear that by the middle of next decade (2020s), the existing Inter City rail network, including both East and West coast mainlines will be stretched to capacity. The High Speed 2 company was therefore created to examine how to develop new railway lines and to "bring the Midlands and northern cities closer to London".

Phase 1 of the high speed rail network (London to Birmingham) is well advanced and it is expected that Parliament will shortly grant consent to allow construction work to begin during 2016/17.

Details of Phase 2 of the high speed rail network have been published, showing the rail links from Birmingham and the Midlands to Manchester and the North-West of England (and to Scotland) and also the link from Birmingham to the East Midlands, South Yorkshire, Wakefield, Leeds and also to York and the North East of England.

The new rail network will have high speed, high capacity and high reliability and will be a major engine for economic growth in the United Kingdom, by shrinking the economic geography of the country and bringing the main cities closer together (by reducing the journey times between them). Construction of this rail network will be the largest infrastructure development in Western Europe. It is projected that Phase 1 (London to Birmingham and the West Midlands) will be in operation for passenger travel by 2026, with the Phase 2 sections opening in 2033. The new trains will be at the cutting edge of rail technology and will travel at speeds of up to a maximum of 225 mph.

Studies have shown that Inter City rail demand has doubled in the last fifteen years and will double again in the next twenty years. By the mid-2020s, the Southern main rail lines will be full to capacity and the East Coast and Midland mainlines will be over-crowded and over-capacity. HS2 meets that demand and changes the way the rail network operates; HS2 will improve transport connections between cities in the Midlands and the north of England. The creation of the high speed lines and the transfer of Inter-City passenger services onto those new lines will create space on the existing regional lines, for both regional passenger services and for rail freight.

The construction of the high speed railway and of new and refurbished stations will create upwards of 100,000 new jobs. A new station will be constructed at Euston and there will be a new link from the high speed rail network to the cross rail (Heathrow Express) at Old Oak Common, to assist in easing the flow of transport across London. New stations will be constructed at Birmingham, at Toton sidings (Derbyshire), at Meadowhall and in Leeds. From Leeds, the HS2 line will connect to the existing rail network serving York, Newcastle and the North-East of England. Construction work on Phase 2 is expected to begin during the middle of the next decade.

The preparations for Phase 2 began in 2010 and HS2 Ltd has been given the task of ensuring the construction of the railway stations and railway lines. There continues to be lengthy discussions with local authorities about the way the construction work will affect their areas. Many options were considered for the location of the high speed line and the stations.

Locally for South and West Yorkshire, the high speed railway route will follow a line almost parallel to the M1 motorway, moving north from the new infrastructure main depot to be constructed at Staveley, near Chesterfield. The high speed line will be routed at elevated levels from the Rother Valley, via Beighton/Catcliffe/Orgreave/Waverley, to the new station at Meadowhall, constructed at a similar height to the upper deck of the adjacent Tinsley viaduct. To the north of M1 Junction 35 (Thorpe Hesley), the high speed line crosses the M1 via a tunnel beneath the motorway (200 metres length) and across Hoyland (tunnel of two kilometres length) to the more suitable, flatter terrain to the East of Barnsley. Passing between Normanton and Pontefract, in the Wakefield area, the high speed line eventually reaches the new station near to the Leeds city centre. An additional spur will link Leeds to York, via Garforth.

The route around Meadowhall has implications for a number of specialist businesses, such as Firth Rixon. The high speed line will have a connection to existing rail services at the Meadowhall transport interchange and station platforms will be lengthened from 100 metres to 300 metres. An additional tram stop will be built, providing a connection from that service into the HS2 network.

After the presentation, Members asked various questions and raised the following issues:-

(1) Property blight and arrangements for compensation

It was noted that Phase 1 of the high speed line has a safeguarded construction route measured 60 metres either side of the centre line of the rail line, affecting the rural areas through which the line passes. A further detailed study is taking place in respect of urban areas. To date, there is not yet any set width of rail corridor for blighted properties and their possible entitlement to compensation. After the Government announcement of the preferred railway route, there will be public consultation during 2013 and 2014 about possible compensation for owners and occupiers of properties affected by the construction of the high speed railway. There is current legislation affecting property blight and the Government has put in place a national compensation code.

(2) Construction of the railway tunnel beneath Hoyland, Barnsley

The shorter tunnel is to be constructed to allow the railway line to pass beneath the M1 motorway to the north of Thorpe Hesley; the longer tunnel (2 kilometres) is to be constructed beneath Hoyland. Twin-bore tunnels are to be constructed to allow trains to pass each other at high speed.

(3) Other countries (eg: France, Japan) complete similar, large-scale construction and engineering projects in a much shorter time than the United Kingdom; will the railway infrastructure be developed in stages, in advance of the eventual opening of the network to passengers in 2033 ?

HS2 (Phase 2) construction will probably begin in 2024, with lines to Leeds and to Manchester being built simultaneously during a period of eight years. The development of stations and tunnels are significant factors. The Parliamentary process will dictate the timescales for construction work and much depends also on the workforce skills and capacity existing in the United Kingdom for this type of large-scale construction and engineering work.

(4) Recent statement issued by the National Audit Office, saying that the economic benefits of the high speed rail network are unclear; will local firms and labour be used ? South Yorkshire has a low wage economy, therefore would it be more beneficial to invest this public money in the local economy ?

The National Audit is very proficient at uncovering gaps or weaknesses in any economic argument or case. The Government is convinced of the economic benefits and value for money of this type of investment, in terms of the transport case. There are likely to be other wider benefits, not yet identified, perhaps by reducing the north-south economic divide. The use of local labour and suppliers is a priority for the developing procurement strategy for HS2. Other transport projects, such as the London cross-rail

system, will not suffer because of the inception of HS2. It is imperative that the high speed rail system should link seamlessly to the international rail network in London, facilitating access by rail to Europe.

(5) 18 trains per hour is a very intensive use of the railway; are the trains dedicated to the high speed network, or are they capable of transferring onto other, regional tracks ? What is the balance between the number of passenger trains and freight trains using HS2 ?

The section of the HS2 rail network local to South Yorkshire will accommodate ten services per hour in each direction. Other areas, such as the Thames Link in London will be upgraded to 24 services per hour. By comparison, the London underground network accommodates 32 trains per hour on its busiest lines. The railway technology is available and sufficient to support these frequencies of train service.

Some rolling stock will travel only on the high speed lines, whilst others (known as 'classic compatible') serving the North-West and North-East of England will be capable of re-joining the existing mainline tracks. The high speed network carries only passenger rail services, in order to achieve high standards of service reliability, but will not carry freight trains.

(6) The impact of the high speed railway line on the village of Catcliffe (where some residents may be eligible for compensation for property blight) and the nearby developing community of Waverley; is there to be meaningful public compensation about the route of the railway line ?

The high speed rail route has cross-party support in Parliament and the preferred route ultimately will be constructed. Businesses and homeowners should make their views known during the public consultation exercise, in order that appropriate action may be taken to try and mitigate the impact of the rail project on their properties and homes.

(7) The new development at Waverley will absorb some of the Borough Council's Local Plan housing allocation; if this development had to be reduced in size, it may lead to other areas of the Rotherham Borough having to accommodate new housing, perhaps with building on land in the green belt

The HS2 Limited company is already involved in discussions with local authorities, businesses, property developers and other interested parties. It is important that the full impact of the construction of the high speed rail network is understood by everyone.

(8) Several Members reiterated their concerns about the economic benefits for the South Yorkshire region (in an era which already has many sophisticated means of communication), compensation for home-owners and the environmental and noise impact of trains travelling at high speeds

The high speed rail network is needed because existing rail networks are being stretched beyond capacity. It is important that the economy and businesses benefit from this public investment in transport. The economic case is a robust one for the achievement of shorter journey times between this country's major cities. Research shows that people do appreciate and value shorter, reliable journey times. Experience in other countries (eg: Lille and Lyon in France) has proved that regions will benefit from the improved economy and rail network, not just the large and capital cities.

(9) Concerns about local connections to and from the high speed rail station at Meadowhall, by rail, bus, tram and road – does the existing transport network around Meadowhall have sufficient capacity to cope with additional people and traffic congestion ?

These issues ought to be raised within the public consultation exercise and also in discussions with the local authorities. It is important that the local road system, car parks, bus, tram and regional rail services are properly in place and operating in a reliable way.

The achievement of these aims may require further investment by HS2 to improve the local highway and transport connections, to ensure that the economic benefits are to the advantage of the region.

Members noted the constraints of the existing transport infrastructure in South Yorkshire and that improvements may take several years to achieve. The public consultation exercise, locally, should help to make the case for the necessary improvements to be delivered, either as part of HS2 or in advance of the railway system opening. Rotherham will benefit from the new tram-train link to be constructed from Meadowhall South to Parkgate, although further improvements will be needed to link this transport system to the HS2 station. In addition, the improvement of the railway line at Holmes Chord from single track to two-way operation is an imperative.

(10) Funding of the high speed rail network and ownership of the rolling stock

The project is entirely financed by public funds. A decision has not yet been made about the future ownership of the rolling stock.

(11) M1 corridor near to Catcliffe and Tinsley already has severe difficulties in terms of poor air quality

This issue has already been identified in preparation of the high speed rail network and mitigating action will be planned as part of the construction phase.

(12) Will the public consultation process be worthwhile and successful ?

It is envisaged that the process will be open and transparent.

Members thanked Stephen McFarlane, Alasdair Hassan and Rachel Blake for their interesting and informative presentation.

EARLY RELEASE OF PENSION BENEFITS
5th June, 2013

Present:- Councillor Stone (in the Chair); Councillors Akhtar and Smith.

EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC.

Resolved:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 1 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (information relating to individuals).

EARLY ACCESS TO PENSION BENEFITS

The Panel considered an application for the early release of pension benefits in respect of L.W.

Resolved:- That the early release of pension benefits in respect of L.W. be approved.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE
11th June, 2013

Present:- Councillor Wootton (in the Chair); Councillors Barron and Swift.

**CLUB/PREMISES CERTIFICATE (LICENSING ACT 2003) - BOW
BROOM SOCIAL CENTRE, 88 THOMAS STREET, SWINTON**

Consideration was given to an application for a premises licence under the Licensing Act 2003, in respect of the premises known as the Bow Broom Social Centre, 88 Thomas Street, Swinton.

The Licensing Authority received representations which were not withdrawn and the Sub-Committee considered those representations.

The Applicants provided some background information as to their reasons for wanting to re-open this establishment, their intended use of the building and their attempts to address some of the concerns that had been raised by local residents relating to insufficient car parking, public nuisance caused by previous noise and live music at the premises, people standing outside, swearing and fighting by patrons of this establishment and the locally circulated petition.

Questions to the Applicants by the Sub-Committee included issues relating to sale of alcohol, playing of recorded music, the need to be a good neighbour, awareness of the Licensing objectives, installation of C.C.T.V., public safety, the protection of children from harm, sound proofing with the provision of double doors to the entrance to the beer garden and erection of public notices.

Questions to the Applicants by local residents included issues relating to car parking, number of complaints about these premises, use of experienced bar staff, use and clarification of the premises and the lack of contact with immediate neighbours.

The Objectors to the application were four local residents.

The representations from local residents were considered and concerns were raised about the potential for noise and disturbance, previous noise issues relating to loud music and rowdy patrons, hours of opening and patron migration in the early hours, public safety, noise disturbance, unwanted facility, why the applicant could not pursue his other option of a residential property, gangs of underage drinkers, young people playing football and past experiences with the running of this club.

Both the Applicants and Objectors were given the opportunity to sum-up their representations.

The case for the Applicants' side made reference to the public perception and reputation of the club under previous poor management, the adherence with the licensing objectives, the view that should a license be granted the anti-social elements of the club would not continue as it had in the past and the efforts to eradicate the concerns already raised under new management, which should be alleviated further with the closing time of 11.00 p.m.

In summing up, the case for the Objectors' side made reference to the previous levels of noise that emanated from the premises and around the beer garden, along with inconsiderate parking and the protection of children from harm.

Members gave due consideration to the application for the premises licence and the conditions that the premises licence holder had volunteered.

Resolved:- (1) That the variation to Premises Licence be granted with a Licensed time of 10.00 a.m. and a premises closing time of 11.00 p.m., with the exception of New Year's Eve of 1.00 a.m.

(2) That C.C.T.V. be installed with cameras specifically located for the inside/outside entrances and beer garden.

(3) That double doors be installed to the entrance to the beer garden.

(4) That all fire risk assessments be put in place and kept up-to-date and that all fire fighting equipment be maintained and certified.

(5) That notices be displayed advising customers of the need to reduce noise when leaving the premises.

(6) That during the playing of live/recorded music all windows and doors remain closed.

(7) That no glass or bottles be taken outside and that all drinks must be in plastic containers.

(8) That the Challenge 25 proof of age scheme be adopted and a refusal book be completed.

(9) That children be supervised by an adult over the age of eighteen at all times, with children under the age of sixteen off the premises by 10.00 p.m.

COUNCIL SEMINAR
11th June, 2013

Present:- Councillor Hussain (in the Chair); Councillors Ahmed, Ali, Beaumont, Beck, Clark, Dalton, Dodson, Gosling, Hoddinott, Pitchley, Roche, Rushforth, G. A. Russell, P. A. Russell, Sims, Watson and Wallis.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Godfrey, Lakin, McNeely and Pickering.

VULNERABLE PERSONS' UNIT

The Chairman, Councillor Hussain, Cabinet Member for Cohesion and Communities, welcomed everyone and introduced Zafar Saleem and Carol Adamson from the Community Engagement Team, along with Chief Inspector Richard Butterworth from South Yorkshire Police to the meeting.

The Officers gave a presentation about Rotherham Vulnerable Persons Unit (VPU) which focused on:-

- The context why the VPU was set up.
- Recent national cases involving vulnerable and repeat victims.
- Weaknesses highlighted nationally in local partnership responses.
- VPU Priorities – Hate Crime/Harassment, Vulnerable People, Community Tensions and Prevent.
- How Police identify vulnerability.
- Assessing risks and risk assessments.
- VPU activities for vulnerable people.
- Multi-agency strategy meetings of the Vulnerability Group and the sharing of information.
- Membership of the Vulnerability Group and the associated groups and the co-ordinating/scrutiny of activity.
- Recently reviewed cases – demand (graphical data) and the reduction and mitigation of risk.
- Key performance indicators around the VPU.
- VPU activities – community cohesion.
- VPU activities – hate crime and harassment.
- Tell MAMA – Measuring Anti-Muslim Attacks – A national service to report any form of anti-Muslim abuse.
- Prevent Issues and the co-ordination of a partnership approach to the Counter Terrorism Local Profile (CTLP) and support to Safer Neighbourhood Teams.
- Future Challenges – community tensions and tension monitoring, impact of national and global events, impact of recent protests, young people and schools and vulnerable people.
- VPU personnel and roles.

A discussion and answer session ensued and the following issues were raised and subsequently clarified:-

- The point at which the VPU considered a person at crisis and when intervention would commence.
- New structure and remit of the VPU.
- Involvement of key agencies and co-ordination of support.
- Child sexual exploitation training and assurances of referrals to the PPU.
- Co-ordination of the PYPPO's work in schools.
- Access to mental health services and referrals by Elected Members.
- Identification of a vulnerable person and the assessment criteria.
- Cataloguing of anti-social behaviour on the Police Anti-Social Behaviour Case Management System.

Agreed:- That the Officers and Chief Inspector Butterworth be thanked for their informative presentation.

**LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE
Monday, 1st July, 2013**

Present:- Councillor Barron (in the Chair); Councillors Buckley and N. Hamilton.

**CLUB/PREMISES CERTIFICATE (LICENSING ACT 2003) - METZ BAR,
6 MAIN STREET, ROTHERHAM**

Consideration was given to an application for a variation of a Premises Licence under the Licensing Act 2003 in respect of the premises known as the Metz Bar, 6 Main Street, Rotherham.

In the absence of the applicant, the Sub-Committee decided to adjourn this hearing until a later date.

COUNCIL SEMINAR
2nd July, 2013

Present:- Councillor Stone (in the Chair); Councillors Beaumont, Beck, Burton, Clark, Dalton, Ellis, Godfrey, Lelliott, McNeely, Pickering, G. A. Russell, Sharman, Sims, Smith and Watson.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ahmed, Ali, Dodson and Havenhand.

THE LOCAL AUTHORITY'S RESPONSIBILITIES IN RELATION TO PUBLIC HEALTH

Consideration was given to a presentation from Dr. Nagpal Hoysal concerning the Council's responsibilities for public health. The presentation included the following summary issues:-

: the three new, main responsibilities of the Local Authority :

health improvement – helping people live healthier life styles;
health protection – planning to prevent public health emergencies (eg: the spread of disease);
providing public health advice to NHS commissioners – including social care services;

: the provision of services – sexual health; school nursing services; drug and alcohol prevention and treatment; helping people to stop smoking; obesity; NHS health checks and lifestyle support;

: a detailed breakdown of planned spending on public health in the 2013/2014 financial year – a limited budget of £14 millions is available, of which only 4% is used for administration and running costs;

: life expectancy – an improvement because in last two decades people in Rotherham are living longer and enjoy healthier lifestyles, although the figures are still below the national average for England (and this gap has widened slightly in recent years);

: Infant Mortality – the rates of infant mortality have been falling;

: Circulatory disease mortality - a measure of lives lost before their time, for example, because of heart disease;

: Cancer – there has been a reduction in the incidence of Rotherham people suffering from cancer, although statistics for the Borough area remain below the national average for England;

: Suicide mortality – suicide rates have been reducing, although there has been a change in the way statistics are recorded;

- : Life expectancy at birth – people in most deprived live shorter lives;
- : Life expectancy – analysis by electoral Ward – clear geographical differences are apparent between electoral Wards;
- : Strategy Response – priorities are : Obesity/smoking/alcohol; Dementia; Affordable Warmth; young people who are not in education, employment or training;
- : the growing emphasis upon Prevention and Early Intervention and Healthy Lifestyles, which requires a strong partnership approach;
- : emerging issues include the Government's welfare reform and particularly the impact upon mental health and child welfare;
- : the improvement of public health should be everyone's business;
- : emphasis upon the deficit and asset approach of the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment.

The Members present asked various questions:-

- (a) services for people suffering domestic violence – health promotion has always emphasised the need to solve the problem of domestic violence; the public health services should assist those who have difficulty speaking up for themselves;
- (b) how are health priorities established ? – the Council will be able to influence these priorities, within the new responsibilities (the Health and Wellbeing Board has an enabling function, to scrutinize the performance of the new public health function);
- (c) will the deprived communities be given priority in budget terms ? - the current budget is limited and therefore the targeting of resources must be precise;
- (d) it was confirmed that public health data will be available for Elected Members on a Ward-by-Ward basis; the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment is being refreshed – and the forthcoming Internet web site will include key information about public health.

Dr. Hoysal was thanked for his very informative presentation.

POLICE AND CRIME PANEL
17th June, 2013

Present:-

Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council:-

Councillor M. Dyson
Councillor R. Sixsmith (Observer)

Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council:-

Councillor G. Jones (Substitute)

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council:-

Councillor J. Akhtar
Councillor T. Sharman

Sheffield City Council:-

Councillor H. Harpham
Councillor T. Hussain
Councillor H. Mirfin-Bourkouris

Co-opted Member:-

Mrs. M. Tennison
Mr. K. Walayat

Apologies for Absence were received from:-

Mayor R. Jones (Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council).
Councillor P. Bartlett (Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council).

J1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Resolved:- That Councillor Helen Mirfin-Boukouris be Chairman of the Police and Crime Panel for 2013/14 Municipal Year.

(Councillor Mirfin-Boukouris in the Chair who thanked Councillor Harry Harpham for his services to the Panel during its establishment)

J2. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

Resolved:- That Councillor Jahangir Akhtar be appointed as the Vice-Chairman of the Police and Crime Panel for the Municipal Year 2013/14.

J3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 13TH MARCH, 2013

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meetings of the Police and Crime Panel held on 13th March, 2013.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meetings of the Police and Crime Panel held on 13th March, 2013 be agreed as a true record.

J4. QUESTION FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

A member of the public asked on what topics was the Police and Crime Panel interested in receiving public questions and in doing so asked why road safety was not detailed in the Police & Crime Plan. 20 mph speed limits were being introduced in urban areas in line with DfT guidelines and asked what was Police policy on legal enforcement and how was this decided?

The Police and Crime Commissioner reported that 20 mph speed limits were in operation across various districts across South Yorkshire and the Police's resources had to patrol the highways on a risk based system.

The Police held a database which they shared with the Local Authority where incidents had taken place.

The Police and Crime Commissioner welcomed introducing 20 mph speed limits, particularly in residential and the most vulnerable areas, like schools, but only had a limited resource to patrol the hotspot zones.

As part of the grants scheme Neighbourhood Watch Areas and local activists were being encouraged to develop PACTS, particularly on road safety around schools. In addition, Local Authorities and Safer Neighbourhood Teams etc. were being encouraged to come forward with solutions to look at priorities within the resources available.

The Vice-Chairman also pointed out that the role of this Panel was to look at the Police and Crime Commissioner's priorities and performance manage against Police and Crime Panel targets.

J5. ANNUAL REPORT

Consideration was given to the report of the Annual Report presented by the Police and Crime Commissioner, which set out how the Commissioner had exercised his statutory functions since being appointed, as well as providing an overview of the work undertaken by South Yorkshire Police Authority of its statutory functions between April and November, 2012.

The main purpose of the report was to highlight performance against the functions of a Police and Crime Commissioner as set out in the Act and to demonstrate performance against the key objectives set out in the Police

and Crime Plan 2013-17 which were:

- Reduce Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour.
- Protect Vulnerable People.
- Improve Visible Policing.

The reporting year was another very difficult year for all public services and Policing was not immune from the further significant cuts made by Central Government to public service funding in 2012/13. In terms of crime performance information comparing 2011-12 to 2012-13 this demonstrated continued overall reductions in crime despite the challenging financial circumstances.

In reviewing the period from November, 2012 to March, 2013, the Police and Crime Commissioner recalled the more significant events including:-

- Drafted and published the first Police and Crime Plan.
- Established fortnightly Commissioner Surgeries giving 1.35million residents access to meet with the Police and Crime Commissioner.
- Recruitment of both a Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner and Deputy Chief Constable.
- Development of Community Grant scheme allocating Proceeds of Crime Act funding back to the community.
- Become the North East Regional Director in relation to the National Police Air Service and secured a seat on the Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary Performance Board.
- Developed the website and electronic channels of communication including twitter and Facebook demonstrating commitment to openness and transparency.
- Established accountability arrangements with the Chief Constable and Senior Command Team.
- Agreed collaboration between West Yorkshire, North Yorkshire and Humberside Police on Scientific Support Service.
- Retained bases in South Yorkshire for the Mounted Police Section and a Police Helicopter.
- Agreed the Custody Suite Rationalisation.
- Established a South Yorkshire Joint Liaison Forum involving Unison, GMB, Unite, Police Federation and Police Superintendents Association.
- Commissioned additional services from South Yorkshire Probation Trust and Victim Support.
- Established a procurement framework to help bolster the South Yorkshire economy.
- Refreshed the Independent Advisory Groups to further provide transparency and accountability, established countywide Child Sexual Exploitation forum, countywide Community Safety Partnership Chairs forum and Joint Audit Committee.

The Police and Crime Commissioner also gave an update on progress of

elements of his Plan relating to:-

- Strategic Planning.
- The Governance Arrangements.
- Progress Against Priorities.
- Reducing Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour.
- Protecting Vulnerable People.
- Improving Visible Policing.
- The Budget.
- Holding the Chief Constable to account.
- Partnership Working.
- Collaboration.
- Community Grants.
- Information and Engagement.
- People.
- Work of the South Yorkshire Police Authority.
- South Yorkshire Police Performance.

The Police and Crime Commissioner was committed to his vision to make South Yorkshire the safest place to live, learn, work and run businesses and believed his Annual Report captured the progress made not only against the objectives as set out in the Police and Crime Plan, which would help work towards this vision, but also the wider responsibilities of his role. There were two significant legacy issues unique to South Yorkshire - the tragic event of Hillsborough and the policing of the mining dispute at Orgreave. The Police and Crime Commissioner was continuing to hold regular discussions and monitor both matters closely. It was his intention to maximise transparency throughout and to do what he could do to help facilitate bringing these matters to an acceptable resolution.

A discussion and a question and answer session ensued and the following issues were raised and clarified by the Police and Crime Commissioner:-

- How members of the public could find out about the Police and Crime Commissioner's public surgeries.
- Establishment of regular strategic forums and the membership of these.
- The priority of reducing anti-social behaviour and how many incidents there had been in the last year, the target setting for the coming year and what attempts would be made to reduce the numbers further.
- Increase in theft from person numbers and whether this was attributable to the down turn in the economy.
- In light of decreasing resources and the number of demonstrations/ protests taking place what measures could be taken to ensure that local communities were kept safe and whether there was potential for Police and Crime Commissioners collectively to lobby the Home Office for additional support.

- The need for good partnership and working relationships between the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Chief Constable.
- Role of the Police Protection Units.
- Review of the PACT meetings welcomed.

The Panel also noted the email that had been received regarding the Scrutiny Review of Domestic Abuse Services being undertaken by the Improving Lives Select Commission in Rotherham, which detailed a number of questions.

The Police and Crime Commissioner confirmed that, with regards to priorities and the budget constraints, funding would not be affected for the next twelve months and would continue for tackling domestic violence. The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner was currently identifying resources that could be put in place and where the gaps in provision were. The Domestic Violence Advocacy Unit was receiving £40,000 from the Local Strategic Partnership, £35,000 from the Council and £20,000 from the Home Office.

Resolved:- That the draft Police and Crime Panel be received and any further comments submitted to the Police and Crime Commissioner by 8th July, 2013.

J6. UPDATE UPON THE HANDLING OF COMPLAINTS

Consideration was given to a report presented by Jacqueline Collins, Monitoring Officer, which provided an update on the handling of complaints received against the Police and Crime Commissioner.

In accordance with Regulation 6(1) of the Elected Local Policing Bodies (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2012 the Panel had a duty to ensure it was kept informed of the handling of such complaints.

Since the previous meeting the following matters have been considered:-

1. A complaint that the Commissioner had failed to respond to correspondence.

The Office of the Commissioner confirmed that a response had been sent, although with some delay. Following consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman the matter was not accepted as a formal complaint and no further action was taken.

2. A complaint that the Commissioner was making statements in support of a political candidate.

Following consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman it was determined that as the Panel had considered a very similar complaint at its meeting on 13th March, 2013, the complaint would not be referred to the Panel for resolution.

A full explanation of the earlier decision was provided to the complainant.

3. A comment regarding a failure of the Commissioner to show support for the Chief Constable.

Having consulted with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman it was determined that the communication took the form of a comment and did not reveal a complaint. Therefore, the matter was not referred to the Panel.

There were two further complaints in relation to which, in accordance with the Panel's complaints procedure, the comments of the Commissioner were being sought. These would be reported to a future meeting of the Panel.

The Panel were of the view that there appeared to be some vagueness by the public on the role of the Police and Crime Commissioner, but it was uncertain how this could be dealt with. It was suggested, however, that a section on Frequently Asked Questions be included on the Police and Crime Panel's website which may help in managing expectations.

Resolved:- That the report be received and the contents noted.

J7. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- (1) That the next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel take place on Monday, 2nd September, 2013 at 10.00 a.m.

(2) That all subsequent meetings be held at 1.00 p.m. to facilitate attendance by members of the public.

BARNSELY, DONCASTER AND ROTHERHAM JOINT WASTE BOARD
14th June, 2013

Present:- Councillor (in the Chair); Councillors R. S. Russell.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Ali.

K1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2013/2014.

Resolved:- That Councillor Chris Mills of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council be appointed Chairman of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board for the 2013/2014 Municipal Year.

K2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2013/2014.

Resolved:- That Councillor Roy Miller of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board for the 2013/2014 Municipal Year.

(Councillor R. Miller in the Chair)

K3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

K4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 15TH MARCH, 2013.

Consideration was given to minutes of the previous meeting of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board, held on 15th March, 2013.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

K5. MATTERS ARISING.

There were no matters arising to report.

K6. AUTHORISED REPRESENTATIVES.

It was noted that Councillor. B. Mordue was attending this meeting on behalf of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council representative, Councillor C. Mills.

K7. IAA2 REPORT.

Further to Minute No. D8 (Delegation of Powers) of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board held on 29th June, 2012, consideration was given to the report presented by the Legal Adviser to this Board, which noted the delegations under the Second Inter-Authority Agreement (IAA2) for the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board for the Municipal Year, 2013-2014. This committee had been created pursuant to Section 101(5) of the Local Government Act, 1972.

The report outlined proposals for how the Joint Waste Board would be delegated to the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Steering Committee, which would be empowered to make day-to-day decisions relating to the Principal Contract. However, the provisions of the Local Government Act, 1972 did not allow for the delegation of powers to be exercised jointly by a committee of officers.

The proposed scheme of delegations for the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Councils' Joint Waste Project for the 2013-2014 Municipal Year were suggested. The roles would rotate to avoid a conflict of interest so that no Authority was holding more than one of the three key roles: -

- Authorised Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Steering Committee member (Chairperson of that Body): -

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council for the 2013-2014 Municipal Year;

- This Officer would subsequently delegate certain functions to the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Manager in order to deal with the day-to-day functions of the Principal Contract.
- The membership of the Steering Committee would be: -
 - Barnsley Representative: - The Assistant Director, Highways, Engineering and Waste Management and Neighbourhoods. In their absence, the Group Manager, Waste Services;

- Doncaster Representative: - The Assistant Director, Environment. In their absence, the Head of Service for Environmental Protection;
- Rotherham Representative: - The Director of Streetpride. In their absence, the Waste Strategy Manager.

Resolved: - (1) With the exception of the decisions reserved to the Authorities for a unanimous decision under IAA2 all other decisions in respect of the Principal Contract are delegated by the Joint Waste Board to the Authorised Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Steering Committee Member.

(2) The Authorised Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Steering Committee Member may elect to delegate certain decisions to the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Manager.

(3) The Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Manager may delegate any decisions delegated to her to a member of the Joint Waste Team (if the right to delegate is granted by the Authorised Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Steering Committee Member).

(4) The Joint Waste Board noted that Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council's representative on the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Steering Committee would be the Authorised Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Steering Committee Member for the Municipal Year, 2013/14.

K8. BARNSELY, DONCASTER AND ROTHERHAM MANAGER'S ANNUAL REPORT.

Consideration was given to the submitted annual report of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Manager. The information contained within the report included: -

- Background to the project;
- Governance;
- Resources;
- Training;
- Project delivery;
- Technical;
- Audit;
- Legal;
- Communications;
- Health and Safety;
- Risk Register;
- Other, including the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Project being nominated for a Partnership Award, 2013.

Since publication of the report an update was available in relation to section 6.3.4 'Bolton Road Construction'. The Planning Consent had been referred to the Planning Casework Unit on 16th May, 2013, due to the Green Belt issue. No call-in had taken place, so the decision had been upheld and was now subject to Judicial Review.

Since publication of the report, in relation to section 10.1 'Health and Safety' two injuries that were reportable to the Health and Safety Executive had occurred. In relation to Section 10.2 an incident of ocre water had occurred resulting from a blockage and subsequent stagnation of water. The Environment Agency had been involved and had ruled that there were no issues of concern.

Discussion ensued on the nomination of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Project for a Partnership Award. The Project did not win this category, although feedback had suggested that it was very close and the standard of entries had been exceptionally high. The Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board Elected Members thanked the Officers involved for their hard work.

Resolved: - That the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Manager's annual report be received and the information noted.

K9. RISK REGISTER.

The Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board considered the updated Waste PFI transition phase risk register.

It was noted that the risks in relation to business continuity resulting from 'permitting delay' and 'permitting failure' had now been closed off.

There were no issues to report based on the risk status report as at 29th May, 2013.

Resolved:- That the updated information on the risk register be received.

K10. AUDIT SUMMARY REPORT.

Further to Minute No. D35 (Audit Action Plan) of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board held on 15th March, 2013, consideration was given to the report presented by the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Manager in relation to the strategic-level governance review of the Waste Management PFI Contract between the three Local Authorities and 3SE. A rating of adequate of assurance was given in relation to the internal control framework, meaning that a sufficient framework of key controls existed, which was likely to result in objectives being achieved, but that the control framework could also be stronger.

The Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Manager reported on the on-going progress in relation to this rating.

There were three actions outstanding in relation to open risks: -

- Contract Manuals – resources had been increased to complete production of contract manuals within the timescales available;
- Terms of Reference – the terms of contract would be merged into a terms of reference specific for each group;
- Rotherham's Finance Systems were being updated and Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham procedures were being implemented to comply with the new systems.

Resolved: - That the progress towards the recommendations of the Waste Management PFI Contract Review Audit Report, 2013, be noted.

K11. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND THE PUBLIC.

Resolved:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 as amended (information relating to the financial/business affairs of any person (including the Joint Committee)).

K12. BDR PFI BUDGET 2012-2013.

Consideration was given to a report of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Manager and presented by the Finance Strategy Manager (Financial Services, Resources Directorate) detailing the 2012/13 annual return of the Operational Management Budget for the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Waste Partnership and presenting the 2013/14 Budget for approval.

It was noted that the Annual Governance Statement for the Financial Year 2012-2013 was required to be submitted to the Audit Commission.

The outturn position for the 2012-2013 Financial Year was a reported underspend of £198,095. This outturn position would be subject to scrutiny by BDO LLP, who had been appointed by the Audit Commission, and by Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council's Internal Audit, as lead Authority. The financial records would be available for public inspection between 24th June, 2013 and 19th July, 2013. Notice of this would be displayed in the three Authorities between 10th June and 23rd June, 2013.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That the 2012/13 annual return of the Operational Management Budget for the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Waste Partnership, as now submitted, be approved.

(3) That the 2013/14 Operational Management Budget for the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Waste Partnership, as now submitted, be approved.

K13. DATE, TIME AND VENUE FOR THE NEXT MEETING: -

Resolved: - That the next meetings of the Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste Board take place on: -

- Friday 13th September, 2013, briefing to begin at 1.30 p.m., meeting to start at 1.45 p.m., in the Rotherham Town Hall;
- Friday 13th December, 2013, briefing to begin at 1.30 p.m., meeting to start at 1.45 p.m., in the Rotherham Town Hall.